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GENNESARET, SEA OF

GENNES'ARET, SEA OF (יוֹמְתָּה גֶּנֶּנְסָרָאֵט, Luke v. 1: δύσω Γεννησάραν, 1 Mac. xi. 67), called in the O. T. “the Sea of Chinnereth,” or “Chinneroth,” Num. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xii. 3), from a town of that name which stood on or near its shore (Josh. xix. 30). In the later Hebrew we always find the Greek form Γέννας, which may possibly be a corruption of גנים, though some derive the word from Gannah, “a garden,” and Sharon, the name of a plain between Tabor and this lake (Onom. s. v. Σαρόν: Cambria, pp. 193-259). Josephus calls it Γεννασαραίνα χώρα (Ant. xii. 2, § 1); and this seems to have been its common name at the commencement of our era (Strabo, xi. p. 755; Plin. v. 16; Ptol. v. 15). At its northeastern angle was a beautiful and fertile plain called "Gennesaret" (גְּנֶנֶסָרָאֵט, Matt. xiv. 34), from which the name of the lake was taken (Joseph. B. J. iii. 10, § 7). The lake is also called in the N. T. Θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, from the province of Galilee which bordered on its western side (Matt. iv. 18; Mark vii. 31; John vi. 1); and Θάλασσα τῆς Τιβέριας, from the celebrated city (John vi. 1, [xxi. 1]). Eusebius calls it Διαμήτηρ Τιβερίας (Onom. s. v. Σαρόν: see also Cyr. in Jev. i. 5). It is a curious fact that all the numerous names given to this lake were taken from places on its western side. Its modern name is Bahar Tiberiav, (בַּהַר תִּבְרֵיָא). It is the source of two rivers which empty into the Jordan a few miles below the sea. The lake is about seventeen miles long and twelve broad.

In Josh. xiii. 3 “the plains south of Chinnereth” are mentioned. It is the sea and not the city that is here referred to (comp. Deut. iii. 17; Josh. xiii. 3); and “the plains” are those along the banks of the Jordan. Most of our Lord’s public life was spent in the environs of the Sea of Gennesaret. On its shores stood Capernaum, “his own city” (Matt. iv. 13); on its shore he called his first disciples from their occupation as fishermen (Luke v. 1-11); and near its shores he spoke many of his parables, and performed many of his miracles. This region was then the most densely peopled in all Palestine. No less than nine cities stood on the very shores of the lake; while numerous large villages dotted the plains and hill-sides around (Porter, Handbook, p. 421).

The Sea of Gennesaret is of an oval shape, about thirteen geographical miles long, and six broad.

GENNESARET, SEA OF

Josephus gives the length at 140 stadia, and the breadth forty (B. J. iii. 10, § 7); and Pliny says it measured xvi. m. v. by vi. (H. N. xiv.). Both these are near the truth that they could scarcely have been more estimates. The river Jordan enters it at its northern end, and passes out at its southern end. In fact the bed of the lake is just a lower section of the great Jordan valley. Its most remarkable feature is its deep depression, being no less than 700 feet below the level of the ocean (Robinson, Bibl. Res. i. 613). Like almost all lakes of volcanic origin it occupies the bottom of a great basin, the sides of which shelf down with a uniform slope from the surrounding plateaus. On the east the banks are nearly 2000 feet high, destitute of verdure and of foliage, deeply furrowed by ravines, but quite flat along the summit; forming in fact the supporting wall of the table-land of Bashan. On the north there is a gradual descent from this table-land to the valley of the Jordan; and then a gradual rise again to a plateau of nearly equal elevation skirting the mountains of Upper Galilee. The western banks are less regular, yet they present the same general features— plateaus of different altitudes breaking down abruptly to the shore. The scenery has neither grandeur nor beauty. It wants features, and it wants variety. It is bleak and monotonous, especially so when the sky is cloudless and the sun high. The golden tints and purple shadows of evening help it, but it looks best during a thunder-storm, such as the writer has often witnessed in early spring. The cliffs and rocks along the shores are mostly a hard porous basalt, and the whole basin has a scathed volcanic look. The frequent earthquakes prove that the elements of destruction are still at work beneath the surface. There is a copious warm fountain near the site of Tiberias, and it is said that at the time of the great earthquake of 1837 both the quantity and temperature of the water were much increased.

The great depression makes the climate of the shores almost tropical. This is very sensibly felt by the traveller in going down from the plains of Galilee. In summer the heat is intense, and even in early spring the air has something of an Egyptian calmness. Snow very rarely falls, and though it often whitens the neighboring mountains, it never lies here. The vegetation is almost of a tropical character. The thorny lote-tree grows

(387)
among the basalt rocks; palms flourish luxuriantly, and indigo is cultivated in the fields (comp. Joseph. B. J. iii. 10, § 6).

The water of the lake is sweet, cool, and transparent; and its beach is everywhere pellucidly it has a beautiful sparkling look. This fact is somewhat strange when we consider that it is exposed to the powerful rays of the sun, that many warm and brackish springs flow into it, and that it is supplied by the Jordan, which rushes into its northern end, a turbid, reddish torrent. The lake abounds in fish now as in ancient times. Some of the same species as those got in the Nile, such as the Ctenurus, the Turbot, and another called by Hasselquist Syrurus Galileus (Reis, pp. 181, 412 f.; comp. Joseph. B. J. iii. 10, § 7). The fishery, like the soil of the surrounding country, is sadly neglected. One little crazy boat is the sole representative of the fleets that covered the lake in N. T. times, and even with it there is no deep-water fishing. Two modes are now employed to catch the fish. One is a hand-net, with which a man, usually naked (John xxi. 7), stands along the shore, and watching his opportunity, throws it round the game with a jerk. The other mode is still more curious. Bread-crums are mixed up with bi-chloride of mercury, and sown over the water; the fish swallow the poison and die. The dead bodies float, are picked up, and taken to the market of Tiberias! (Porter, Handbook, p. 432.)

A "mournful and solitary silence" now reigns along the shores of the Sea of Gennesaret, which were in former ages studded with great cities, and resounded with the din of an active and industrious people. Seven out of the nine cities above referred to are now uninhabited ruins; one, Magdala, is occupied by half a dozen mud hovels; and Tiberias alone retains a wretched remnant of its former prosperity.

GE'ONNES (Γέννεας, Alex. Γένναιος: Gen'nes), father of Apollonius, who was one of several generals (στρατηγοὶ) commanding towns in Palestine, who molested the Jews while Lyssias was governor for Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. xii. 2). Luther understands the word as an adjective (Γένναιος = well-born), and has "des edlen Apollonius."

GENTILES. I. Old Testament,—The Hebrew יְנִיטָל in sing. = a people, nation, body politic; in which sense it is applied to the Jewish nation amongst others. In the plural it acquires an ethnographic, and also an invocative meaning, and is rendered in L. V. by gentiles and Heathen.

הניטלו, the nations, the surrounding nations, foreigners, as opposed to Israel (Neh. v. 8). In Gen. x. 5 it occurs in its most indeterminate sense = the far-distant inhabitants of the Western Isles, without the slightest necessary notion of heathenism, or libertinism. In Lev., Dent., Ps., the term is applied to the various heathen nations with which Israel came into contact; its meaning grows wider in proportion to the wider circle of the national experience, and more or less invocative according to the success or defeat of the national arms. In the prophets it attains at once its most comprehensive and its most hostile view; hostile in presence of inward invasions, comprehensive with reference to the triumphs of a spiritual future.

Notwithstanding the disagreeable connotation of the term, the Jews were able to use it, even in the plural, in a purely technical, geographical sense. Sc Gen. x. 5 (see above); Gen. xiv. 1;Josh. xii. 23; Is. ix. 1. In Josh. xii. 24, "the king of the nations of Gilgal," A. V.; better with Genuesus the king of the Gentiles at Gilgal," where probably, as afterwards in Galilee, foreigners, Gentiles, were settled among the Jews.

For "Galilee of the Gentiles," comp. Matt. iv. 15 with Is. ix. 1, where A. V. = "Galilee of the nations." In Heb. גַּלְיָאָאֵל לְבָנָא, the "circle of the Gentiles;" Kat έξοχήν, גַּלְיָאֵל ha-Ga'al; whence the name Galilee applied to a district which was largely peopled by the Gentiles, especially the Phoenicians.

The Gentiles in Gen. xiv. 1 may either be the inhabitants of the same territory, or, as suggested by Genuesus, "nations of the West," generally.

II. New Testament.—1. The Greek ἐθνος in sing. means a people or nation (Matt. xxiv. 7; Acts ii. 5, &c.), and even the Jewish people (Luke vii. 5, &c., xvi. 1, &c.; comp. Matt. xxi. 23, ἐθνος, heathen, ethniio): in Matt. xxi. 43 ἐθνος alludes to, but does not directly stand for, "the Gentiles." As equivalent to Gentiles it is found in the Epistles of St. Paul, but not always in an invocative sense (e. g. Rom. xi. 13; Eph. iii. 1, 6).


The A. V. is not consistent in its treatment of this word; sometimes rendering it by Greek (Acts xiv. 1, vii. 4; Rom. i. 16, x. 12), sometimes by Gentile (Rom. ii. 9, 10, iii. 9; 1 Cor. x. 32), inserting Greek in the margin. The places where ἐθνος is equivalent to Greek simply (as Acts xvi. 1, 3) are much fewer than those where it is equivalent to Gentile. The former may probably be reduced to Acts xvi. 1, 3; Acts xviii. 17; Rom. i. 14. The latter use of the word seems to have arisen from the almost universal adoption of the Greek language. Even in 2 Macc. iv. 13 Ελληνωμόν appears as synonymous with ἀλλοφαλωμόν (comp. vi. 9); and in Is. x. 12 the Local renders גַּלְיָאֵל by Ελληνων: and so the Greek Fathers defended the Christian faith πῶς Ελληνων, and καὶ Γαληνων. [GREG; HEATHEN.]

T. E. B.

GENU'BATH (גֵּנְבָּת) [thep, Ges.]; Gen'vbat: Genubeth, the son of Hadad, an Edomite of the royal family, by an Egyptian princess, the sister of Tahpenes, the queen of the Pharaoh who governed Egypt in the latter part of the reign of David (1 K. vi. 20; comp. 16). Genubath was born in the palace of Pharaoh, and weaned by the queen herself; after which he became a member of the royal establishment, on the same footing as one of the sons of Pharaoh. The fragment of Edomite chronicle in which this is contained is very remarkable, and may be compared with that in Gen. xxxvi. Gubnabath is not again mentioned or alluded to.

GE'ON (גֵּון: Gehon), i. e. Girion, one of the four rivers of Eden; introduced, with the Jordan, and probably the Nile, into a figure in the praise
This is a page from a document discussing the historical and geographical significance of Gerar and Gerar Valley. The text references various biblical passages and geographical locations, discussing the names, historical moments, and cultural significance of these places. It also makes reference to archaeological and historical studies by scholars such as Robinson and others. The page contains specific theological terms and biblical quotes, such as Genesis 20:1 and 21:32, and names like Shimei and Shem. The text is rich with historical and geographical detail, providing insights into the past civilizations and their interactions in this region.
GERASA

(Gerasa, Phœn.; P., Gerasa, Not. Eccles.; Arab. Jerash, جرش). This name does not occur in the O. T., nor in the Received Text of the N. T. But it is now generally admitted that in Matt. viii. 28 "Gerasenes" superseded "Gadarenes." Gerasa was a celebrated city on the eastern borders of Perea (Joseph. B. J. iii. 3, § 3), placed by some in the province of Tzelosia and region of Decapolis (Steph. s. c.), by others in Arabia (Epiph. ad loc.; Her. Ἰορ. in John). These various statements do not arise from any doublet as to the locality of the city, but from the ill-defined boundaries of the provinces mentioned. In the Roman age no city of Palestine was better known than Gerasa. It is situated amid the mountains of Gilead, 20 miles east of the Jordan, and 25 north of Philadelphia, the ancient Rabbath-Ammon. Several MSS. read Γερασαί instead of Γερασηνοί, in Matt. viii. 28; but the city of Gerasa lay too far from the Sea of Tiberias to admit the possibility of the miracles having been wrought in its vicinity. If the reading Γερασηνοί be the true one, the γερασαί, "district," must then have been very large, including Gadara and its environs; and Matthew thus uses a broader appellation, where Mark and Luke use a more specific one. This is not improbable: as Jerome (ad Thund) states that Gilead was in his day called Gerasa; and Origen affirms that Γερασηνοί was the ancient reading (Opp. iv. p. 140).

[GERASA.]

It is not known when or by whom Gerasa was founded. It is first mentioned by Josephus as having been captured by Alexander Janneus (cirec. n. c. 83); Joseph. B. J. i. 4, § 8). It was one of the cities the Jews burned in revenge for the massacre of their countrymen at Gerasa, at the commencement of their last war with the Romans; and it had scarcely recovered from this calamity when the Emperor Vespasian despatched Annianus, his general, to capture it. Annianus, having carried the city at the first assault, put to the sword one thousand of the Jews who had not effected their escape, enslaved their families, and plundered their dwellings (Joseph. B. J. iv. 9, § 1). It appears to have been a more important city in this period that Gerasa attained its greatest prosperity, and was adorned with those monuments which give it a place among the proudest cities of Syria. History tells us nothing of this, but the fragments of inscriptions found among its ruined palaces and temples, show that it is destined for its architectural splendor to the age and genius of the Antonines (A. D. 138-80). It subsequently became the seat of a bishopric. There is no evidence that the city was ever occupied by the Saracens. There are no traces of their architecture—no mosques, no inscriptions, no reconstruction of old edifices, such as are found in most other great cities in Syria. All here is Roman, or at least ante-Islamic; every structure remains as the hand of the destroyer or the earthquake shook it—ruins and desolation.

The ruins of Gerasa are by far the most beautiful and extensive east of the Jordan. They are situated on both sides of a shallow valley that runs from north to south through a high undulating plain, and falls into the Zerka (the ancient Jablock) at the distance of about 5 miles. A little rivulet, thickly fringed with elder, winds through the valley, giving life and beauty to the deserted city. The first view of the ruins is very striking; and such as have enjoyed it will not soon forget the impression made upon the mind. The long colonnade running through the centre of the city, terminating at one end in the graceful circle of the forum; the groups of columns clustered here and there round the crumbling walls of the temples; the heavy masses of masonry that distinguish the positions of the great theatres; and the vast field of shapeless ruins rising gradually from the green banks of the rivulet to the buttressed heights on each side—all combine in forming a picture such as is rarely equaled. The form of the city is an irregular square, each side measuring nearly a mile. It was surrounded by a strong wall, a large portion of which, with its flanking towers at intervals, is in a good state of preservation. Three gateways are still nearly perfect; and within the city upwards of two hundred and thirty columns remain on their pedestals. (Full descriptions of Gerasa are given in the Handbook for Syria, and Pal.; Burchard's Travels in Syria; Buckingham's Arab Tribes; Litter's Pal. and Syria.)

J. L. P.

GERASENES, Matt. viii. 28. [GADARA.]

GERGESITES, THE (οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι: Vulg. omits), Jud. v. 16. [GERGASHTITES.]

GERIZIM (always כֶּרֶנֶּיזֶּים; har-Ge'rizim, the mountain of the Gerizzites, from יִרְזִים, dwellers in a shorn (i.e. desert) land, from יִרְזָה, give off; to cut off: possibly the tribe subdued by David, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8; פִּנְגָוֹס, [Vit. Alex. period. ext. Alex. D. xi. 29; פִּנְגָאִי; Ge'rizim], a mountain designated by Moses, in connexion with Mount Ebal, to be the scene of a great solemnity upon the entrance of the children of Israel into the promised land. High places had a peculiar charm attached to them in these days of external observance. The law was delivered from Sinai: the blessings and curses allied to the performance or neglect of it were directed to be pronounced upon Ge'rizim and Ebal. Six of the tribes—Simeon, Levi (but Joseph being represented by two tribes), Jish, Dan, and Naphtali—upon the latter to curse (Deut. xxvii. 12-13). Apparently, the Ark halted mid-way between the two mountains, encompassed by the priests and Levites, thus divided by it into 10 bands, with Joshua for their oryphas. He read the blessings and cursings successively (Josh. vii. 33, 34), to be re-echoed by the Levites on either side of him, and responded to by the tribes in their double array with a loud Amen (Deut. xxvii. 14). Curiously enough, only the formula for the curses is given (ibid. ver. 14-26); and it was upon Ebal, and not Ge'rizim, where the altar of whole unworked stone was to be built, and where the huge plastered stones, with the words of the law (Josh. viii. 32; Joseph. Ant. iv. 8, § 44, limits them to the blessings and curses just pronounced) written upon them, were to be set up (Deut. xxvii. 4-6) —a significant omen for a people entering joyously upon their new inheritance, and yet the song of Moses abounds with forebodings still more sinister and plain-spoken (Deut. xxviii. 5, 6, and 15-28). The next question is, Has Moses defined the lo
satives of Ebal and Gerizim? Standing on the eastern side of the Jordan, in the plain of Moab (Deut. i. 7), he asks: "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down (i. e. at some distance to the W.), in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the campaign against against Gilgal (i. e. whose territory — not these mountains — commenced over against Gilgal — see Patrick on Deut. xi. 30), beside the plains of Moreh?"... These closing words would seem to mark their site with unusual precision: for in Gen. vii. 5 — the plain (LXX. ἐκτείνεσθαι) of Moreh is expressly connected with "the place of Sichem or Shechem" (N. T. "Sychem" or "Sichar," which last form is thought to convey a reproach. Reland, Dissert. on Gerizim, in Uog. Theaur. p. deccxxvi., in Josephus the form is "Sicima"), and accordingly Judg. ix. 7, Joshua is made to address his celebrated parable to the men of Shechem from the top of Mount Gerizim." The "hills of Moreh," mentioned in the history of Gideon his father, may have been a mountain overhanging the same plain, but certainly could not have been further south (comp. e. vi. 33, and vii. 1). Was it therefore prejudice, or neglect of the true import of these passages, that made Eusebius and Epiphanius, both natives of Palestine, concur in placing Ebal and Gerizim near Jericho, the former charging the Samaritans with crime for attributing titles to Mount Gerizim? (Reland. Dissert., as above, p. deccxxvi.). Of one thing we may be assured, namely, that their Scriptural site must have been, in the fourth century, lost to all but the Samaritans; otherwise these two fathers would have spoken very differently. It is true that they consider the Samaritan hypothesis irreconcilable with Deut. xi. 30, which it has already been shown not to be. A more formidable objection would have been that Joshua could not have marched from Ai to Shechem, through a hostile country, to perform the above solemnity, and retraced his steps so soon afterwards to Gilgal, as has been found there by the Gideonites (Josh. ix. 6; comp. viii. 30-35). Yet the distance between Ai and Shechem is not so long (under two days' journey). Neither can the interval implied in the context of the former passage have been so short, and in the latter so brief, that the latter passage has been misplaced. The remaining objection, namely, "the wide interval between the two mountains at Shechem" (Stanley, S. & P. p. 238, note), is still more easily disposed of, if we consider the blessings and curses to have been pronounced by the Levites, standing in the midst of the valley — thus abbreviating the distance by one half — and not by the six tribes on either hill, who only responded. How indeed could 600,000 men and uphers, besides women and children (comp. Num. ii. 32 with Judg. xx. 2 and 17), have been accommodated in a smaller space? Besides in those days of assemblies "sub dio," the sense of hearing must have been necessarily more acute, just as, before the aids of writing and printing, memories were much more retentive. We may conclude, therefore, that there is no room for doubting the Scriptural position of Ebal and Gerizim, though it may be doubted whether they were placed — in the territory of the tribe of Ephraim; the latter of them overhanging the city of Shechem or Sichem, as Josephus, following the Scriptural narrative, asserts. Even Eusebius, in another work of his (Praec. Evang. ix. 22), quotes some lines from Theodorus, in which the true position of Ebal and Gerizim is described with great force and accuracy and St. Jerome, while following Eusebius in the Omination, in his ordinary correspondence does not hesitate to connect Sichem or Neapolis, the well of Jacob, and Mount Gerizim (Ep. cviii. c. 13, el. Migne). Procopius of Gaza does nothing more than follow Eusebius, and that clumsily (Roland, Palest. lib. ii. c. 13, p. 563); but his more accurate namesake of Caesarea expressly asserts that Gerizim rose over Neapolis (Proc. lib. v. 7) — that Ebal was not a peak of Gerizim (v. Quaresm. Elucid. T. S. lib. vii. Per. i. e. 8), but a distinct mountain to the N. of it, and separated from it by the valley in which Shechem stood, we are not called upon here to prove; nor again, that Ebal was entirely barren, which it can scarce be called now; while Gerizim was the same proverb for verdure and gushing rills formerly, that it is now, at least where it descends towards Nablus, It is a far more important question whether Gerizim was the mountain on which Abrahau was directed to offer his son Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2 ff). First, then, let it be observed that it is not the mountain, but the district which is there called Moriah (of the same root with Moreh: see Corn. a. Lapid. on Gen. xii. 6), and that antecedently to the occurrence which took place "upon one of the mountains" in its vicinity — a consideration which, not itself would naturally point to the locality, already known to Abraham, as the plain or plains of Moreh, "the land of vision," "the high land:" and therefore consistently "the land of adoration," or "religious worship," as it is variously explained. That all these interpretations are incomparably more applicable to the natural features of Gerizim and its neighborhood, than to the hilltop (in comparison) upon which Solomon built his temple, none can for a moment doubt who have seen both Jerusalem unquestionably stands upon high ground, but owing to the hills "round about" it cannot be seen on any side from any great distance; nor, for the same reason, could it ever have been a land of vision, or extensive views. Even from Mount Olivet, which must always have towered over the small eminences at its base to the S. W., the view cannot be named in the same breath with that from Gerizim, which is one of the finest commanding, as it does, from an elevation of nearly 2,500 feet (Arrowsmith, Geograp. Dict. of the H. S. p. 145), "the Mediterranean Sea on the W., the snowy heights of Hermon on the N., on the E. the wall of the trans-Jordanian mountains, broken by the deep cleft of the Jablok " (Stanley, S. & P. p. 235), and the lovely and tortuous expanse of plain (the Makkhe) stretched as a carpet of many colors beneath its feet, as "present to a traveller advancing up the Philistine plain " (ibid. p. 252) — the direction from which Abraham came — to be overlooked. It is by no means necessary, as Mr. Porter thinks (Handbook of S. & P. i. 339), that he should have started from Beer-sheba (see Gen. xxii. 34 — "the whole land being before him," c. xx. 15). Then, "on the morning of the third day, he would arrive in the plain of Sharon, exactly where the massive height of Gerizim is visible afar off" (Ibid p. 251), and from thence, with the mount always —

— a From the top of Gerizim the traveller enjoys a prospect unique in the Holy Land. See it well described in Tristram's Land of Israel p. 101, 1st ed. B.
in view, he would proceed to the exact "place which
god had told him of" in all solemnity — for
again, it is not necessary that he should have ar-
ried on the actual spot during the third day. All
about the narrative, is that, from the time
that it hove in sight, he and Isaac parted
from the young men, and went on together alone.
The Samaritans, therefore, through whom the tradition
of the true site of Gerizim has been preserved, are
probably not wrong when they point out still — as
they have done from time immemorial — Gerizim
as the hill upon which Abraham's "faith was made
perfect" and if it be observable that no such spot is
attested to be shown on the rival hill of Jerusa-
lem, as distinct from Calvary. Different reasons
in all probability caused these two localities to be
so named: the first, not a mountain, but a land,
district, or plain (for it is not intended to be as-
serted that Gerizim itself ever bore the name of
Moriah; though a certain spot upon it was ever
afterwards to Abraham personally "Jehovah-
Jireh"), called Moreh, or Moriah, from the noble
vision of nature, and therefore of natural religion,
that met the eye; the second, a small hill deriving
its name from a special revelation or vision, as the
express words of Scripture say, which took place
"by the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite":
(2 Chr. iii. 1; comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16). If it be
thought strange that a place once called by the
"Father of the faith" Jehovah-Jireh, should have
been merged by Moses, and ever afterwards,
in a general name so different from it in sense and
origin as Gerizim; it would be still more strange,
that, if Mount Moriah of the book of Chronicles
and Jehovah-Jireh were one and the same place, no
sort of allusion should have been made by the in-
spired historian to the prime event which had
caused it to be so called. True it is that Josephus,
in more than one place, asserts that where Abra-
ham offered, there the temple was afterwards built
(Ant. i. 14, § 2, and vii. 14, § 9). Yet the same
Josephus makes God bid Abraham go to the moun-
tain — not the land — of Moriah; having omitted
all mention of the plains of Morch in his account
of the preceding narrative. Besides, in more than
one place he shows that he bore no love to the Sao-
raritans (ibid. xii. 8, § 6, and xii. 5, § 5), St.
Jerome follows Josephus (Quod. in Gen. xxxii. 5. ed.
Migne), and his uncertainty that no such temple of
Gerizim, what else could he have done? Besides
it appears from the Ommaristicon (s. v.) that he
considered the hill of Moreh (Judg. vii. 1) to be
the same with Moriah. And who that is aware of
the extravagance of the Rabbinian traditions re-
specting Mount Moriah can attach weight to any
one of them? (Cumeaux, De Republ. Is. lib. ii.
12). Finally, the Christian tradition, which makes
the site of Abraham's sacrifice to have been on
Calvary, will derive countenance from neither Jose-
phus nor St. Jerome, unless the sites of the Tem-
ple and of the Crucifixion are admitted to have
been the same.
Another tradition of the Samaritans is far less
trustworthy; namely, that Mount Gerizim was the
spot where Melchisedech met Abraham — though
there was a vast difference between what was
neighborhood (Gen. xxxii. 18; Stab. S. o. P. p. 247 ff.). The first altar erected in the land of
Abraham, and the first appearance of Jehovah to
him in it, was in the plain of Moreh near Seirien
(Deut. xii. 6); but the mountain overhanging that
hym (assuming our view to be correct) had not yet
been hallowed to him for the rest of his life by the
decisive trial of his faith, which was made there
subsequently. He can hardly therefore be supposed
to have been gerizim from his road so far, which lay
through the plain of Morch; and the Jordan again is
likely that he would have found the king of Sodom
so far away from his own territory (Gen. xiv. 17 ff.).
Lastly, the altar which Jacob built was not on
Gerizim, as the Samaritans contend, though probably about its base, at the head of the
plain between it and Edom, "in the parcel of a
field which that patriarch purchased from the
children of Hamor, and he spread his tent
(Gen. xxxiii. 18-20). Here was likewise his well
(John iv. 6); and the tomb of his son Joseph
(Josh. xxiv. 32), both of which are still shown;
the former surmounted by the remains of a vaulted
chamber, and with the ruins of a church hard by
(Robinson, Bibl. Res. ii. 283) the latter, with a
"fruitful vine" trailing over its white-washed in-
closure, and before it two dwarf pillars, hollowed
out at the top to receive lamps, which are lighted
every Friday or Mohammedan sabbath. There
is, however, another Mohammedan monument claiming
to be the said tomb (Stanley, S. o. P. p. 241, note).
The tradition (Robinson, ii. 283, note) that the
twelve patriarchs were buried there likewise (it
should have made them eleven without Joseph, or
thirteen, including his two sons), probably depends
upon Acts vii. 42; where, unless we are to suppose
confusion in the narrative, ofad should be read
for ‘Apad, which may well have been suggested to
the copist from its recurrence, v. 17; while ofad
, from having already occurred, v. 15, might
have been thought suspicious.
We now enter upon the second phase in the his-
Tory of Gerizim. According to Josephus, a marriage
contracted between Manasseh, brother of Judas,
the then high-priest, and the daughter of Sanballat
the Cuthian (comp. 2 K. xvii. 24), having created
a great stir amongst the Jews, who had been
strictly forbidden to contract alien marriages (Ezr.
ix. 2; Neh. xiii. 23) — Sanballat, in order to re-
ceal his son-in-law to this unpopular alliance, ob-
tained leave from Alexander the Great to build
a temple upon Mount Gerizim, and to inaugurate
a rival priesthood and altar there to those of Jerusa-
lem (Ant. xi. 8, §§ 2-4, and for the harmonizing
of paraphrase of the site of the temple and Mount
Prideaux, "became the common refuge and asylum
of the refractory Jews" (ibid. ; see also Joseph
Ant. xi. 8, § 7), and for a time, at least, their
temple seems to have been called by the name of a
Greek deity (ibid. xi. 5, § 5). Hence one of the
first acts of Hyrcanus, when the death of Antiochus
Sidetes had set him free, was to erect Shechem,
and then to destroy the temple upon Gerizim, after it
had stood there 200 years (Ant. xiii. 9, § 1). But
the destruction of their temple by no means ruined
the rancour of the Samaritans. The road from
Galilee to Judaea lay then, as now, through Sa-
maria, skipping the foot of Gerizim (John iv. 4).
Here was a constant occasion for religious contro-
versy and for outrage. How is it that Thou, be-
ing a Jew, aske to drink of the water of Samaria?" said the female to our Lord at the
well of Jacob, where both parties would always
be sure to meet. "Our fathers worshipped in
this mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place
where men ought to worship?" . . . Subsequently
we read of the depredations committed on that road.
upon a party of Galileans (Ant. xx. 6, § 1). The liberal attitude, first of the Saviour, and then of his disciples (Acts viii. 14), was thrown away upon all those who would not abandon their creed. And Gerizim continued to be the focus of outbreaks through successive centuries. One, under Pilate, while it led to their severe chastisement, procured the disgrace of that ill-starred magistrate, who had crucified Jesus, the king of the Jews," with impunity (Ant. xviii. 4, § 1). Another hostile gathering on the same spot caused a slaughter of 10,600 of them under Vespasian. It is remarkable that, in this instance, want of water is said to have made them easy victims; so that the delicious cold and pure spring on the summit of Gerizim must have failed before so great a multitude (B. J. iii. 7, § 32). At length their aggressions were directed against the Christians inhabiting Neapolis — now powerful, and under a bishop — in the reign of Zeno. Terebinthus at once carried the news of this outrage to Byzantium: the Samaritans were forcibly ejected from Gerizim, which was handed over to the Christians, and adorned with a church in honor of the Virgin; to some extent fortified, and even guarded. This not proving sufficient to repel the foe, Justinian built a second wall round the church, for which his historian says defied all attacks (Procop. De Aedif. v. 7). It is probably the ruins of these buildings which meet the eye of the modern traveller (Handb. of S. of P. ii. 339). Previously to this time, the Samaritans had been a numerous and important sect — sufficiently so, indeed, to be carefully distinguished from the Jews and Cœcilians in the Theodosian code. This last outrage led to their comparative disappearance from history, as a distinct race, after the 12th, 13th, and 17th centuries take notice of their existence, but extreme paucity (Early Travels, by Wright, pp. 81, 181, and 432), and their number now, as in those days, is said to be below 200 (Robinson, Bibb. Res. ii. 282, 2d ed.). We are confined by our subject to Gerizim, and therefore can only touch upon the Samaritans, or their city Neapolis, so far as their history connects directly with that of the mountain. And yet we must observe that it was undoubt- edly this mountain of which our Lord had said, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem (i. e. exclusively), worship the Father." (John iv. 21) — so likewise it is a singular historical fact, that the Samaritans have continued on this selfsame mountain century after century, with the briefest interruptions, to worship according to their ancient custom ever since to the present day. While the Jews — expelled from Jerusalem, and therefore no longer able to offer up bloody sacrifices according to the law of Moses — have been obliged to adapt their ceremonial to the circumstances of their destiny: here the Paschal Lamb has been offered up in all ages of the Christian era by a small but united nationality (the spot is accurately marked out by Dr. Robinson, Bibb. Res. ii. 277). Their copy of the Law, probably the work of Manasseh, and known to the fathers of the 2d and 3d centuries (Prideaux, Connect. i. 600; and Robinson, ii. 297—301), was, in the 17th, vindicated from oblivion by Seelig, Usher, Morris, and others: and no traveller now visits Palestine with out making a sight of it one of his prime objects Gerizim is likewise still to the Samaritans what Jerusalem is to the Jews, and Mecca to the Mohamnedans. Their prostrations are directed towards it wherever they are; its holiest spot in their estimation being the traditional site of the tabernacle, near that on which they believe Abraham to have offered his son. Both these spots are on the summit: and near them is still to be seen a mound of ashes, similar to the larger and more celebrated one N. of Jerusalem; collected, it is said, from the sacrifices of each successive age (Dr. Robinson, Bibb. Res. ii. 292 and 299, evidently did not see this on Gerizim). Into their more legendary traditions respecting Gerizim, and the story of their alleged worship of a dove,— due to the Jews, their enemies (Ireland, Dict. ap. Uplin. Thesaur. vii. pp. deexxi—xxxiii.), — it is needless to enter.

E. S. F.

* The theory that Gerizim is "the mountain on which Abraham was directed to offer his son Isaac," advocated by Dean Stanley (S. of P. p. 218) and controverted by Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 212), is brought forward by the writer of the above, on grounds which appear to us wholly unsustain-

(1.) The assumed identity of Moreh and Moriah cannot be admitted. There is a radical difference in their roots (Robinson's Gesen. Heb. Lex. a. v.), which is conceded by Stanley; and the reasoning about "the plains of Moreh, the land of vision," "called Moreh, or Moriah, from the noble vision of nature," etc., is irrelevant. Murphy (Com. in loc.) justly observes: "As the two names occur in the same document, and differ in form, they naturally denote different things."

(2) The distance of Gerizim from Beer-sheba is fatal to this hypothesis. The suggestion that Abraham need not have started from Beer-sheba, is gratuitous — the narrative fairly conveying the impression that he started from his residence, which was then at that place. [BEER-SHEBA.] From this point Jerusalem is three days, and Gerizim two days, and there is not a day's journey between them. It is possible that the journey could not have been completed, with a loaded ass, "on the third day;" and the route by which this writer, following Stanley, sends the party to Gerizim, is an unknown and improbable route.

(3) The suggestion of Mr. Froude above, and of Mr. Grose [MORIAH], that the patriarch only came in sight of the mountain on the third day, and had an infinite time for the rest of the journey, and the similar suggestion of Dr. Stanley, that after coming in sight of the mountain he had "half a day" for reaching it, are inadmissible. Acknowledging "that from the time it hove in sight, he and Isaac parted from the young men and went on together alone," these writers all overlook the fact that from this point the wood for the burnt-offering was laid upon Isaac. Thus far the needed materials had been carried by the servants and the ass. That the young man could bear the burden for a short distance alone, does not warrant the supposition that he could have borne it for a day's journey, or a half-day's — in which case it would seem that the donkey and servants might have

---

a * The reader will find under PASSOVER (Amer. ed.) particular account of the manner in which the Sa- maritans celebrate that great festival on Gerizim. On Gerizim and the modern Samaritans interesting infor-


---

mation will be found in Mrs.'s Three Months' Residence at Nobles, Lond. 1854; and in Mr. Grose's paper On the Modern Samaritans in Vacation Tourists for 1854.
been left at home. The company halted, apparently, not very far from the spot of the intended sacrifice.

(4.) The commanding position of Gerizim, with the wide prospect from its summit, is a necessary, though probable, element in the decision of the question. It was to the land of Moriah that the patriarch was directed, some one of the eminences of which, apparently not yet named, the Lord was to designate as his destination. In favor of Gerizim as an elevated site, Stanley lays stress upon the phrase, "lifted up his eyes," forgetting that this identical phrase had been applied (Gen. xiii. 10) to Lot's survey of the plain of the Jordan below him.

(5.) The Samaritan tradition is inadmissible. From the time that a rival temple to that on Moriah was erected on Gerizim, the Samaritans felt a natural desire to invest the spot with some of the sanctities of the earlier Jewish history. Their substitution of Moreh for Moriah (Gen. xvi. 2) in their version, is of the same character with this claim. Had this been the traditional site of the scene in question, Josephus would hardly have ventured, without some allusion to the claim for Jerusalem; and though sharing the prejudices of his countrymen, his general fairness as a historian forbids the intuition that he was capable of robbing this community of a cherished site, and transferring it to another. Moreover, the improbable theory that Gerizim, and not Jerusalem, was the scene of the meeting between Abraham and Melchisedec, which, though held by Prof. Stanley, Mr. Foulkes is compelled to reject, has the same authority of Samaritan tradition.

The objections to the Moriah of Jerusalem as the site in question, need not be considered here. The theory which claims that locality for this sacrificial scene, has its difficulties, which will be examined in their place. [MORAH, Amer. ed.] Whether that theory be accepted or rejected, the claims of Gerizim appear to us too slightly supported to entitle them to any weight in the discussion.

S. W.

GERIZITES, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8. [GERIZITES.]

GERRHENIANS, THE (גֶּרֶהְנִיאֶּנָּאָה: Gen. xlviii. 2; Gezer: Gezeren: od. Gezeren), named in 2 Mac. xiii. 24 only, as one limit of the district committed by Antiochus Epiphanes to the government of Judas Macacaulay, the other limit being Ptolemais (Achea). To judge by the similar expression in defining the extent of Simon's government in 1 Mac. xi. 59, the specification has reference to the sea-coast of Palestine, and, from the nature of the case, the Gerrhenians, wherever they were, must have been south of Ptolemais. Gerdus seems to have been the first to suggest that the town Gerishon or Gerha was intended, which lay between Ptolemais and Rhinocedon (Wady el Arish). But it has been pointed out by Ewald (Geschichte, iv. 365, note) that the coast as far north as the latter place was at that time possession of Egypt, and he thence conjectures that the inhabitants of the ancient city of Gere, S. E. of Gaza, the residence of Abraham and Isaac, are meant. In support of this Grimm (Vulg. Curs.) mentions that at least one MS. reads Γερασηαων, which would without difficulty be corrupted to Γερασηαων.

It seems to have been overlooked that the Syrian version (early, and entitled to much respect) has

Gozor (גוזָר). By this may be intended either (a) the ancient Gezer, which was near the sea somewhere about Joppa; or (b) Gaza, which appears sometimes to take that form in these books. In the former case the government of Judas would contain half, in the latter the whole, of the coast of Palestine. The latter is most probably correct, as otherwise the important district of Idumaea, with the great fortress of Bethsura, would have been left unprovided for.

GERSHON (in the earlier books יָמִנָה) in ch. generally יָמִנָה. 1. (Papara: in Judg. iv. 16, [Vat. M. Paparoa, Vat. II] and Alex. Paparoa: Joseph. Paparoa: Gersam, Gersom.) The first-born son of Moses and Zipporah (Ex. ii. 22; xviii. 3). The name is explained in these passages as יָמִנָה (Ger shon) = a stranger there, in allusion to Moses' being a stranger in Midian—"for he said, I have been a stranger (Ger) in a foreign land." This signature is adopted by Josephus (Ant. ii. 13, § 1), and also by the LXX. in the form of the name which they give—Papaon; but according to Gesenius (Thes. p. 306 b), its true meaning, taking it as a Hebrew word, is "expulsion," from a root יָמִנָה, being only another form of Gershom (see also Fürst, Handbuch). The circumcision of Gershon is probably related in Ex. iv. 23. He does not appear again in the history in his own person, but he was the founder of a family of which more than one of the members are mentioned later. (a.) One of these was a remarkable person—"Jonathan the son of Gershon," the "young man the Levite," whom we first encounter on his way from Bethlehem-Judah to Micah's house at Mount Ephraim (Judg. xvii. 7), and who subsequently became the first priest to the irregular worship of the tribe of Dan (xviii. 30). The change of the name "Moses" in this passage, as it originally stood in the Hebrew text, to "Manasseh," as it now stands both in the text and the A. V., is explained under MANASSEH. (b.) But at least one of the other branches of the family preserved its allegiance to Jehovah, for when the courses of the Levites were settled by king David, "the sons of Moses the man of God" received honorable prominence, and SHIMEUEL chief of the sons of Gershon was appointed ruler (יָמִנָה) of the treasurers. (1 Chr. xxiii. 15-17; xxvi. 24-28.)

The form under which the name Gershon—the eldest son of Levi—is given in several passages of Chronicles, namely, 1 Chr. vi. 16, 17, 20, 43, 62, 71; xv. 7. The Hebrew is almost alternately יָמִנָה and יָמִנָה; the LXX. adhere to their ordinary rendering of Gershom: [Rom.] Vat. POTHOS, Alex. Paparoa, [exc. vi. 43, Vat. POTHOS, and xv. 7, Alex. Paparoa, Vat. PA. Paparoa] Vulg. Gersom and Gersom.

3. (יָמִנָה: Paparoa, [Vat.] Alex. Paparoa: Gersom, the representative of the priestly family of Phineas, among those who accompanied Ezra from Babylon (Exz. viii. 2). In Esdras the name is Gersom.

GERSHON (יָמִנָה: in Gen. Paphos, in other books uniformly Paphos; and so also Alex with three exceptions; Joseph. Ant. ii. 7, § 4 Paparoa: [Gersom]), the eldest of the three sons.
GERSHONITES, THE

of Levi, born before the descent of Jacob's family into Egypt (Gen. xvi. 11; Ex. vi. 16). But though the eldest born, the families of Gershon were outstripped in fame by their younger brethren of Kohath, from whom sprang Moses and the priestly line of Aaron. a Gershon's sons were Libni and Shimi (Ex. vi. 17; Num. iii. 18, 21; 1 Chr. vi. 17), and their families were duly recognized in the reign of David, when the permanent arrangements for the service of Jehovah were made (1 Chr. xxiii. 7–11). At this time Gershon was represented by the famous Asaph "the seer," whose genealogy is given in 1 Chr. vi. 39–43, and also in part, 20, 21. The family is mentioned once again as taking part in the reforms of king Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxix. 12, where it should be observed that the sons of Asaph are reckoned as distinct from the Gershonites). At the census in the wilderness of Sinai the whole number of the males of the tribe Gershon was 7,900 (Num. iii. 22), midway between the Kohathites and the Merarites. At the same date the efficient men were 2,630 (iv. 40). On the occasion of the second census the numbers of the Levites are given only in gross (Num. xxvi. 62). The sons of Gershon had charge of the fabrics of the Tabernacle — the coverings, curtains, hangings, and cords (Num. iii. 25, 26; iv. 25, 29); for the transport ordered two covered wagons and four oxen (vii. 3, 7). In the encampment their station was behind (מזגנ) the Tabernacle, on the west side (Num. iii. 23). When on the march they went with the Merarites in the rear of the first body of the three tribes — Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, — with Reuben behind them. In the apportionment of the Levitical cities, thirteen fell to the lot of the Gershonites. These were in the northern tribes — two in Manasseh beyond Jordan; four in Issachar; four in Asher; and three in Naphtali. All of these are said to have possessed "suburbs," and two were cities of refuge (Josh. xxi. 27–53; 1 Chr. vi. 62, 71–76). It is not easy to see what special duties fell to the lot of the Gershonites in the service of the Tabernacle after its erection at Jerusalem, or in the Temple. The sons of Jeduthun "prophesied with a harp," and the sons of Heman "lifted up the horn," but for the sons of Asaph no instrument is mentioned (i Chr. xxv. 1–5). They were appointed to "prophesy" (that is, probably, to utter, or sing, inspired words), perhaps after the special prompting of David himself (xxv. 2). Others of the Gershonites, sons of Laadan, had charge of the "treasures of the house of God, and over the treasures of the holy things" (xxvi. 20–22), among which precious stones are specially named (xxix. 8). In the story the name is given, with two exceptions (1 Chr. vi. 1; xxiii. 6), given in the slightly different form of Gershom. [GERSHOM, 2.] See also GERSHONITES.

G.

GERSHONITES, THE (גייטונא), i. e. the Gershunite tribe: "אלו צדואו, אלו צדואו [Vat.-vei]; Nicholson: [Vat.-vei]; Alex. [in Josh. and 1

Chfr.] גושנאו [Gersonite, Gerson, filii Gersom or Gerson], the family descended from GERSHON or GERSHON, the son of Levi (Num. iii. 21, 23, 24, iv. 24, 27, xxvi. 57; Josh. xii. 33; 1 Chr. xxiii. 7; 2 Chr. xix. 12).

"THE GERSHONITE." [Yəsəwē, Yəshō'ē; Vat. Yəsawē, Yəshō'ē; Alex. Yəsawē, Yəshō'ē; Gersonni, Gersonna], as applied to individuals, occurs in 1 Chr. xxvi. 21 (Laadan), xxix. 8 (Jehiel).

G.

GERSHON (גֶּשֶׁר הָנִי), 1 Esdr. viii. 29. [GERSHOM, 3.]

GERZITES, THE (גֶּרֶזְיִים), or (גֶּרֶזְיֵי),— (Ges. Thes. p. 301) — the Gizrite, or the Gerzite. Vat. omits, Alex. תְּמאָ יָהוּ: "Yahweh has blessed the tribe of Gad and of Asher (Judg. i. 39)." In our English versions the Gizrite, or the Amalekites, occupied the land between the south of Palestine and Egypt in the time of Saul (1 Sam. xxvii. 8). They were rich in bedouin treasures "sheep, oxen, asses, camels, and apparel" (ver. 9; comp. xv. 3; 1 Chr. vi. 21). The name is not found in the text of the A. V. but only in the margin. This arises from its having been corrected by the Masorets (Keri) into Gizrites, which form (or rather Gizrites) our translators have adopted in the text. The change is supported by the Targum, and by the Alex. MS. of the LXX. as above. There is not, however, any apparent reason for relinquishing the older form of the name, the interest of which lies in its connection with that of Mount Gerizim. In the name of that ancient mountain we have the only remaining trace of the presence of this old tribe of Bedouins in central Palestine. They appear to have occupied it at a very early period, and to have relinquished it in company with the Amalekites, who also left their name attached to a mountain in the same locality (Judg. xii. 15), when they abandoned that rich district for the less fertile but freer South. Other tribes, as the Avvim and the Zemarites, also left traces of their presence in the names of towns of the central district (see pp. 201 a, 277, note b).

The connection between the Gerzites and Mount Gerizim appears to have been first suggested by Gesenius. [First accepts the same view.] It has been since adopted by Stanley (S. & F. p. 237, note). Gesenius interprets the name as "dwellers in the dry, barren country." [G.

GESEM, THE LAND OF (גֶּשֶׁמ), the Greek form of the Hebrew name GOSHEN (Jud. i. 9).

GESHAM (גֶּשֶׁמ), i. e. Geshan [filthy, Ges.]; סַרְגָּד, Alex. פָּרָגָא: "Farion," one of the sons of JAHDAI, in the genealogy of Judah and family of Caleb (1 Chr. ii. 47). Nothing further concerning him has been yet traced. The name, as it stands in our present Bibles, is a corruption of the A. V. of 1011, which has, accurately, GESHAN. Birington, usually very careful, has Geshah (Table xi. i. 280), but without giving any authority.

a corruption of the Hebrew המָלֶךְ . Simah (A. V. "of old . . . to Shear") or it may contain a mention of the name Telmim or Telain, a place in the extreme south of Judah (Josh. xv. 24), which bore a prominent part in a former attack on the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv. 4). In the latter case T has been read for T. (See Lenzgerke: Fürst's Handw. & c.)
GESHAN (1 Chr. ii. 47), the correct form of a name for which Geshan has been improperly substituted in modern editions of the A. V.

GE'SHEM, and GASH'MU (גֶּשֶם, גַּשְׁמוּ) (comp. Ge'shem, [Geshem], Ge'shum), an Arabian, mentioned in Neh. ii. 19, and vi. 1, 2, 6, who, with “Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobias, the servant, the Ammonite,” opposed Nehemiah in the repairing of Jerusalem. Geshem, we may conclude, was an inhabitant of Arabia Petraea, or of the Arabian Desert, and probably the chief of a tribe which, like most of the tribes on the eastern frontier of Palestine, was, in the time of the Captivity and the subsequent period, allied with the Persians or with any peoples threatening the Jewish nation. Geshem, like Sanballat and Tobias, seems to have been one of the “governors beyond the river,” to whom Nehemiah came, and whose mission “grieved them exceedingly, that there was come a man to seek the welfare of the children of Israel” (Neh. ii. 19); for the wandering inhabitants of the frontier doubtless availed themselves largely, in their predatory excursions, of the distracted state of Palestine, and dreaded the re-establishment of the kingdom; and the Arabians, Ammonites, and Ashdodites, are recorded as having been “conquered to fight against Jerusalem, and to hinder” the repairing. The endeavors of these confederates and their failure are recorded in chapters ii., iv., and vi. The Arabic name corresponding to Geshem cannot easily be identified. Jasim (or Gásim, جاسم) is one of very remote antiquity; and Jashan (يان) is the name of an historical tribe of Arabia Proper; the latter may more probably be compared with it.

GE'SHUR (גָּשָׁרוּ, גָּשָׁרוּ; גֶּשֶר, גַּשְׁר), a bridge: [Ge'shur, ex. 2 Sam. iii. 3, Ge'sir, Vat. Ge'sir; 1 Chr. ii. 23, Alex. Ge'siwr, iii. 2, Ge'siwr; Ge'sur:] Arab. جسر, Aj'sur, a little principality in the northeastern corner of Bashan, adjoining the province of Argob (Dent. iii. 14), and the kingdom of Aram (Syria) in the A. V. (Isa. xxv. 8; comp. 1 Chr. ii. 23). It was within the boundary of the allotted territory of Manasseh, but its inhabitants were never expelled (Josh. xiii. 13; comp. 1 Chr. ii. 23). King David married “the daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur” (2 Sam. iii. 3); and her son Absalom sought refuge among his maternal relations after the murder of his brother. The wild acts of Absalom’s life may have been to some extent the results of natural training; they were at least characteristic of the stock from which he sprung. He remained at “Geshur of Aram” until he was taken back to Jerusalem by David (2 Sam. xii. 37, xv. 8). It is highly probable that Geshur was a section of the wild and rugged region, now called el-Lejih, among whose rocky fastnesses the Geshurites might dwell in security while the whole surrounding plains were occupied by the Israelites. On the north the Lejih borders on the territory of Danassus, the ancient Aram; and in Scripture the name is so intimately connected with Bashan and Argob, that one is led to suppose it formed part of them (Dent. iii. 13, 14; 1 Chr. ii. 21, Josh. tii. 12, 13). [Aorob.] J. L. P.

The bridge over the Jordan above the sea of Galilee no doubt stands where one must have stood in ancient times. [Bridge, Amer. ed.] It may be, says Robinson (Phys. Geogr. p. 155), “that the adjacent district on the east of the Jordan took the name of Geshur (גַּשְׁר), as if Bridge-land;” at any rate Geshur and the Geshurites were in this vicinity.

GE'SHURI and GE'SHURITES (גָּשָׁרוּ, גֶּשְׁרִים): [Dent., Μαργαρης, Vat. Alex. -ςις; Comp. Ge'siwr; in Jos., Alex Ge'siwr; xii. 5, Perseus; xii. 2, 11, 15, Perseus; Vat. Ge'siwr; 1 Sam., Ge'siwr, Vat. -ςις; Alex. Ge'siwr; Ge'sur.] The inhabitants of Geshur, which see (Dent. iii. 14; Jos. xii. 5, xiii. 11).

GETH'ER (גֶּתֶר, גַּתֶר; [Alex. Γαθέρ]) Gether), the third, in order, of the sons of Aram (Gen. x. 23). No satisfactory trace of the people sprung from this stock has been found. The theories of Bochart and others, which rest on improbable etymologies, are without support; while the suggestions of Tarrans (Hieron.), Bactrians (Joseph. Ant.), and Geshum, גָּשָׁרוּ, (G. Dar.,) are not better founded. (See Bochart, Phyllog., ii. 10, and Winer, s. v.) Kalisch proposes Geshur; but he does not adduce any argument in its favor, except the similarity of sound, and the permutation of Aramaean and Hebrew letters.

The Arabs write the name غَطَر (Gathir); and, in the mythical history of their country, it is said that the probably aboriginal tribes of Thmoid, Taur, Jades, and Ad (the last, in the second generation, through 'Ood), were descended from Gathir (Cassim [de Perceval], Fawzi, i. 8, 9, 23; Abul-Fida, Hist. Antisl. 16). These traditions are in the highest degree untrustworthy; and, as we have stated in Arameh, the tribes referred to were, almost demonstrably, not of Semitic origin. See ARAM, ARAM, and ARABIA.

GETHSEMANE (גֶּתֶשְׁמֶנֶא, Gethsemane, a "wine-press," and גָּתֶם, "shaken," "oil," גֶּתֶשְׁמֶנָא; [so Tisch.; Lachm. Treg. -πεῖ], or more generally גֶּתֶשְׁמָנָא; a small "farm," as the French would say, "un bien mechant farme" (χειμπρόν: αυτόν), or as the Vulgate, villa; "A.V. a place;" Matt. xxvi. 36; Mark xiv. 32, situated across the brook Kidron (John xviii. 1), probably at the foot of Mount Olivet (Luke xxi. 39), to the N. W., and about 1 or ½ of a mile English from the walls of Jerusalem. There was a "garden," or rather orchard (κήπος), attached to it, to which the olive, fig, and pomegranate doubtless invited resort by their "hospitalitable shade." And we know from the Evangelists, Luke (xxii. 39) and John (xviii. 2), that our Lord ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples. "It was on the road to Bethany," says Mr. Greswell (Helv. Dia., xlix.), "and the family of Lazarus might have possessions there;" but, if so, it should have been rather on the S. side of the mountain where Bethany lies: part of which, in
may be remarked, being the property of the village still, as it may well have been then, is even now called Bethany (el-Azariyeh) by the natives. Hence the expressions in S. Luke xxiv. 50 and Acts i. 12 are quite consistent. According to Josephus, the suburbs of Jerusalem abound with gardens and pleasure-grounds (παραθεραίοι, B. J. vi. 1, § 1; comp. v. 3, § 2) now, with the exception of those belonging to the Greek and Latin convents, hardly the vestige of a garden is to be seen. There is indeed a favorite paddock or close, half-a-mile or more to the north, on the same side of the continuation of the valley of the Kidron, the property of a wealthy Turk, where the Mohammedan holies pass the day with their families, their bright flowing costume forming a picturesque contrast to the stiff sombre foliage of the olive-grove beneath which they cluster. But Gethsemane has not come down to us as a scene of mirth; its inexhaustible associations are the offspring of a single event — the Agony of the Son of God on the evening preceding His Passion. Here emphatically, as Isaiah had foretold, and as the name imports, were fulfilled those dark words, "I have trodden the wine-press alone" (Is. iii. 3; comp. Rev. xiv. 20, "the winepress... without the city"). "The period of the year," proceeds Mr. Greswell, "was the Vernal Equinox: the day of the month about two days before the full of the moon — in which case the moon would not be now very far past her meridian; and the night would be enlightened until a late hour towards the morning" — the day of the week Thursday, or rather, according to the Jews, Friday — for the sun had set. The time, according to Mr. Greswell, would be the last watch of the night, between our 11 and 12 o'clock. Any recapitulation of the circumstances of that inedible event would be unnecessary; any comments upon it unseasonable. A modern garden, in which are eight venerable olive-trees, and a grotto to the north, detached from it, and in closer connection with the Church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin — in fact with the road to the summit of the mountain running between them, as it did also in the days of

Old Olive-Trees in Gethsemane, from S. E.

the Crusaders (Sanuti Secret. Fidel. Cruc. lib. iii. p. xiv. c. 9) — both securely inclosed, and under lock and key, are pointed out as making up the true Gethsemane. These may, or may not, be the spots which Eusebius, St. Jerome (Liber de Situ et Nomina]bus, s. v.), and Adamnarus mention as such; but from the 4th century downwards some such localities are spoken of as known, frequented, and even built upon. Every generation dwells most upon what accords most with its instincts and predilections. Accordingly the pilgrims of antiquity say nothing about those time-honored olive-trees, whose age the poetic minds of a Lamartine or a Stanley shrink from criticizing — they were doubtless not so imposing in the 6th century; still, had they been noticed, they would have afforded mutual witness to the locality — while, on the other hand, few modern travellers would inquire for, and adore, with Antoninus, the three precise spots where our Lord is said to have fallen upon His face. Against the contemporary antiquity of the olive trees, it has been urged that Titus cut down all the trees round about Jerusalem; and certainly this is no more than Josephus states in express

a * El-Azariyeh is the Arabic name, derived from Azariah. Bethany is current only among foreigners, or those of s reign origin. In this instance the native language adopts the more distinctive Christian appellation. 

H.
GETHSEMANE

terms (see particularly B. J. vi. 1, § 1, a passage which must have escaped Mr. Williams, Holy City, vol. ii. p. 437, M. ed., where only cries v. 3, § 2, and vi. 8, § 1). Besides the 10th legion, arriving from Jericho, were posted about the Mount of Olives (v. 2, § 3; and comp. vi. 2, § 8), and, in the course of the siege, a wall was carried along the valley of the Kidron to the fountain of Siloam (v. 2). The probability, therefore, would seem to be, that they were planted by Christian hands to mark the spot; unless, like the sacred olive of the Acropolis (Kühr ad Herod. viii. 55), they may have reproduced themselves. Mandrelli (Early Travels in Pal. by Wright, p. 471) and Parussinius (Elucid. T. S. lib. iv. per. c. ch. 7) appear to have been the first to notice them, not more than three centuries ago: the former arguing against, and the latter in favor of, their reputed antiquity: but nobody reading their accounts would imagine that there were then no more than eight, the locality of Gethsemane being supposed the same. Parallel claims, to be sure, are not wanting in the cedars of Lebanon, which are still visited with so much enthusiasm: in the beechen, or oak of Mavre, which was standing in the days of Constantine the Great, and even worshipped (Vales. ad Enos. Hist. Const. iii. 53), and the fig-tree (Ficus ilicifolia) near Nerbudda in India, which native historians assert to be 2,500 years old (Patterson's Journal of a Tour in Egypt, &c., p. 262, note). Still more appositely there were olive-trees near Linterum 250 years old, according to Flucci, in his time, which are recorded to have survived the middle of the tenth century (Venant. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. Paris, 1846, vol. xxx. p. 61).

* Gethsemane, which means "olive-press" (see above) is found according to the narrative in the proper place: for Oliveti, as the name imports, was famous for its olive-trees, still sufficiently numerous there to justify its being so called, though little cultivation of any sort appears now on that mount. The place is called also "a garden" (χώρα), but we are not by any means to transfer to that term our ideas of its meaning. It is to be remembered, as Stanley remarks (S. of P. p. 187, 1st ed.), that "Eastern gardens are not flower-gardens nor private gardens, but the orchards, vineyards, and fig-enclosures" near the towns. The low wall, covered with white stucco, which incloses the reputed Gethsemane, is comparatively modern. A series of rude pictures (utterly out of place there, where the memory and the heart are the only prompts required) are hung up along the face of the wall, representing different scenes in the history of Christ's passion, such as the scourging, the mockery of the soldiers, the sinking beneath the cross, and the like. The eight olive-trees here, though still verdant and productive, are so decayed as to require to be propped up with heaps of stones against their trunks in order to prevent their being blown down by the wind. Trees of this class are proverbially long-lived. Schubert, the celebrated naturalist, decides that those in Gethsemane are old enough to have flourished amid a race of contemporaries that perished long centuries ago (Reise in das Morgenland, ii. 521). Stanley also speaks of them as the most venerable of their race on the face of the earth . . . the most affecting of the sacred memorials in or about Jerusalem." (S. of P. p. 450, 1st ed.)

There are two or three indications in the Gospel history which may guide us as to the general situation of this ever memorable spot to which the Saviour repaired on the night of his betrayal. It is quite certain that Gethsemane was on the western slope of a little hill or spur of that mountain where it sinks down into the valley of the Kidron. When it is said that "Jesus went forth with his disciples beyond the brook Kidron, where was a garden" (John xviii. 1), it is implied that he did not go far up the Mount of Olives, but reached the place which he had in view soon after crossing the bed of that stream. The garden, it will be observed, is named in that passage with reference to the brook, and not the mountain. This result agrees also with the presumption from the Saviour's abrupt summons to his disciples recorded in Matt. xxvi. 46: "Arise, let us be going: see, he is at hand that doth betray me." The best explanation of this language is that his watchful eye, at that moment, caught sight of Judas and his accomplices, as they issued from one of the eastern gates, or turned round the northern or southern edges of the valley, in order to descend into the valley. The night, with the moon then near its full, and about the beginning of April, must have been clear, or if exceptionally dark, the torches (John xviii. 13) would have left no doubt as to the object of such a movement at that unsavory hour. It may be added that in this neighborhood also are still to be seen cedars and desert tombs into which his pursuers may have thought that he would endeavor to escape and conceal himself, and so came prepared with lights to follow him into these lurking-places.

The present enclosure known as Gethseman fulfills all these conditions: and so also, it may be claimed, would any other spot similarly situated across the brook, and along the western declivity in front of Jerusalem. Tischendorf (Reise in den Orient, i. 312) finds the traditional locality "in perfect harmony with all that we learn from the Evangelists." Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 284) thinks it should be sought "rather in a secluded vale several hundred yards to the northeast of the present Gethsemane." Robinson alleges no positive reasons against the common identification. "The authenticity of the sacred garden," says Williams (Holy City, ii. 437), "I choose rather to believe than to defend." But such differences of opinion as these involve an essential agreement. The original garden may have been more or less extensive than the present site, or have stood a few hundred rods further to the north or the south; but far, certainly, from that spot it need not be supposed to have been. We may sit down there, and read the narrative of what the Saviour endured for our redemption, and feel assured that we are near the place where he prayed, and longed for. Part of it may still, but little be done"; and while, "being in an agony, he sweated as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground." It is altogether probable that the disciples in going back to Jerusalem from Bethany after having seen the Lord taken up into heaven passed Gethsemane on the way. What new thoughts must have arisen in their minds, time of the Saccarine compound of Jerusalem, a p. 626. Since that period the Saviour receives half of the pata baskets of the temple as his tribute. (See Rammes, Palaeist. p. 309, 4th Aufl.)
what deeper insight into the mystery of the agony must have flashed upon them, as they looked once more upon that scene of the sufferings and humiliation of the crucified and ascended One. H.

GEUEL (גְּיוַּל, Sam. גְּיוּל [God's ex- genital; Ges.]; Τούδηλα; [Vat. Τούδηλα; Gyle], son of Machi: ruler of the tribe of God, and its representative among the spies sent from the wilderness of Paran to explore the Promised Land (Num. xiii. 15).

GEZER (גְּזֶר, in pause גְּזֶר [deep place, precipice; Fürst, Ges.]: פַּאֶר; פַּאֶר [Alex. 1 K. ix. 15, 16], פַּאֶר; פַּאֶר; Josh. x. 34, Vat. פַּאֶר; 1 Chr. xiv. 16, 10, פַּאֶר פַּאֶר; Gezer; [Gezer, Gazar]), an ancient city of Canaan, whose king, Horan, or Eleam, coming to the assistance of Lachish, was killed with all his people by Joshua (Josh. x. 33; xii. 12). The town, however, is not said to have been destroyed; it formed one of the landmarks on the south boundary of Ephraim, between the lower Beth-horon and the Mediterranean (xvi. 3), the western limit of the tribe (1 Chr. vii. 28). It was allotted with its suburbs to the Kohathites Levites (Josh. xxi. 31; 1 Chr. vi. 67); but the original inhabitants were not dispossessed (Judg. i. 29); and even down to the reign of Solomon the Canaanites, or (according to the LXX. addition to Josh. xvi. 10) the Canaanites and Perizzites, were still dwelling there, and paying tribute to Israel (1 K. ix. 16). At this time it must in fact have been independent of Israelite rule, for Pharaoh had burnt it to the ground and killed its inhabitants, and then presented the site to his daughter, Solomon's queen. But it was immediately rebuilt by the king; and though not heard of again till after the Captivity, yet it played a somewhat prominent part in the later struggles of the nation.

[GAZERA.]

Ewald (Gezeh. iii. 280; comp. ii. 427) takes Gezer and Gezur to be the same, and sees in the destruction of the former by Pharaoh, and the simultaneous expedition of Solomon to Hamath-zophon, the neighborhood of the latter, indications of a revolt of the Canaanites, of whom the Gezurites formed the most powerful remnant, and whose attempt against the new monarch was thus frustrated. But this can hardly be supported.

In one place Gob is given as identical with Gezer (1 Chr. xx. 4, comp. 2 Sam. xvi. 15). The exact site of Gezer has not been discovered; but its general position is not difficult to infer. It must have been between the lower Beth-horon and the sea (Josh. xvi. 3; 1 K. ix. 17); therefore on the great maritime plain which lies beneath the hills of which Beth’er et-tahat is the last outpost, and forms the regular coast road of communication with Egypt (1 K. ix. 16). It is therefore appropriately named as the last point to which David's pursuit of the Philistines extended (2 Sam. v. 25; 1 Chr. xiv. 16); and as the scene of at least one sharp en

a If Lochish be where Van de Velde and Porter would place it, at Um Libis, near Gaza, at least 40 miles from the southern boundary of Ephraim, there is some ground for suspecting the existence of two Gezers, and this is confirmed by the order in which it is mentioned in the list of Josh. xii. with Hebron, Ezion, and Debir. There is not, however, any means of determining this.

b In these two places the word, being at the end of a period, has, according to Hebrew custom, its first counter (1 Chr. xx. 4), this plain being their own peculiar territory (comp. Jos. Ant. vii. 8, § 1, Ταγαΰτης, της Παλαιστίνης χώρας ὑπάρχουσα) and as commanding the communication between Egypt and the new capital, Jerusalem, it was an important point for Solomon to fortify. By Eusebius it is mentioned as four miles north of Neco¬lis (Αμάριτης); a position exactly occupied by the important town Jinsa, the ancient Ginos, and corresponding well with the requirements of Joshua.

But this hardly agrees with the indications of the 1st book of Maccabees, which speak of it as between Emmonus (Anoeis) and Azotus and Jamaica; and again as on the confines of Azotus. In the neighborhood of the latter there is more than one site bearing the name Yasia; but whether this Arabic name can be derived from the Hebrew Gezer, and also whether so important a town as Gazar was in the time of the Maccabees can be represented by such insignificant villages as these, are questions to be determined by future investigation. If it can, then perhaps the strongest claims for identity with Gezer are put forward by a village called Yasia, 4 or 5 miles east of Joppa, on the road to Ramleh and Lydd.

From the occasional occurrence of the form Gazer, and from the LXX. version being almost uniformly Gazar or Gazer, Ewald infers that this was really the original name.

G.

GEZRITES, THE (גְּזֶרִים), occur. the Gize¬rites: [Vat. omits; Alex. τού Γεζηρούν; Gezri].

The word which the Jewish critics have substituted in the margin of the Bible for the ancient reading, "the Gerizzite" (1 Sam. xxvii. 8), and which has thus become incorporated in the text of the A. V.

If it mean anything — at least that we know — it must signify the dwellers in Gezer. But Gezer was not less than 50 miles distant from the "south of Judah, the south of the Jeraulmedites, and the south of the Kenites," the scene of David's inward flight; a fact which stands greatly in the way of our receiving the change. [GERIZITES, THE.]

GIAH (גִּיא, i.e. a vinear or giren; a view also taken in the Vulgate.

GIANTS. The frequent allusion to giants in Scripture, and the numerous theories and disputes which have arisen in consequence, render it necessary to give a brief view of some of the main curious and curious inferences to which the mention of them leads.

1. They are first spoken of in Gen. vi. 4, under the name Nephilim (גִּיאים נֵפִיל; LXX. γιγαντεῖς Aguil. ενοίητοιτειρες; Symm. θαυματίαν; Vulg. gigantes). The word was evidently lengthened, and stands in the text as Gazer and in these two places only the name is so transferred to the A. V.

But, to be consistent, the same change should have been made in several other passages, where it was used in the Hebrew (e.g. Josh. xvi. 3, 10; 1 K. ix. 15, &c. It would seem better to render [represent] the Hebrew name always by the same English one, when the difference arises from nothing but an euphuistic accept.
GIANTS

The word is derived either from מָרָכֶל (mārakel) or מַרְכֶּל (marcel) (= "marvellous"), or, as is generally believed, from מְרַכֶּל (mercāl), either in the sense to throw down, or to fall (= fallen angels, Jarchi, cf. Is. xiv. 12; Luke x. 18); or meaning "ἀθροιστεῖς" (Asgen.), or collapsi (by euphemism, Boettcher, de Inferiis, p. 92); but certainly not "because men fell from terror of them" (as R. Kimchi). That the word means "giants" is clear from Num. xiii. 32, 33, and is confirmed by מִרְכֶּל (mirakel), the Chaldee name for "the aery giant" (Orion (Joh. ix. 9, xxxviii. 31; Is. xiii. 10; Targ.), unless this name arise from the obliquity of the constellation (Gen. of Earth, p. 35).

But we now come to the remarkable conjectures about the origin of these Nephilim in Gen. vi. 1-4. (An immense amount has been written on this passage. See Kurz, Die Eben der Schöne Gottes, &c., Berlin, 1857; Ewald, Jahrb. 1854, p. 120; Goyett's Isaiah Ungültigst; Faber's Many Miseanc, in the Journal of Soc. Lit., Oct. 1858, &c.) We are told that "there were Nephilim in the earth," and that afterwards (kal met ἐκεῖνα, LXX.) the "sons of God" mingling with the beautiful "daughters of men" produced a race of violent and insolent Gibborim (גִּבְבוֹרִים). This latter word is also rendered by the LXX. γίγαντες, but we shall see hereafter that the meaning is more general. It is clear however that no statement is made that the Nephilim themselves sprang from this unhallowed union. Who then were they? Taking the usual derivation מָרָכֶל (marakel), and explaining it to mean "fallen spirits," the Nephilim seem to be identical with the "sons of God;" but the verse before us militates against this notion as much as against that which makes the Nephilim the same as the Gibborim, namely, the offspring of wicked marriages. This latter supposition can only be accepted if we admit (1) that there were two kinds of Nephilim, — those who existed before the unequal interourse, and those produced by it (Heidergerg, Hist Patr. xii.), or (2) by following the Vulgate rendering, postposter viti ingenii sunt, &c. But the common rendering seems to be correct, nor is there much probability in Alen Ezra's explanation, that מְרַכֶּל (mercāl) "(after that)" means מָרָכֶל (marakel) (in. c. "after the deluge"), and is an allusion to the Anakims. The genealogy of the Nephilim then, or at any rate of the earliest Nephilim, is not recorded in Scripture, and the name itself is so mysterious that we are lost in conjecture respecting them.

2. The sons of the marriages mentioned in Gen. vi. 1-4, are called Gibborim (גִּבְבוֹרִים), from מְרַכֶּל (mercāl) to be strong, a general name meaning powerful (ἀθρόισται καὶ παριστάν ὑπερταίραν καλος. Joseph. Ant. i. 3, § 1; γίγαντες τῶν ποιήματι καὶ βοηθασάντων τοῦ λαοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ., Philo de Gigant., p. 270; comp. Is. ii. 2, xiii. 24; Ez. xxxii. 21). They were not necessarily giants in our sense of the word "Theodote, (Quest. 48.) Yet, as was natural, these powerful chieftains were almost universally represented as men of extraordinary stature. The LXX. render the word γίγαντες, and call Naino a γίγαντας (1 Chr. i. 10); Augustine calls them Stu-

turati (de Civ. Dei, xv. 4); Chrysostom ὢμοιοι, Theodoret παριστάνεις (comp. Bar. iii 28, ἐν οὕτως, ἐπιστάμενος πάλαιος). But who were the parents of these giants; who are "the sons of God" (הוּנֵי הָבֵית הָאָדָם)? The opinions are various: (1) Men of power (vid. παριστάταινες, Symm., Hieron. Quest. Heb. ad loc.; מְרַכֶּל, Onk.; מִרְכֶּל, Samar.; so too Seiden, Versst. &c.). (2) Men with great gifts, "in the image of God" (Ritter, Schumann); (3) Giants arrogantly assuming the title (Paulus); or (4) the pious Sethites (comp. Gen. iv. 26; Maimon. Moth. II. i. 14; Said. ii. 29 and παριστάταινες. Cedren. Hist. Comp. p. 10; Ang. de Civ. Dei, xv. 27; Chrysost. Rom. 22, in Gen.; Theod. in Gen. Quest. 47; Cyril, c. 9, i. 9, &c.). A host of modern commentators catch at this explanation, but Gen. iv. 26 has probably no connection with the subject. Other texts quoted in favor of the view are Deut. iv. 1, 2; Ps. lxxiii. 15; Prov. xiv. 26; Hos. i. 10; Rom. viii. 14, &c. Still the mere antiquity in the verse, as well as other considerations, tend strongly against this gloss, which islet 1 is built on a foregone conclusion. Compare however the Indian notion of the two races of men Suras and Asuras (children of the sun and of the moon, North, Rom., and Rabbi, p. 284 ff.), and the Persian belief in the marriage of Djinshid with the sister of a erva, whence sprung black and impious men (Kalisch, Gen. p. 175). (5) Worshipers of false gods (παριστάται τῶν ἡθῶν, Apc.) making מְרַכֶּל = "servants" (comp. Deut. xiv. 1; Prov. xiv. 26; Ex. xxxii. 1; Deut. iv. 28, &c.). This view is ably supported in Genesis of Earth and Man, p. 39 f. (6.) Devils, such as the Inebul and Sincub li. Such was the belief of the Caballists (Yaleus, de S. Philoso., cap. 8). That these beings can have intercourse with women St. Augustine declares it would be folly to doubt, and it was the universal belief in the East. Mohammed makes one of the ancestors of Balsis Queen of Sheba a demon, and Damir says he heard a Mohammedan doctor openly boast of having married in succession four demon wives (Boechart, Hieroz. r. p. 747). Indeed the belief still exists (Iane's Mod. Egypt. i. ch. x. ad in.) (7) Closely allied to this is the oldest opinion, that they were angels (ἄγγελοι τῶν ἡθῶν, LXX.) for such was the old reading, nos eisioi. Ang. de Civ. Dei, xvi. 23; so too Joseph. Ant. i. 3, § 1; Phil. de Gigant, i. 358; Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 7, § 63; Sulp. Sever. Hist. Scriptur. in Orthod. i. i. &c.; comp. Job i. 6, ii. 11; Ps. xxxi. 1. Job iv. 18). The rare expression "sons of God" certainly means angels in Job xxxviii. 7, i. ii. 6, i. 11, and that such is the meaning in Gen. vi. 4 also, was the most prevalent opinion both in the Jewish and early Christian Church.

Thus this very ancient view which gave rise to the curious book of Enoch, and the notion quoted from it by St. Jude (iii. 6), and alluded to by St. Peter (2 Pet. ii. 4; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 10 Tert. de Virg. Vel. 7). According to this book
certain angels, sent by God to guard the earth (Ἐγγέφυτον, φύλακες), were perverted by the beauty of women, "went after strange flesh," taught sorcery, finery (lumina Irphillollon, ciréus ex àure, Tert., etc.), and being banished from heaven had sons 3,000 edious high, thus originating a celestial and terrestrial race of demons — "Unde modo vagi subventur corpora multa" (Commendini Instruct. III., Colus Theonum) s. c. they are still the sources of epilepsy, etc. Various names were given at a later time to these monsters. Their chief was Leuinx, and of their number were Machsael, Aza, Shamchozani, and (the wickedest of them) a goat-like demon Azael (comp. Azael. Lev. xvi. 8, and for the very curious questions connected with this name, see Bochart, Hieros. i. p. 652 ff.; Rab. Eliezer, cap. 22; Bersisheth Rab. ad Gen. vi. 2; Seunort, de Gigantibus, iii.).

Against this notion (which Hiëvernick calls "the slightest whim of the Alexandrine Gnostics and Caballistic Rabbis") Heidegger (Hist. Potr. l. c.) quotes Matt. xxii. 30; Luke xxiv. 39, and similar testimonies. Philastrius (Adv. Heres. cap. 108) characterizes it as a heresy, and Chrysostom (Hom. 22) even calls it το βδομάδριον εκείνο. Yet Jude is explicit, and the question is not so much what can be, as what we believe. The fathers almost unanimously accepted these fables, and Tertullian argues warily (partly on expedient grounds!) for the genuineness of the book of Enoch. The angels were called Εγγέφυτον, a word used by Aquil.

and Symm. to render the Chaldee יֵלֵל (Dan. iv. 13 ff.; Vulg. Vjpi1: LXX. eτρ: Lex. Cyrril. ἡγεῖιων ἡ ἄγγελος; Fabric. Cod. Pseudap. p. 180), and therefore used, as in the Zend-Avesta, of good guardian angels, and applied especially to archangels in the Syriac liturgies (cf. יֵלֵל, Is. xxii. 11), but more often of evil angels (Castelli Leg. Syr. p. 469; Scalig. ad Enseb. Chron. p. 403; Gesen. s. v. יֵלֵל). The story of the Egregori is given at length in Tert. de Car. Fem. i. 2, ii. 10; Commodianus, Instruct. iii.; Lactant. Divit. Inst. ii. 14; Tertull. Patriarch. [Raben.], c. v., etc. Every one will remember the allusions to the same interpretation in Milton, Par. Reg. ii. 179 —

"Before the Flood, thou with thy lusty crew, False-titled sons of God, roaming the earth, Cast wanton eyes on the daughters of men, And coupled with them, and begat a race."

The use made of the legend in some modern poems cannot sufficiently be reprobat ed.

We need hardly say how closely allied this is to the Greek legends which connected the θυρεία φύλα γιγαντών with the gods (Hom. Od. vii. 203; I'au sau. viii. 23), and made δαίμωνες sons of the gods (Plat. Apolog. θυρείαν; Cratyl. § 32). Indeed the whole heathen tradition resembles the one before us (Cumberland’s Sanchonatho, p. 24; Hom. Od. vii. 306 ff.; Xen. Thesprot. 185, Opp. et D. 144; Plut. Rep. ii. § 17, p. 804 B; de Legg. iii. § 16, p. 805 A; Or. Medam. l. 151; Luc. iv. 593; Lucian, de Dea Syr., etc.; cf. Grot. de Ver. i. 6); and the Greek translators of the Bible make the resemblance still more close by introducing such words as δεο defending, γηγενεαι, and even Τιτανει, to which last Josephus (l. c.) expressly compares the giants of Genesis (LXX. Prov. ii. 18; Ps. xlviii. 2 (xlii. 2); 2 Sam. v. 18; Judith xvi. 7). The fate too of these demon-chiefs is identical with that of heathen story (Job xxvi. 5; Ecclus. xvi. 7; Bar. iii. 26-28; Wisd. xiv. 6; 3 Macc. ii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 19).

These legends may therefore be regarded as distortions of the Biblical narrative, handed down by tradition, and embellished by the fancy and imagination of eastern nations. The belief of the Jews in later times is remarkably illustrated by the story of Asmodeus in the famous Lel Tobih. It is deeply instructive to observe how wide and marked a contrast there is between the incidental allusion of the sacred narrative (Gen. vi. 4), and the minute frivolities or profane follies which degrade the heathen mythology, and repeatedly appear in the groundless imaginations of the Rabbinic interpreters. If there were fallen angels whose lawless desires gave birth to a monstrous progeny, both they and their nefarious offspring were destroyed by the deluge, which was the retribution on their wickedness, and they have no existence in the baptized and regenerated earth.

Before passing to the other giant-races we may observe that all nations have had a dim fancy that the aborigines who preceded them, and the earliest men generally, were of immense stature. Berosus says that the ten antediluvian kings of Chaldea were giants, and we find in all monarchical traditions a similar statement about the earliest possessors of Britain (comp. Hom. Od. x. 119; Aug. de Civ. Dei, xv. 9; I'n. vii. 16; Varr. op. Ant. Gell. iii. 10; Jer. on Matt. xxvi. 3-5). The great size decreased gradually after the deluge (2 Esdr. v. 52-55). That we are dwarfs compared to our ancestors was a common belief among the Latin and Greek poets (II. v. 302 ff.; Luceret. ii. 115; Virg. An. xii. 100); Jude (v. 8, 9), although it is now a matter of absolute certainty from the remains of antiquity, reaching back to the very earliest times, that in old days men were no taller than ourselves. On the origin of the mistaken supposition there are curious passages in Natalis Comes (Mythology, vi. 21), and Macrobius (Saturn. i. 20).

The next race of giants which we find mentioned in Scripture is —

9. THE REPHAIM, a name which frequently occurs, and in some remarkable passages. The earliest mention of them is the record of their defeat by Chedorlaomer and some allied kings at Ashtoroth Karmim (Gen. xiv. 5). They are again mentioned (Gen. xv. 20), their dispersion recorded (Deut. ii. 10, 20), and Og the giant king of Bashan said to be "the only remnant of them" (Deut. iii. 11; Jos. xii. 4, xiii. 12, xvii. 15). Exterminated, however, from the east of Palestine, they long found a home in the west, and in connection with the Philistines, under whose protection the small remnant of them may have lived, they still employed their arms against the Hebrews (2 Sam. xxi. 18 ff.; 1 Chr. xx. 4). In the latter passage there seems however to be some confusion between the Rephaim and the sons of a particular giant of Gath, named Rapha. Such a name may have been conjectured as that of a founder of the race, like the names Ion, Dorus, Teut, etc. (Boettcher, de Inferia, p. 96, n; Rapha occurs also as a proper name, 1 Chr. vii. 25, vii. 37). It is probable that they had possessed districts west of the Jordan in early times, since the "Valley of Rephaim" (κοιλάδα τῶν Τιτάνων), 2 Sam. v. 18; 1 Chr. xi. 15; Is. xii. 5; κ. τῶν γιγαντῶν, Joseph. Ant. vii. 4, § 1), a rich valley S. W. of Jerusalem, derived its name from them.

That they were not Canaanites is clear from
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There being no allusion to them in Gen. x. 16-19, they were probably one of those aboriginal people to whose existence the traditions of many nations testify, and of whose genealogy the Bible gives us no information. The few names recorded have, as Ewald remarks, a Semitic aspect (tischach, des Volkes Isr. i. 311), but from the hatred existing between them and both the Canaanites and Hebrews, some suppose them to be Japheticites, "who comprised especially the inhabitants of the coasts and islands." (Kahleian. Gen. p. 531).

**VII.**

Is. lixxvii. 14; Is. xxvi. 14, where it is confused with רוגץ; cf. Gen. i. 2, and sometimes רוגץ, רוגץ, especially in the later versions. In A. V. the words used for it are "Rephaim," "giants," and "the dead." That it has the latter meaning in many passages is certain (Ps. lixviii. 10; Prov. i. 18, ix. 18, xxi. 10; Is. xxvi. 19, 14). [Dead, The, Amer. ed.] The question arises, how are these meanings to be reconciled? Genesius gives no derivation for the national name, and derives רוגץ = mortai, from רוגץ, smarit, and the proper name Rapha from an Arabic root signifying "a tall," thus seeming to sever all connection between the meanings of the word, which is surely most unlikely. Musius, Simonis, &c., suppose the second meaning to come from the fact that both spectres and giants strike terror (accepting the derivation from רוגץ, remisit, "unstrung with fear." R. Dechai on Deut. ii. 3; Vitringa and Hiller from the notion of length involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Hiller, Synonyma, Hesper. p. 205; Virg. Aen. ii. 772, &c.). J. D. Michaelis (ad loc. Thuc. ii. p. 466) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, &c., were Troglytotes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Boettcher sees in רוגץ and רוגץ a double root, and thinks that the giants were called רוגץ (bangamfoci) by an empeirion; and that the dead were so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek καυμάτες, καυμάτες (comp. Böttmann, Lex. ii. 257 ff.). His arguments are too elaborate to quote, but see Boettcher, pp. 94-100. An attentionive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Genesius also hints) from some notion of Sheol being the residence of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are Prov. xxvi. 16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all); Is. xxvi. 14, 19, which are difficult to explain without some such supposition; Is. xiv. 9, where the word רוגץ (ai ἐνζεκαὶ τῆς γῆς, I.N.X.) if taken in its literal meaning of "giant," may mean evil spirits represented in that form (cf. Lev. xvii. 7); and especially in xxvi. 6, "Behold the giants (A. V. 'dead things') grown under the waters" (Dooyan version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaquatic prison of rebellious spirits like that (according to the Hindoo legend) Vishnu the water-god confuses a race of giants (cf. וּדוֹאָדוֹחֵי, as a title of Neptune, with the Roman Neptunus), which the Bible calls הים, here "giants," and "dead." The word "giants," "dead," or "the dead." (accepting the derivation from רוגץ, remisit, "unstrung with fear." R. Dechai on Deut. ii. 3; Vitringa and Hiller from the notion of length involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Hiller, Synonyma, Hesper. p. 205; Virg. Aen. ii. 772, &c.). J. D. Michaelis (ad loc. Thuc. ii. p. 466) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, &c., were Troglytotes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Boettcher sees in רוגץ and רוגץ a double root, and thinks that the giants were called רוגץ (bangamfoci) by an empeirion; and that the dead were so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek καυμάτες, καυμάτες (comp. Böttmann, Lex. ii. 257 ff.). His arguments are too elaborate to quote, but see Boettcher, pp. 94-100. An attentionive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Genesius also hints) from some notion of Sheol being the residence of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are Prov. xxvi. 16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all); Is. xxvi. 14, 19, which are difficult to explain without some such supposition; Is. xiv. 9, where the word רוגץ (ai ἐνζεκαὶ τῆς γῆς, I.N.X.) if taken in its literal meaning of "giant," may mean evil spirits represented in that form (cf. Lev. xvii. 7); and especially in xxvi. 6, "Behold the giants (A. V. 'dead things') grown under the waters" (Dooyan version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaquatic prison of rebellious spirits like that (according to the Hindoo legend) Vishnu the water-god confuses a race of giants (cf. וּדוֹאָדוֹחֵי, as a title of Neptune, with the Roman Neptunus), which the Bible calls הים, here "giants," and "dead." The word "giants," "dead," or "the dead."
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Geese, however (misled by supposed relics) thought otherwise (Joseph. Ant. v. x. 1. § 3). No one has yet proved by experience the possibility of giant races, materially exceeding in size the average height of man. There is no great variation in the ordinary standard. The most stunted tribes of Esquimaux are at least four feet high, and the tallest races of America (e. g. the Guayaquilts and people of Paraguay) do not exceed six feet and a half. It was long thought that the Patagonians were men of enormous stature, and the assertions of the old voyagers on the point were positive. For instance Pizafetta (Voyage Round the World, Pinkerton. xi. 314) mentions an individual Patagonian so tall, that they "hardly reached to his waist." Similar exaggerations are found in the Voyages of Byron, Wallis, Carteret, Cook, and Forster; but it is now a matter of certainty from the recent visits to Patagonia (by Winter, Capt. Snow, and others), that there is nothing at all extraordinary in their size.

The general belief (until very recent times) in the existence of fabulously enormous men, arose from fancied giant-graves (see De la Vallee's Travels in Persia, ii. 90), and above all from the discovery of huge bones, which were taken for those of men, in days when comparative anatomy was unknown. Even the ancient Jews were thus misled (Joseph. Ant. vii. 10. § 8). Augustus appeals triumphantly to this argument, and mentions a molar tooth which he had seen at Utica a hundred times larger than ordinary teeth (De Civ. Dei, xv. 9). No doubt it once belonged to an elephant. Vives, in his commentary on the place, mentions a tooth as big as a fist, which was shown at St. Christopher's. In fact this source of delusion has only very recently been dispelled (Sennert. De Gigant. passim; Martin's West. Isabel. in Pinkerton, ii. 891). Most bones, which have been exhibited, have turned out to be long to whales or elephants, as was the case with the vertebra of a supposed giant, examined by Sir Hans Sloane in Oxfordshire.

On the other hand, isolated instances of monstrosity are sufficiently attested to prove that beings like Goliath and his kinsmen may have existed. Columnella (R. R. iii. 8, § 2) mentions Navius Pollio as one of the Gauls, and Pliny says that in the time of Claudius Caesar there was an Arab named Gabbaras nearly ten feet high, and that even he was not so tall as Fusio and Secundilla in the reign of Augustus, whose bodies were preserved (vii. 16). Josephus tells us that, among other hostages, Artabanus sent to Tiberius a certain Eleazar, a Jew, surmounted "the Giant," seven cubits in height (Ant. xviii. 4, 5, 5). Nor are well-authenticated instances wanting in modern times. O'Brien, whose skeleton is preserved in the Museum of the College of Surgeons, must have been 8 feet high, but his unnatural height made him weakly. On the other hand the blacksmith Parsons, in Charles II.'s reign, was 7 feet 2 inches high, and also remarkable for his strength (Fuller's Worthies, Staffordshire).

For information on the various subjects touched upon in this article, besides minor authorities quoted in it, see Grot. de Veritat. i. 16; Nork, Bann. and Robb. p. 210 ad fin.; Ewald, Gesch. i. 305-312; Winer, s. v. Riesen, etc.; Gesen. s. v. גּיִבְיָא; Rosenmiller, Kalisch, et Comment. ad loc cit.; Rosenm. Alterthumsk. ii.; Boetticher, de Infereis, p. 95 f.; Heideluger, Hist. Patr. xi.; Hävnik's Inrod. to Pentat. p. 434 f.; Horne's Inrod. i. 148; Faber's Brit. Hist. Lect. iii. 7; Maitland's Encyc. of Travels i. 217, in Maitland's False Worship, i-57; Prichard's Nat. Hist. of Man, v. 489 f.; Hamilton On the Pentat. pp. 189-201; Papers on the Rehims by Miss F. Corbaux, Journal of Soc. Lit. 1854. There are also monographs by Cassianon, Sanguetilli, and Senment; we have only met with the latter (Dissert. Hist. Phil. de Gigantibus, Vittenberg 1603); it is interesting and learned, but extraordinarily erudite. F. W. F.

GIBBAR (גּיִבְיָא [hero, or high, gigantic]; גּיִבְרֶל [Vat. Teseb; Gebbar]). Bene-Gibbar, to the number of ninety-five, returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezr. ii. 20). In the parallel list of Neh. vii. the name is given GIBEZON.

GIB'ETHON (גּיִבְיָא [eminence, hill]; in Josh., גּיִבְרֶל [Vat. Teseb; Gebbar]). Geb'ethon, a town allotted to the tribe of Dan (Josh. xix. 44), and afterwards given with its "suburbs" to the Kohathite Levites (xxii. 33). Being, like most of the towns of Dan, either in or close to the Philistines' country, it was no doubt soon taken possession of by them; at any rate they held it in the early days of the monarchy of Israel, when king Nadab "and all Israel," and after him Omri, besieged it (1 K. xvi. 27; xvi. 17). What were the special advantages of situation or otherwise which rendered it so desirable as a possession for Israel are not apparent. In the Omo-nonticon (Gabathon) it is quoted as a small village (טלמה) called Gebel, in the 17th mile from Cesarea. This would place it nearly due west of Cimmaria, and about the same distance therefrom. No name at all resembling it has, however, been discovered in that direction.

GIB'EA (גּיִבְיָא [hill-inhabitant, Frurst; hill, Gesen.]; גּיִבְרֶל [Vat. Teseb; Gebbar]). Sheva, "the father of Macebeaen," and "father of Gibea," is mentioned with other names unmistakably those of places and not persons, among the descendants of Judah (1 Chr. ii. 49, comp. 42). [FATHER.] This would seem to point out Gibeah (which in some Hebrew MSS. is Gilbe; see Bunting, i. 216) as the city Gibeah in Judah. The mention of Madmannah (49, comp. Josh. xv. 31), as well as of Ziph (42) and Maon (45), seems to carry us to a locality considerably south of Hebron. [GIBRAH, 1.] On the other hand Madmannah recalls Madmenah, a town named in connection with Gibeah of Benjamin (Is. x. 31), and therefore lying somewhere north of Jerusalem.

GIB'EAH (גּיִבְיָא), derived, according to Genius (Thes. pp. 259, 260), from a root, גּיִבְיָא, signifying to be round or humped; comp. the Latin gibbus, English gibbons; the Arabic جبّ, jabal, a mountain, and the German gipfel. A word employed in the Bible to denote a "hill" — that is, an eminence of less considerable height and extent than a "mountain," the term for which is גּיִבְיָא, har. For the distinction between the two terms, see Ps. cxlviii. 9; Prov. viii. 25; Is. ii. 2, xl. 4, &c. In the historical books gibon is commonly applied to the bald rounded hills of central Palestine, especially in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Stanley, App. § 25). Like most words of this kind it gave its name to several towns and places in Palestine.
which would doubtless be generally on or near a

1. Gibeah (Gaḇāḏ: Gabah), a city in the
mountain-district of Judah, named with Maon and
the southern Carmel (Josh. xv. 57; and comp. 1
Ch. ii. 49, &c.). In the Osmomastion a village
generated Gabatha is mentioned as containing the
monument of Halakuk, the prophet, and lying
twelve miles from Elenthropolis. The direction,
however, is not stated. Possibly it was identical
with Keilah, which is given as eastward from Elen-
thropolis (Eusebius says seventeen, Jerome eight
miles) on the road to Hebron, and is also mentioned
as containing the monument of Halakuk. But
neither of these can be the place intended in Joshua,
since that would appear to have been to the S. E.
of Hebron, near where Carmel and Maon are still
existing. For the same reason this Gibeah cannot
be that discovered by Robinson as Jebel' in the
Wady Musa'er, not far west of Bethlehem, and ten
miles north of Hebron (Rob. ii. 6, 16). Its site
is therefore yet to seek.

2. Gib'eath (יוֹבֵית; Gaḇāḇāḇ; Alex. Taḇāḇāḇ:
Gababah). This is enumerated among the last
group of the towns of Benjamin, next to Jerusalem
(Josh. xvii. 28). It is generally taken to be
the place which afterwards became so notorious as
a "Gibeah-of-Benjamin" or "of-Saul." But this,
as we shall presently see, was five or six miles north
of Jerusalem, close to Gibon and Ramah, with
which, in that case, it would have been mentioned
in ver. 25. The name being in the "construct
state,"—Gibeah and not Gibeth,—may it not be-
long to the following name, Kirjath (i. e. Kirjath-
jeirim, as some MSS. actually read), and denote the
hill adjoined that town (see below, No. 3)? The
obvious objection to this proposal is the statement
of the number of this group of towns as fourteen,
but this is not a serious objection, as in these cata-
logues discrepancies not unfrequently occur between
the numbers of the towns, and that stated as the
sum of the enumeration (comp. Josh. xv. 32, 36;
xix. 6, &c.). In this very list there is reason to
believe that Zelah and Ha-Keleph are not separate
names, but one. The lists of Joshua, though in
the main coeval with the division of the country,
must have been often added to and altered before
they became finally fixed as we now possess them,
and the singularity conformed on the "hill of Kirjath"
by the temporary sojourn of the Ark there in the
time of Saul would have secured its insertion
among the lists of the towns of the tribe.

3. (יוֹבֵית; Gaḇāḇāḇ; Alex. Gaḇāḇāḇīn;
in Gabah), the place in which the Ark remained
from the time of its return by the Philistines till
its removal by David (2 Sam. vi. 3, 4; comp. 1

a For instance, Beth-maraboth, "house of char-
coal," which in the village of Gabah (Josh.
xix. 5) would seem to date from the time of Solomon,
when the traffic in these articles began with Egypt.

b יִבְיָד, A. V. "meadows of Gibeah," taking
the word [after the Targum and R. Kimchi as Maḇaroth,
an open field (Stanley, App. § 19); the LXX. (Rom. Var.)
transfers the Hebrew word literally, Maḇaraphi; 1 MSS.
read Maḇaḵ Pāḇən or Pāḇən; but Comp. Aid.,
with Alex. and about 15 other MSS., add ʼeḇāḇāḇ
or ʼeḇāḇāḇ Pāḇən; the Syriac has ʼeḇāḇāḇ = cave. The
Hebrew word for cave, Meḇāḇ, differs from that
adopted in the A. V. only in the vowel-points; and

Sam. vii. 1, 2). The name has the definite art-
icle, and in 1 Sam. vii. 1 [as here in the margin of
the A. V.] it is translated "the hill." (See No. 2 above.)

4. Gib'eaḥ-of-Benjamin. This town does
not appear in the lists of the cities of Benjamin
in Josh. xvii. (1.) We first encounter it in the
tragi-comic story of the Levite and his concubine, when
it brought all but extermination on the tribe (Judg.
xix., xx.). It was then a "city" (יוֹבֵית) with the
usual open street (יוֹבֵית) or square (Judg. xix. 15
17, 20), and containing 700 "chosen men" (xx.
15), probably the same whose skill as slingers is
preserved in the next verse. Thanks to the pre-
cision of the narrative, we can gather some general
knowledge of the position of Gibeah. The Levite
and his party left Bethlehem in the "afternoon"
—when the day was coming near the time at
which the tents would be pitched for evening. It
was probably between two and three o'clock.
At the ordinary speed of eastern travellers they would
come "over against Jebus" in two hours, say by
five o'clock, and the same length of time would take
them an equal distance, or about four miles, to
the north of the city on the Nobthis road, in the
direction of Mount Ephraim (xix. 13, comp. 1).
Ramah and Gibeah both lay in sight of the road,
Gibeah apparently the nearest; and when the sud-
den onset of that climate, accompanied by more
than a very brief twilight, made further progress
impossible, they "turned aside" from the beaten
track to the town where one of the party was to
meet a dreadful death (Judg. xix. 9-15). Later
indications of the story seem to show that a little
north of the town the main track divided into two
—one, the present Nobhas road, leading up to
Bethel, the "house of God," and the other taking
to Gibeah-in-the-field (xx. 31), possibly the present
Jebus. Below the city, probably,—about the base
of the hill which gave its name to the town, —was
the cave of Gibeah," in which the liers in wait
concealed themselves until the signal was given
c (xx. 33).

During this narrative the name is given simply
as Gibeah," with a few exceptions; at its intro-
duction it is called "Gibeah which belongeth to
Benjamin" (xix. 14, and so in xx. 4). In xx. 10
we have the expression "Gibeah of Benjamin,"
but here the Hebrew is not Gibeah, but Gela—יוֹבֵית.
The same form of the word is found in xx. 38,
where the meadows, or cave, "of Gibeah," should
be "of Gela."

In many of the above particulars Gibeah agrees
very closely with Tuleth el-Fal" [hill of beans],
a conspicuous eminence just four miles north of

there seems a certain consistency in an ambush con-
celring themselves in a cave, which in an open field
would be impossible.

* Herodotus (Book of the Rhetor. c, 323) objects to the
meaning "cave" that the liers-in-wait are said
(vers. 29) to have been set "round about Gibeah." He
undoubtedly at least part of vers. 33 to mean that the
men of Israel came forth from their ambush ere the
town of Gibea, in order to expel the men of the
Benjamites (xx. 31, 32). Butcher, Trenchard and
others give nearly the same interpretation, rendering
the last clause of the verse "post demotionem Gibaeonem.

A e Josephus, Ant. v. 2, § 11.
Jerusalem to the right of the road. Two miles beyond it and full in view is er-Ram, in all probability the ancient Ramah, and between the two the main road divides, one branch going off to the right to the village of Jebn, while the other continues its course upwards to Bethin, the modern representative of Bethel. (See No. 5 below.)

(2.) We next meet with Gibeah of Benjamin during the Philistine wars of Saul and Jonathan (1 Sam. xiii., xiv.). It now bears its full title. The position of matters seems to have been this: The Philistines were in possession of the village of Gela, the present Jebn on the south side of the Wady Saqeinath. In their front, across the wady, which is here about a mile wide, and divided by several swells lower than the side Eminences, was Saul in the town of Michmash, the modern Mahkemas, and holding also "Mount Bethel," that is, the heights on the north of the great wady — Deir Dircën, Barba, Tell el-Hajar, as far as Beth'in itself. South of the Philistine camp, and about three miles in its rear, was Jonathan, in Gibeah-of-Benjamin, with a thousand chosen warriors (xiii. 2).

The Philistines, in order to dislodge the Philistines from Gela, by a feat of arms which at once procured him an immense reputation. But in the meantime it increased the difficulties of Israel, for the Philistines (hearing of their reverse) gathered in prodigious strength, and advancing with an enormous armament, pushed Saul's little force before them out of Bethel and Michmash, and down the eastern passes, to Gilgal, near Jericho in the Jordan valley (xiv. 3, 7). They then established themselves at Michmash, formerly the headquarters of Saul, and from thence sent out their bands of plunderers, north, west, and east (vv. 17, 18). But nothing could dislodge Jonathan from his main stronghold in the south. As far as we can disentangle the complexities of the story, he soon relinquished Gela, and consolidated his little force in Gibeah, where he was joined by his father, with Samuel the prophet, and Ahiah the priest, who, perhaps remembering the former fate of the Ark, had brought down the sacred Ephod 8 from Shiloh. These three had made their way up from Gilgal, with a force sorely diminished by desertion to the Philistine camp (xiv. 21), and flight (xiii. 7) — a mere remnant (καταλειμμα) of the people following in the rear of the little band (LXX.). Then occurred the feat of the hero and his armor-bearer. In the stillness and darkness of the night they descended the hill of Gibeah, crossed the intervening country to the steep terraced slope of Jebn, and threading the mazes of the ravine below, climbed the opposite hill, and discovered themselves to the garrison of the Philistines just as the day was breaking. 5

No one had been aware of their departure, but it was not long unknown. Saul's watchmen at Tuleil el-Fel were straining their eyes to catch a glimpse in the early morning of the position of the foe; and as the first rays of the rising sun on their light broke over the mountains of Gilgal, and glit-

1 Sam. xiv. 3. In ver. 18 the ark is said to have been at Gibeah; but this is in direct contradiction to the statement of vii. 1, compared with 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4, and 1 Chr. xiii. 1; also to those of the LXX. and Josephus at this place. The Hebrew words for ark and uoph — יִסְכִּית and יְסָכִית — are very similar, and may have been mistaken for one another (Kwald, Griech. in 46. note; Stanley, p. 360).

a They were this to Josephus: ὠφρασιοῦν ἡς τῆς ἤμερας (Ant. vi. 6, § 3).

b This is their inference from the fact that the wives of 400 out of the 600 Benjamites who escaped the massacre at Gibeah came from Jabesh-Gilead (Judg. xxi. 12).

c The word in this verse rendered "hill" is not gibeah but law, i.e. "mountain," a singular change and not quite intelligible.
GIBEAH

GIBEAH

gives his route as though Samaria to Gophna, thence a day's march to a valley "called by the Jews the Valley of Thornes, near a certain village called Galathiasoule, distant from Jerusalem about thirty stadia," i.e. just the distance of Tushel el-Ful. Here he was joined by a part of his army from Emmaus (Nicopolis), who would naturally come up the road by Bethoron and Gibeah, the same which still falls into the northern road close to Tushel el-Ful. In both these respects therefore the agreement is complete, and Gibeah of Benjamin must be taken as identical with Gibeah of Saul. The discovery is due to Dr. Robinson (i. 577-79), though it was partly suggested by a writer in Sted. und Kritiken.

This identification of Gibeah, as also that of Gela with Jebel, is fully supported by Is. x. 28-32, where we have a specification of the route of Nebuchadnezir from the north through the villages of the Benjaminite district to Jerusalem. Commencing with Ai, to the east of the present Bethin, the route proceeds by Makkina, across the "passages" of the Wady Surnint to Jeba on the opposite side; and then by er-Ran and Tushel el-Ful, villages actually on the present road, to the heights north of Jerusalem, from which the city is visible. Gallin, Mudnemah, and Gebim, none of which have been yet identified, must have been, like Anathoth (Annai) villages on one side or the other of the direct line of march. The only break in the chain is Migron, which is here placed between Ai and Michmeth, while in 1 Sam. xiv. 2 it appears to have been five or six miles south, at Gibeah. One explanation that presents itself is, that in that uneven and rocky district the name "Migron," "precipice," would very probably, like "Gibeah," be borne by more than one town.

In 1 Sam. xxii. 6, xxiii. 19, xxvi. 1, "Gibeah" [LXX. Gbouer]: Vulg. Gibeon: doubtless stands for G. of Saul.

6. GIBEAH-IN-THE-FIELD (רִבְּאֵה-אֶת הַגֶּדֶן): Gibeah en arypeh: [Alex. Γ. έν τω αραγώ: Gobna], named only in Judg. xx. 31, as the place to which one of the "highways" (רַדְבַּל הָצֶה) led from Gibeah-of-Benjamin, "of which one went up to Bethel, and one to Gibeah-in-the-field." Such, "the word here rendered "field," is applied specially to cultivated ground, "as distinguished from town, desert, or garden" (Stanley, App. § 15). Cultivation was so general throughout this district, that the text affords no clue to the situation of the place. It is, however, remarkable that the north road from Jerusalem, shortly after passing Tushel el-Ful, separates into two branches, one running on to Betha (Bethel), and the other diverging to the right to Gela (Geba). The attack on Gibeah came from the north (comp. xx. 18, 19, and 26, in which "a house of God" is really Bethel), and therefore the divergence of the roads was north of the town. In the case of Gibeah-of-Benjamin we have seen that the two forms "Gela" and "Gibeah" appear to be convertible, the former for the latter. If the identification now proposed for Gibeah-in-the-field be correct, the case is here reversed, and "Gibeah" is put for "Gela."

The "meadows of Gala" (גָּלָה) [A. V. Gibeah: Judg. xx. 33] have no connection with the "field," the Hebrew words being entirely different. As stated above, the word rendered "meadows" is probably accurately "caves." [Geba, p. 877 n.]

7. There are several other names comroaded to Gibeah, which are given in a translated form in the A. V., probably from their appearing not to belong to towns. These are:—

(1.) The "hill of the foreskins" (Josh. v. 3) between the Jordan and Jericho; it derives its name from the circumcision which took place there, and seems afterwards to have received the name of Gilgal.

(2.) [Tushel el-Ful] in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xxx. 33). This may be the Jeba on the left of the Nobba road, half-way between Bethel and Shiloh; or the Jeba north of Nobba (Robb. ii. 265 note, 312). Both would be "in Mount Ephraim," but there is nothing in the text to fix the position of the place, while there is no lack of the name among the villages of central Palestine.

(3.) The "hill of Maron" (Judg. vii. 1).

(4.) The "hill of God" — Gibeah-ka-Eklim (1 Sam. x. 5); one of the places in the route of Saul, which is so difficult to trace. In verses 10 and 13, it is apparently called "the hill," and "the high place."

(5.) [Vulg. 1 Sam. xxvi. 3; Gobna Hocilla.] The "hill of Hachilah" (1 Sam. xxiii. 13, xxvi. 1, 3).

(6.) The "hill of Ammah" (2 Sam. ii. 5).

(7.) The "hill Gaber" (Jer. xxxii. 39).

GIB'EATH, Josh. xviii. 28. [Gibeath, 2.]

GIB'EATHITE, THE (רִיבְּאֵת הַתִּיָּשֶּׁר; Ῥιβάθητις; [Vat. fa. Ῥιβάθητις; Alex. Ριβάθητις; Giov. Zebulithes]), i.e. the native of Gibeah (1 Chr. xiii. 3); in this case Shamah, or "the Benjaminites," father of two Benjamites, "Saul's brethren," who joined David.

GIB'EON (רִיבְּאֵן), i.e. belonging to a hill: [Giboan: [Vat. 1 K. ix. 2, 3; Gibaon, Jer. xii. 12, 13; Joseph. Ριβανον; Gibbon], one of the four cities of the Hivites, the inhabitants of which made a league with Joshua (ix. 3-15), and thus escaped the fate of Jericho and Ai (comp. xi. 19). It appears, as might be inferred from its taking the initiative in this matter, to have been the largest of the four — a great city, like one of the royal cities — larger than Ai (x. 2). Its men too were all practiced warriors (Gibborim, "Gibborim"). Gibeon lay within the territory of Benjamin (xviii. 25), and with its "suburbs" was allotted to the priests (xvii. 17), of whom it became afterwards a principal station. Occasional notices of its existence occur in the historical books, which are examined more at length below; and after the Captivity we find the "men of Gibeon" returning with Zerubabel (Neh. vii. 25); in the list of Ezra the name is altered to Gilbar, and assisting Nehemiah in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (iii. 7). In the post-biblical times it was the scene of a victory by the Jews over the Roman troops under Cestius Galus, which offers in many respects a close parallel to that of Joshua over the Cananites (Jos. B. J. ii. 21). T. Stanley, S. P. 212.

The situation of Gibeon has fortunately been recovered with as great certainty as any ancient site in Palestine. The traveller who pursues the northern canal-road from Jerusalem, turning off to

assemble. (Jost, 161, 170)找出

Beeroth

as O. Jos. ix. 17. Josephus (Ant. v. 1, § 10) agrees

Beeroth
the left at Tulkil el-Ful (Gibeath) on that branch of it which leads westward to Jaffa, finds himself, after crossing one or two stony and barren ridges, in a district of a more open character. The hills are rounder and more isolated than those through which he has been passing, and rise in well-defined mameions from broad undulating valleys of tolerable extent and fertile soil. This is the central plateau of the country, the “land of Benjamin;” and these round hills are the Gibeaths, Gebas, Gibeons, and Ramahs, whose names occur so frequently in the records of this district. Retaining its ancient name almost intact, el-Jib stands on the northernmost of a couple of these mameions, just at the place where the road to the sea parts into two branches, the one by the lower level of the Wady Saleimân, the other by the heights of the Beth-horonos, to Gimzo, Lydda, and Joppa. The road passes at a short distance to the north of the base of the hill of el-Jib. The strata of the hills in this district lie much more horizontally than those further south. With the hills of Gibeon this is peculiarly the case, and it imports a remarkable precision to their appearance, especially when viewed from a height such as the neighboring eminence of Netly Smawil. The natural terraces are carried round the hill like contour lines; they are all dotted thick with olives and vines, and the ancient-looking houses are scattered over the flatlshop summit of the mound. On the east side of the hill is a copious spring which issues in a cave excavated in the limestone rock, so as to form a large reservoir. In the trees further down are the remains of a pool or tank of considerable size, probably, says Dr. Robinson, 120 feet by 100, i.e. of rather smaller dimensions than the lower pool at Hebron. This is doubtless the “pool of Gibeon” at which Abner and Joab met together with the troops of Ish-bosheth and David, and where

that sharp conflict took place which ended in the death of Asahel and led at a later period to the treacherous murder of Abner himself. Here or at the spring were the “great waters (or the many waters, ṣāḥyôn ṣāḥyôn) of Gibeon,” a at which Johanan the son of Kareah found the traitor Ishmael (Jer. xlii. 12). Round this water also, according to the notice of Josephus (ἐν τοις παραλίασι τῆς ἱεροσολυμίας, Ant. v. 1, § 17), the five kings of the Amorites were encamped when Joshua burst upon them from Gilgal. The “wilderness of Gibeon” (2 Sam. ii. 24 — the Midbar, i.e. rather the waste pasture-grounds — must have been to the east, beyond the circle or suburb of cultivated fields, and towards the neighboring swells, which bear the names of Jedîrek and Biz Nebelakh. Such is the situation of Gibeon, fulfilling in position every requirement of the notices of the Bible, Josephus Eusebius, and Jerome. Its distance from Jerusalem by the main road is as nearly as possible 61 miles; but there is a more direct road reducing it to 5 miles.

The name of Gibeon is most familiar to us in connection with the artifice by which its inhabitants obtained their safety at the hands of Joshua, and with the memorable battle which ultimately resulted therefrom. This transaction is elsewhere examined, and therefore requires no further reference here. [JOSHUA; BETH-HORON.] We next hear of it at the encounter between the men of David and of Ish-bosheth under their respective leaders Joab and Abner (2 Sam. ii. 12-17). The meeting has all the air of having been

a Both here and in 1 K. iii. 4, Josephus substitutes Macon for Gibeon (Ant. x. 3, § 5, vii. 2, § 1).
premeditated by both parties, unless we suppose that Joab had heard of the intention of the Benjamites to revisit from the distant Mahalaim their native villages, and had seized the opportunity to try his strength with Abner. The details of this disastrous encounter are elsewhere given. [Joah.]

The place where the struggle began received a name from the circumstance, and seems to have been long afterwards known as "the field of the strong man." [Helch.]

We again meet with Gibeon in connection with Joab; this time as the scene of the cruel and revolting death of Amasa by his hand (2 Sam. xx. 5-10). Joab was in pursuit of the rebellious Shela the son of Becher, and his being so far out of the direct north road as Gibeon may be accounted for by supposing that he was making a search for this Benjamite among the towns of his tribe. The two rivals met at "the great stone which is in Gibeon" — some old landmark, now no longer recognizable, at least not recognized — and then Joab repeated the treachery by which he had murdered Abner, but with circumstances of a still more revolting character. [Joah.; Armis, p. 158.]

It is remarkable that the retribution for this crowning act of perfidy should have overtaken Joab close to the very spot on which it had been committed. For it was to the tabernacle at Gibeon (1 K. ii. 28, 29; comp. 1 Chr. xvi. 29) that Joab fled for sanctuary when his death was pronounced by Solomon, and it was while clinging to the horns of the brazen altar there that he received his death-blow from Benaiah the son of Jehoshaphat (1 K. ii. 28, 30, 31; and LXX. 29).

Familiar as these events in connection with the history of Gibeon are to us, its reputation in Israel was due to a very different circumstance — the fact that the tabernacle of the congregation and the brazen altar of burnt-offering were for some time located on the "high place" attached to or near the town. We are not informed whether this "high place" had any name for sanctity before the tabernacle came there; but if not, it would probably have been erected elsewhere. We only hear of it in connection with the tabernacle, nor is there any indication of its situation in regard to the town. Professor Stanley has suggested that it was the remarkable hill of Nebi Samwil, the most prominent and individual eminence in that part of the country, and to which the special appellation of "the great high-place" (1 K. iii. 4; יֵבֵי סָ السعود) would perfectly apply. And certainly, if "great" is to be understood as referring to height or size, there is no other hill which can so justly claim the distinction (Siani and Pol., p. 216). But the word has not always that meaning, and may equally imply eminence in other respects, e. g. superior sanctity to the numerous other high places — Bethel, Ramah, Mizpah, Gibeah — which surrounded it on every side. The main objection to this identification is the distance of Nebi Samwil from Gibeon — more than a mile — and the absence of any close connection therewith than with any other of the neighboring places. The most natural position for the high place of Gibeon is the twin mount immediately south of el-Jib — so close as to be all but a part of the town, and yet quite separate and distinct. The testimony of Eiphaphias, by which Mr. Wright supports his conjecture, namely, that the "Mount of Gideon," was the highest round Jerusalem (Ain. Herodasa, i. 394), should be received with caution, standing as it does quite alone, and belonging to an age which, though early, was marked by ignorance, and by the most improbable conclusions.

To this high place, wherever situated, the "tabernacle of the congregation" — the sacred tent which had accompanied the children of Israel through the whole of their wanderings — had been transferred from its last station at Nob. The exact date of the transfer is left in uncertainty. It was either before or at the time when David brought up the ark "from Kirjath-jearim, to the new tent which he had pitched for it on Mount Zion, that the original tent was spread for the last time at Gibeon. The expression in 2 Chr. i. 5, "the brazen altar he put before the tabernacle of Jehovah," at first sight appears to refer to David. But the text of the passage is disputed, and the authorities are divided between כִּלָּה= מֵאָם, and כִּלָּה= מָהָי. Whether king David transferred the tabernacle to Gibeon or not, he certainly appointed the staff of priests to offer the daily sacrifices there on the brazen altar of Moses, and to fulfill the other requirements of the law (1 Chr. xvi. 40), with no less a person at their head than Zechar the priest (30), assisted by the famous musicians Heman and Jeduthun (41).

One of the earliest acts of Solomon's reign — it must have been while the remembrance of the execution of Joab was still fresh — was to visit Gibeon. The ceremonial was truly magnificent: the congregation with all the great officers of the state — the captains of hundreds and thousands, the judges, the governors, and the chief of the fathers — and the sacrifice consisted of a thousand burnt-offerings (1 K. iii. 4). And this glimpse of Gibeon in all the splendor of its greatest prosperity — the smoke of the thousands animals rising from the venerable altar on the commanding height of "the great high place" — the clang of "trumpets and cymbals and musical instruments of God" (1 Chr. xxi. 42) resounding through the valleys far and near — is virtually the last we have of it. In a few years the temple at Jerusalem was completed, and then the tabernacle was once more taken down and removed. Again "all the men of Israel assembled themselves" to king Solomon, with the "elders of Israel," and the priests and the Levites brought up both the tabernacle and the
The Gibeonites are also known as the 'Bene-Giddel' and are mentioned in the Targum, a Hebrew translation of the Old Testament. They were known for their skill in building and were close associates of Solomon's builders, as indicated in the New Testament (Acts 7:44). They were also known for their role in the construction of the temple in Jerusalem (I Chron. 29:26). However, their name is also known to have been corrupted to 'Cathue' in some versions.

GIDEON, THE

The name 'Gideon' is mentioned in connection with Lebanon in the enumeration of the portions of the Promised Land remaining to be conquered by Joshua (Josh. xiii. 4). The ancient versions, as will be seen above, give no help, but there is no reason to doubt that the allusion is to the inhabitants of the city Gebal, which was on the sea-coast at the foot of the northern slopes of Lebanon. The one name is a regular derivative from the other (see Gesenius, Thes. p. 238 b). We have here a confirmation of the identity of the Aphek mentioned in this passage with Aro, which was overlooked by the writer when examining the latter name (cf. Gen. 49:20; and the whole passage is instructive, as showing how very far the limits of the country designed for the Israelites exceeded those which they actually occupied.

* Dean Stanley describes the atrocities of the aboriginal Gibeonites, and the acts of revenge of their descendents against the family of Saul, with his wonted vivisness and skill (History of the Jewish Church, 294, and ii. 36). See also ZEPHAN.
press, to conceal it from the predatory tyrants. After a natural hesitation he accepted the commission of a deliverer, and learned the true character of his visitant from a miraculous sign (vi. 12-23); and being reassured from the fear which first seized him (Ex. xx. 19; Judg. xiii. 22), built the altar of Jehovah-shalom, which existed when the book of Judges was written (vi. 24). In a dream the same night he was ordered to throw down the altar of Baal and cut down the Asherah (A. V. "grove") upon it [Asherah], with the wood of which he was to offer in sacrifice his father's "second bullock of seven years old," an expression in which some see an allusion to the seven years of servitude (vi. 26, 1). Perhaps that particular bullock is specified because it had been reserved by his father to sacrifice to Baal (Rosenmuller, Nebel ad loc.), for Joshua seems to have been a priest of that worship. Bithynia can hardly be right in supposing that Gideon was to offer two bullocks (Richt. p. 115). At any rate the minute touch is valuable as an indication of truth in the story (see Ewald, Gesch. ii. 498, and note). Gideon, assisted by ten faithful servants, obeyed the vision, and next morning ran the risk of being stoned; but Joshua appeased the popular indignation by using the common argument that Baal was capable of defending his own majesty (comp. 1 K. xviii. 27). This circumstance gave Gideon the surname of "Magen" (="Let Baal plead") vi. 32; LXX. τεφοδαλα, a standing instance of national irony, expressive of Baal's impotence. Winer thinks that this irony was increased by the fact that Μακίαν θυσία, was a surname of the Phoenician Hercules (comp. Movers, Phoen. i. 434). We have similar cases of contempt in the names Sychar, Bala-zote, etc. (Lightfoot, Hor. Hbr. ad Matt. xii. 24). In consequence of this name some have identified Gideon with a certain priest Τεφοδαλαος, mentioned in Ezechiel's (Prop. Ezech. i. 10) as having given much accurate information to Sandemianus the Byrtian (Barchet, Philog. p. 775; Huetius, Dec. Ezech. p. 84, &c.), but this opinion cannot be maintained (Ewald, Gesch. ii. 494; W. Gesenius, loc. cit.). We also find the name in the form "Τεφοδαλα" in Sahidic (2 Sah. vii. 23); comp. Ezech. i. 18, xiii. 34 with Isaiah-xvi. 2. 3 Sam. ii. (4). Ewald (p. 495, &c.) brings forward several arguments against the supposed origin of the name.

2. After this begins the second set of Gideon's life. "Clothed" by the Spirit of God (Judg. vi. 34; comp. 1 Chr. xii. 18; Luke xiv. 40), he blew a trumpet; and, joined by "Zebalum, Nathatil, and even the reluctant Asher" (which tribes were chiefly endangered by the Midianites), and possibly also by some of the original inhabitants, who would suffer from these predatory "sons of the East" no less than the Israelites themselves, he encamped on the slopes of Gilboa, from which he overlooked the plains of Esdraelon covered by the tents of Midian (Stanley, S. of P., p. 243). Strengthened by a double sign from God (to which Ewald gives a strange figurative meaning, Gesch. ii. 500), he reduced his army of 32,000 by the usual process (Dent. xx. 8; comp. 1 Mac. iii. 56). The expression "let him depart from Mount Gilgal" is perplexing: Dathan would render it "to Mount Gilgal" - on the other side of Jordan; and Genicus reads הִגְיָדְנָא, Gilboa; but Ewald is probably right in regarding the name as a sort of war-ery and general designation of the Mannasses. (See, (Gesen. Thes. p. 834, n.) By a second test at "the spring of trembling" (now probably Alm Jâdil), on which see Stanley, S. of P. (p. 342), he again reduced the number of his followers to 300 (Judg. vii. 6 f.), whom Josephus explains to have been the most cowardly in the army (Ant. vi. 5, § 3). Finally, being encouraged by words fortunately overheard (what the latter Jews termed the Bath Kol; comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 9, 10, Lightfoot, Hor. Hbr. ad Matt. iii. 14) in the relation of a significant dream, he framed his plans, which were admirably adapted to strike a panic terror into the huge and undisciplined nomad host (Judg. viii. 15-18). We know from history that large and irregular oriental armies are especially liable to sudden outbursts of uncontrollable terror, and when the stillness and darkness of the night were suddenly disturbed in three different directions by the flash of torches and by the reverberating echoes which the trumpets and the shouting woke among the hills, we cannot be astonished at the complete rout into which the enemy were thrown. It must be remembered, too, that the sound of 300 trumpets would make them suppose that a corresponding number of companies were attacking them.a For specimens of similar stratagems see Liv. xxii. 10; Polyb. Strateg. ii. 37; Frontin. ii. 4; Sall. Judg. 99; Nieahr, Descr. de l'Aphrod. p. 304; Joseph. Js. 1841, ii. 516 (quoted by Ewald, Rosenmuller, and Winer). The custom of dividing an army into three seems to have been common (1 Sam. xi. 11; Gen. xiv. 19), and Gideon's war-ery is not unlike that adopted by Cyrus (Xenoph. Cyro. iii. 28). He adds his own name to the war-ery, as suited both to inspire confidence in his followers and strike terror into the enemy. His stratagem was eminently successful, and the Midianites, breaking into their wild peculiar cries, fled headlong "down the descent to the Jordan," to the "house of the Ascent" (Beth-saat), and the "meadow of the dance" (Ada-nehbals), but were intercepted by the Ephraimites (to whom notice had been sent, vii. 24) at the fords of Beth- barah, where, after a second fight, the princes Tubb and Zeeb ("the Raven" and "the Wolf") were detected and slain—the former at a rock, and the latter concealed in a wine-press, to which their names were afterwards given. Meanwhile the higher sheikhs Zebal and Zalmuna had already escaped, and Gideon (after pausing—for by a soft answer, which became proverbial—the haughty tribe of Ephraim, viii. 1-3) pursued them into eastern Mas- saseh, and, bursting upon them in their fancied security among the tents of their Bedouin countrymen (see Karkok), won his third victory, and avenged on the Midianites the massacre of

---

a It is curious to find "tumphs and pitchers" in use here, as at this time in the streets of Cairo. The Zabat or Ashel of the police carries with him at night a torch which burns, soon after it is lighted, without a flame, except when it is moved through the air, when it suddenly blazes forth.

b The war-ery was properly, "For Jehovah and for Gilboa." The A. V. inserts "the sword," but that has no warrant, and restricts too much the idea.
his kingly brethren whom they had slain at Tabor (viii. 18 f.). In these three battles only 15,000 out of the Midianites escaped alive. This is indeed stated in Judg. viii. 10, that 120,000 Midianites had already fallen; but here as elsewhere, it may merely be intended that such was the original number of the routed host. During his triumphal return Gideon took signal and appropriate vengeance on the coward and apostate towns of Succoth and Peniel. The memory of this splendid deliverance took deep root in the national traditions (1 Sam. xii. 11; Ps. lxxxiii. 11; Is. ix. 4, x. 26; Heb. xi. 32).

3. After this there was a peace of 40 years, and we see Gideon in peaceful possession of his well-earned honors, and surrounded by the dignity of a numerous household (viii. 29-31). It is not improbable that, like Saul, he had owed a part of his popularity to his princely appearance (Judg. viii. 18). In this third stage of his life occur alike his most noble and his most questionable acts, namely, the refusal of the monarchy on theocratic grounds, and the irregular consecration of a jewelled ephod, formed out of the rich spoils of Midian, which proved to the Israelites a temptation to idolatry, although it was doubtless intended for use in the worship of Jehovah. Gideon's sons and others (Thee. p. 133; Bertheau, p. 133 f.) follow the Peshito in making the word Ephod here mean an idol, chiefly on account of the vast amount of gold (1,700 shekels) and other rich material appropriated to it. But it is simpler to understand it as a significant symbol of an unauthorized worship.

Respecting the chronology of this period little certainty can be obtained. Making full allowance for the use of round numbers, and even admitting the improbable assertion of some of the Rabbis that the period of oppression is counted in the years of rest (vile Rosenmuller, On Judg. iii. 11), insuperable difficulties remain. It, however, as has been suggested by Lord A. Hervey, several of the judgeships really synchronize instead of being successive, much of the confusion vanishes. For instance, he supposes (in a comparison of Judg. iii., viii., and xii.) that there was a combined movement under three great chiefs, Ehud, Gideon and Jephthah, by which the Israelites emancipated themselves from the dominion of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Midianites (who for some years had occupied their land), and enjoyed a long term of peace through all their coasts. "If," he says, "we string together the different accounts of the different parts of Israel which are given us in that miscellaneous collection of ancient records called the book of Judges, and treat them as connected and successive history, we shall fall into as great a chronographical error as if we treated in the same manner the histories of Mercia, Kent, Essex, Wessex, and Northumb-land, before Englund became one kingdom" (Genealogy, of our Lord, p. 238). It is now well known that a similar source of error has long existed in the chronology of Egypt.

F. W. F.

Gideoni (גידיאוֹנֵי) or once גידיאַוֹנֵי [a pros- trator, warrior]: Peshito: [Vat. Genesis, Genesis, Peshito, etc.] Gesenius [gen.]. Abidan, son of Gideon, was the chief of the tribe of Manasseh, Benjamin at the time of the census in the wilderness of Fini (Num. i. 11; ii. 22; vii. 60, 65; x. 24).

Giddom (גִּדְדֹם) [a cutting down, desolating]: Lekechi: Alex. Gâdanâ [Comp, Abd. Gâdadâ], a place named only in Judg. xx. 43, as the limit to

when the pursuit of Benjamin extended after the final battle of Gibeah. It would appear to have been situated between Gibeah (Tulul el-Fâlî) and the cliff Minna (probably Râmâin, about three miles E. of Bethel); but no trace of the name, nor yet of that of Memnah, if indeed that was a place (Judg. xx. 43: A. V. "with case" — but see margin), has yet been met with. [Menuchah, Amer. ed.] The reading of the Alex. LXX., "Gilead," can hardly be taken as well founded. In the Valley the word does not seem to be represented.

Gier-Eagle (גֵּיֶר-אָגָל) [rich, râchâm; פֶּרֶצָי], râchâmab: ñûôûôô [עַבְּרָיִים], an ancient bird mentioned in Lev. xi. 18 and Deut. xiv. 17. There is no reason to doubt that the râchâm of the Hebrew Scriptures is identical in reality as in name with the râchâm (רָכָּחָם) of the Arabs, namely, the Egyptian vulture (Neophron percnopterus); see Gener, De Arb. p. 176; Bochart, Hervae., Tovor. p. 293, and Hasselquist's Natural Hist. of Egypt, ii. 195, 2d ed. The LXX. in Lev. i. c. renders the Hebrew term by "swan" (κότάρας), while in Deut. i. c. the "purple water-hen" (Porphyrio intermedium) is given as its representative. There is too much discrepancy in the LXX. translations of the various birds mentioned in the Levitical law to allow us to attach much weight to its authority. The Hebrew term etymologically signifies "a bird which is very affectionate to its young," which is perfectly true of the Egyptian vulture, but not more so than of other birds. The Arabian writers relate many fables of the Râchâm, some of which the reader may see in the Hierocodiac of Bochart (iii. p. 56). The Egyptian vulture, according to Bruce, is called by the Egyptians "Pharaoh's Hen." It is generally distributed throughout Egypt, and Mr Tristram says it is common in Palestine, and breeds in great numbers in the valley of the Cedron (Ib., i. 23). Though a bird of decidedly unprepossessing appearance and of disgusting habits, the Egyptians, like all other Orientals, wisely protect so efficient a scavenger, which rides them of putrefying carcases that would otherwise breed a pestilence in their towns. Near Cairo, says Shaw (Tovor. p. 388, folio), there are several flocks of the Ach Bobbi, "white father," — a name given it by the Turks.
partly out of the revenue they have for it, partly from the color of its plumage. — "which, like the ravens about our metropolis, feed upon the carrion and nastiness that is thrown without the city." Young birds are of a brown color with a few white feathers; adult specimens are white, except the primary and a portion of the secondary wing feathers, which are black. Naturalists have referred this variety to the "περιστήριον" or "περιστήριον" of Aristotle (Hist. Anim. i. 22, § 2, ed. Schuch.).

GIFT

* There are two birds known as "ravens" among the Arabs in Egypt. The first is the variety known as "Neophron percnopterus." It is found extensively in all parts of Egypt, and is common in Palestine and Syria. The adult has the front of the head and the upper part of the throat and cere naked, and of a bright lemon yellow. The plumage is a dirty white, with the exception of the quill-feathers, which are a grayish black. The appearance of this bird soaring (in circles) over and around the towns in Egypt, with its bright yellow beak and neck and crop, and white body, and dark-wing feathers, is exceedingly beautiful.

The second is the "Pelecanus onocrotalus," found in large numbers in Egypt, and about Lake Huleh in the Palestrine. This is probably the bird intended by "κύλλα" in Lev. xi. 18 and Dent. xiv. 17, while the bird to which "περίστηριον" should be "corinorant." This seems altogether more natural when we consider the context, and that it is grouped with the large water-fowl. The word "περίστηριον" translated "corinorant" in Lev. xi. 17 and Dent. xiv. 17 more properly suits the Diver ("Calypsoa"), of which there is a large species in Egypt.

GIFT. The giving and receiving of presents has in all ages been not only a more frequent, but also a more formal and significant proceeding in the East than among ourselves. It enters largely into the ordinary transactions of life: no negotiation, alliance, or contract of any kind can be entered into between states or sovereigns without a previous interchange of presents: none of the important events of private life, betrothal, marriage, coming of age, birth, take place without presents: even a visit, if of a formal nature, must be prefaced by a present.

We cannot advise a more remarkable proof of the important part which presents play in the social life of the East, than the fact that the Hebrew language possesses no less than fifteen different expressions for the one idea. Many of these expressions have specific meanings: for instance, "minchah" (מִכָּחָה) applies to a present from an inferior to a superior, as from subjects to a king (Judg. iii. 15; 1 K. x. 25; 2 Chr. xvii. 5); "mashcheth" (מָשַךְ) expresses the converse idea of a present from a superior to an inferior, as from a king to his subjects (Esth. ii. 18); hence it is used of a portion of food sent by the master of the house to his inferior guests (Gen. xiii. 34; 2 Sam. xi. 8); "nashchath" (נָשֶׁךָת) has very much the same sense (2 Sam. xix. 42); "berith" (בֵּרִית), literally a "blessing," is used where the present is one of a complimentary nature, either accompanied with good wishes, or given as a token of attention (Gen. xxxvii. 11; Judg. i. 16; 1 Sam. xxv. 27, xxx. 26; 2 K. v. 15); and again, "shochoth" (שֹׁכְחָת) is a gift for the purpose of escaping punishment, presented either to a judge (Ex. xxviii. 8; Dent. x. 17), or to a conqueror (2 K. vi. 8). Other terms, as "mattan" (מַתַּן), were used more generally. The extent to which the custom prevailed admits of some explanation from the peculiar usages of the East; it is clear that the term "gift" is frequently used where we should say in English "present," or "give." The tribute of subject states was paid not in a fixed sum of money, but in kind; each nation presenting its particular product — a custom which is frequently illustrated in the sculptures of Assyria and Egypt; hence the numerous instances in which the present was no voluntary act, but an exaction (Judg. iii. 16-18; 2 Sam. vii. 2, 6; 1 K. iv. 21; 2 K. xxvii. 3; 2 Chr. xxi. 17, xxvi. 8); and hence the expression "to bring presents" — to own submission (Ps. lxxix. 29, lxxxvi. 11; Is. viii. 7). Again, the present taken to a prophet was viewed very much in the light of a consulting "fee," and conveyed no idea of bribery (1 Sam. ix. 7, comp. xii. 3; 2 K. v. 5, viii. 9): it was only when false prophets and corrupt judges arose that the present was prostituted, and became, instead of a "minchah" (as in the instances quoted), a "shochoth," or bribe (Is. i. 23, v. 15; Jer. xi. 17; Mic. iii. 11). But in assistance for these cases, which are hardly "gifts" in our sense of the term, there is still a large excess remaining in the practice of the East: friends brought presents to friends on any joyful occasion (Esth. ix. 19, 22), those who asked for information or advice to those who gave it (2 K. viii. 8), the needy to the wealthy from whom any assistance was expected (Gen. xlii. 11; 2 K. xv. 19, xvi. 8), rulers to their favorites (Gen. xiv. 12; 2 Sam. vi. 8), especially to their officers (Esth. ii. 18; Joseph. Ant. xii. 2, § 15), or to the people generally on festive occasions (2 Sam. vi. 19); on the occasion of a marriage, the bride-room not only paid the parents for his bride (A. V. "dowry"), but also gave the bride certain presents (Gen. xxiv. 12; comp. Gen. xxiv. 22), while the father of the bride gave her a present on sending her away, as is expressed in the term "shiluchim" (שִׁלְכוּת) (1 K. x. 16); and again, the portions of the sons of concubines were paid in the form of presents (Gen. xxv. 6).

The nature of the presents was as various as were the occasions: food (1 Sam. i. 7, xvi. 20, xxiv. 11), sheep and cattle (Gen. xlvii. 13-15; Judg. xv. 8), gold (2 Sam. xviii. 11; Job iii. 11; Matt. xi. 20), jewels (Gen. xxiv. 53), furniture, and vessels for eating and drinking (2 Sam. xvi. 28), delicacies, such as spices, honey, etc. (Gen. xxiv. 53; 1 K. x. 23, xiv. 3), and robes (1 K. x. 25; 2 K. v. 22), particularly in the ease of persons induced into high office (Esth. vi. 8; Dan. vi. 16; comp. Herod. iii. 29). The mode of presentation was as much as possible: the presents were conveyed by the hands of servants (Judg. iii. 18), or still better on the backs of beasts of burden (2 K. viii. 9), even when such a mode of conveyance was unnecessary. The refusal of a present was regarded as a high indignity, and this constituted the aggravated insult noticed in Matt. xvii. 11, the marriage robe having been offered and refused (Trench, Parable). No present was not to bring a present when the position of the parties demanded it (1 Sam. x. 27).
GIHON (גִּחוֹן [gīhōn]: Gr. Πρώτος: Alex. Prōtos. [Gehon]. I. The second river of Paradise (Gen. i. 13). The name does not again occur in the Hebrew text of the O. T.; but in the LXX. it is used in Jer. ii. 18, as an equivalent for the word Shichor or Silhor, i. e. the Nile, and in Ecclus. xxiv. 27 (A. V. "Geon"). All that can be said upon it will be found under Eden, p. 638 f. 2. (מִין, and in Chron. מִינָה [minā]: [in K. K. מִין, [Vat. Prōtos, Alex. o Prōtos in 2 Chr. xxxii. 30], Prōtos, [Vat. Σείλων, Alex. Gihon, in 2 Chr. xxxiii. 14, κακαν νοτόν, Comp. τοῦ Πρώτος: Gihon.] A place near Jerusalem, memorable as the scene of the anointing and proclamation of Solomon as king (1 K. i. 33, 38, 43). From the terms of this passage, it is evident it was at a lower level than the city — "bring him down (בִּנְיָן) upon גִּחוֹן" "they are come up (胬ְּנָה) from thence." With this agrees a later mention (2 Chr. xxxiii. 14), where it is called "Gihon-in-the-valley," the word rendered valley being נחל (nāchāl). In this latter place Gihon is named to designate the direction of the wall built by Manasseh — the outside of the city of David, from the west of Gihon-in-the-valley to the entrance of the Fish-gate. It is not stated in any of the above passages that Gihon was a spring; but the only remaining place in which it is mentioned suggests this belief, or at least that it had given its name to some water — "Hezekiah also stopped the upper source or issue (נַחַל, from נַחַל, to rush forth; incorrectly "watercourse" in A. V.) of the waters of Gihon" (2 Chr. xxxiii. 30). If the place to which Solomon was brought down on the king's mule was Gihon-in-the-valley — and from the terms above noticed it seems probable that it was — then the "upper source" would be some distance away, and at a higher level.

The locality of Gihon will be investigated under Jerusalem; but in the mean time the following facts may be noticed in regard to the occurrences of the word. (1.) Its low level: as above stated. (2.) The expression "Gihon-in-the-valley:" "where it will be observed that נחל (nāchāl" "torrent" or "wady") is the word always employed for the valley of the Kidron, east of Jerusalem — the so-called Valley of Jehoshaphat; ge ("ravine" or "glen") being as constantly employed for the Valley of Hinnom, south and west of the town. In this connection the mention of Ophel (2 Chr. xxxiii. 14) with Gihon should not be disregarded. In agreement with this is the fact that (3) the Temple of Jonathan, and the Syriac and Arabic Versions, have Sīlūka, i. e. Sīlūm (Arab. Ain-Sīlūk) for Gihon in 1 K. i. In Chronicles they agree with the Hebrew text in having Gihon. In Sīlūm be Gihon, then (4) "from the west of Gihon to the Fish-gate" — which we know from St. Jerome to have been near the present "Jaffa-gate," would answer to the course of a wall inclosing "the city of David" (2 Chr. xxxiii. 14); and (5) the omission of Gihon from the very detailed catalogue of Neh. iv. is explained. G.
the natives as Jebel el-Dhib. The ridge rises out of the plain of Esdraelon, and, running eastward, sinks down into the valley of the Jordan. The Israelites at first pitched their tents at Jezreel, the present Zer'in on the western declivity of Gilboa, and near a fountain (1 Sam. xxix. 1), undoubtedly the present Um el-Jiljil, exactly in the right position, and forming naturally one indiscernable for selecting that spot. The "high places" on which Saul and Jonathan were slain would be the still higher summits of the ridge up which their forces were driven as the battle turned against them in the progress of the fight. The Philistines encamped at first at Shunem (1 Sam. xxviii. 4), now called Solhem, on the more northern, but parallel, ridge opposite to Jezreel, where they could overlook and watch the enemy, and at the same time were protected against any surprise by the still higher ground behind them. On the other hand, the camp of the Philistines was visible, distant only eight or ten miles, from the camp of Israel. Hence when "Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled." The Philistines, in their proper home, dwelt in the country south of Jabbok, and having in all probability marched north along the coast as far as Carmel, had been turned across the plain of Esdraelon, and had thus reached this well-chosen camping ground at Shunem. The Philistines are next mentioned as rallying their forces at Aphik (1 Sam. xxviii. 4). No place of this name has yet been discovered in that neighborhood. Some suppose that it was only another name for Shunem; but it is more likely to be the name of a different place, situated nearer Jezreel, perhaps the one from which the Philistines made their direct attack on the Israelites. Further, we read that the conquerors, after the battle, carried the bodies of Saul and his sons to Beth-shean, and hung them up on the walls of that city. Beth-shean was a stronghold of the Philistines which the Israelites had never wrested from them. That place, evidently, reappeared in the present Beisan, which is on the eastern slope of the Gilboa range, visible in fact from the two peaks, and still remarkable for its strength of position as well as the remains of ancient fortifications.

The strange episode of Saul's nocturnal visit to the witch of Endor illustrates this same feature of the narrative. It is evident that Saul was absent on that errand but a few hours, and the place must have been near his encampment. This Endor, as no one can doubt, must be the present Tell el-Dhib, with its dreary cisterns (Thomson's Land and Book, ii. 191), a fitting abode of such a necromancer, on the north side of Dalby, at the west end of which was Shunem. Hence Saul, leaving his camp at Jezreel, could steal his way under cover of the night across the intervening valley, and over the moderate summit which he would have to ascend, and then, after consulting the woman with a familiar spirit at Endor, could return to his forces without his departure being known to any except those in the secret. All these places, so interwoven in the network of the story, and clearly identified after theapse of so many centuries, lie almost within sight of each other. A person may start from any one of them and make the circuit of them all in a few hours. The date assigned to this battle is n. c. 1055, later but a little than the traditional age of the siege of Troy. It is seldom that a record of remote events can be subjected to so severe a scrutiny as this.

For other sketches which reproduce more or less fully the occurrences of this battle, the reader may see Van de Velde (Travels in Syria and Persia, ii. 368 ff.); Stanley (8, of I. 8, 560 f., Amer. ed.), Robinson (Bibl. Res. iii. 174 f., 1st ed.); and Porter (Handbook, ii. 355 ff.). Some of the writers differ as to whether the final encounter took place at Jezreel or higher up the mountain. Stanley has drawn out the personal incidents in a striking manner (Josephus, Ant. ii. 30 ff.). For geographical information respecting this group of places, see especially Robinson, Phys. Geog. pp. 29-38, and Ritter's Geogr. of Palestine, Cape's transl., ii. 321-356.

GILEAD (גיל) [see below]: Palæstina, a mountainous region east of the Jordan; bounded on the north by Bashan, on the east by the Arabian plateau, and on the south by Moab and Ammon (Gen. xxxi. 21; Pent. iii. 12-17). It is sometimes called "Mount Gilboa" (Gen. xxxi. 25, תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ; Judges. i. 1, תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ; Judges. iv. 5, תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ), sometimes the "land of Gilboa" (Num. xxxii. 1, תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ; Judges. iv. 5, תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ); and some times simply "Gilead" (Ps. lx. 7, Gen. xxxiv. 23); but a comparison of the several passages shows that they all mean the same thing. There is no evidence, in fact, that any particular mountain was meant by Mount Gilead more than by Mount Lebanon (Judg. iii. 9)—they both comprehended the whole range, and the range of Gilead embraced the whole province. The name Gilead, as is usual in Palestine, describes the physical aspect of the country. It signifies "a hard, rocky region;" and it may be regarded as standing in contrast to Bashan, the other great trans-Jordanic province, which is, as the name implies, a "level, fertile tract."

The statements in Gen. xxxi. 48 are not opposed to this etymology. The old name of the district was תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ (Gilead), but by a slight change in the pronunciation, the radical letters being retained, the meaning was made beautifully applicable to the "heap of stones." Jacob and Laban had built up תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ and Laban said, this heap תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ is a witness תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ between me and thee this day. Therefore was the name of it called "Gilgal" תְּרוֹם יְבָאוֹ (the heap of witness). Those acquainted with the modern Arabs and their literature will see how intensely such a play upon the word would be appreciated by them. It does not appear that the interview between Jacob and his father-in-law took place on any particular mountain peak. Jacob, having passed the Embrates, "set his face toward Mount Gilgal;" he struck across the desert by the great fountain at Palmira; then traversed the eastern part of the plain of Damascus, and the plateau of Bashan, and entered Gilead from the northeast. In the Mount Gilead Laban overtook him—apparently soon after he entered the district; for when they separated again, Jacob went on his way and arrived at Mahamain, which must have been considerably north of the river Jalib (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2, 22).

The extent of Gilead we can ascertain with tolerable exactness from incidental notices in the Holy Scriptures. The Jordan was its western border (1
A comparison of a number of passages shows that the river Hieromax, the nursery, Sotriit el-Muluk, separated it from Bashan on the north. "Half Gilead" is said to have been possessed by Sihon king of the Amorites, and the other half by Og king of Bashan; and the river Jabbok was the division between the two kingdoms (Deut. ii. 12; Josh. xii. 1–5). The half of Gilead possessed by Og must, therefore, have been north of the Jabbok. It is also stated that the territory of the tribe of Gad extended along the Jordan valley to the Sea of Galilee (Josh. xiii. 27); and yet "all Bashan" was given to Manasseh (ver. 30). We, therefore, conclude that the deep glen of the Hieromax, which runs eastward, on the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee, was the dividing line between Bashan and Gilead. North of that glen stretches out a flat, fertile plateau, such as the name Bashan (בַּשָּׁן, like the Arabic بَشَانَةُ, signifies "soft and level soil") would suggest; while on the south we have the rough and rugged, yet picturesque hill country, for which Gilead is the fit name. (See Porter in Journal of Soc. Lit. vi. 284 ff.) On the east the mountain range melts away gradually into the high plateau of Arabia. The boundary of Gilead is here not so clearly defined, but it may be regarded as running along the foot of the range. The southern boundary is less certain. The tribe of Reuben occupied the country as far south as the river Arnon, which was the border of Moab (Deut. ii. 35, iii. 12). It seems, however, that the southern section of their territory was not included in Gilead. In Josh. xiii. 9–11 it is intimated that the "plain of Medeba" ("the Mishor") is called, north of the Arnon, is not in Gilead; and when speaking of the cities of refuge, Moses describes Bezer, which was given out of the tribe of Reuben, as being "in the wilderness, in the plain country (i. e. in the country of the Mishor," רֶמֶח רשַף, while Ramoth is said to be in Gilead (Deut. iv. 43). This southern plateau was also called "the land of Jazer" (Num. xxxii. 1; 2 Sam. xxiv. 5; compare also Josh. xiii. 16–23). The valley of Heshbon may therefore, in all probability, be the southern boundary of Gilead. Gilead thus extended from the parallel of the south end of the Sea of Galilee to that of the north end of the Dead Sea—about 60 miles; and its average breadth scarcely exceeded 20.

While such were the proper limits of Gilead, the name is used in a wider sense in two or three parts of Scripture. Moses, for example, is said to have seen, from the top of Pisgah, "all the land of Gilead unto Dan" (Deut. xxxiv. 1); and in Judg. xx. 1, and Josh. xii. 9, the name seems to comprehend the whole territory of the Israelites beyond the Jordan. A little attention shows that this is only a vague way of speaking, in common use everywhere. We, for instance, often say "England" when we mean "England and Wales." The section of Gilead lying between the Jabbok and the Hieromax is now called Jebel Ajlan; while that to the south of the Jabbok constitutes the modern province of Belts. One of the most conspicuous peaks in the mountain range still retains the ancient name, being called Jebel Jilid, "Mount Gilead." It is about 7 miles south of the Jabbok, and commands a magnificent view over the whole Jordan valley, and the mountains of Judah and Ephraim. It is probably the site of Ramath-Mizpah of Josh. xiii. 29; and the "Mizpah of Gilead," from which Jephthah "passed over unto the children of Ammon (Judg. xi. 29). The spot is admirably adapted for a gathering place in time of invasion, or aggressive war. The neighbouring village of es-Salt occupies the site of the old "city of refuge" in Gad, Ramoth-Gilead. (Ramat-Gilead.)

We have already alluded to a special descriptive term, which may almost be regarded as a proper name, used to denote the great plateau which borders Gilead on the south and east. The refuge-city Bezer is said to be "in the country of the Mishor" (Deut. iv. 43); and Jeremiah (xlvii. 21) says, "judgment is come upon the country of the Mishor" (see also Josh. xiii. 9, 16, 17, 21, xii. 8).

Mishor (מִשִּׁורְ) and ḫall (מִשָּׁרְ) signifies a "level plain," or "table-land;" and no word could be more applicable. This is one among many examples of the immense accuracy of Bible topography.

The mountains of Gilead have a real elevation of from two to three thousand feet; but their apparent elevation on the western side is much greater, owing to the depression of the Jordan valley, which averages about 1,000 feet. Their outline is singularly uniform, resembling a massive wall running along the horizon. From the distant east they seem very low, for on that side they meet the plateau of Arabah, 2,000 ft. or more in height. Though the range appears bleak from the distance, yet on ascending it we find the scenery rich, picturesque, and in places even grand. The summit is broad, almost like table-land "tossed into wild confusion of undulating downs" (Stanley, S. of P. p. 320). It is everywhere covered with luxuriant vegetation. In the extreme north and south there are no trees; but as we advance toward the centre they soon begin to appear, at first singly, then in groups, and at length, on each side of the Jabbok, in fine forests chiefly of prickly oak and terebinth. The rich pasture land of Gilead presents a striking contrast to the nakedness of western Palestine. Except among the hills of Galilee, and along the heights of Carmel, there is nothing to be compared with it as a "place for cattle" (Num. xxxii. 1). Gilead anciently abounded in spices and aromatic gums which were exported to Egypt (Gen. xxxvii. 25; Jer. viii. 22, xvi. 11). The first notice we have of Gilead is in connection with the history of Jacob (Gen. xxxvi. 21 ff.); but it is possibly this same region which is referred to under the name Ham, and was inhabited by the giant Zuzims. The kings of the East who came to punish the rebellious "cities of the plain," first attacked the Rehphans in Asheroth Karmaim, i. e. in the country now called Maurit; then they advanced southwards against the "Zuzims in Ham;" and next against the Emins in Shaveh-Kirathaim, which was subsequently possessed by the Mobeites (Gen. xiv. 5; Deut. ii. 8–9). [See Emins; Rehphant.] We hear nothing more of
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Gilead till the invasion of the country by the Israelites. One half of it was then in the hands of Sihon king of the Amorites, who had a short time previously driven out the Moabites. Og, king of Bashan, had the other section north of the Jabbok. The Israelites defeated the former at Dahath, and the latter at Edrei, and took possession of Gilead and Bashan (Num. xxxi. 29 ff.). The rich pasture lands of Gilead, with its study forests, and equinoctial streams, attracted the attention of Reuben and Gad, who "had a very great multitude of cattle," and was allotted to them. The future history and habits of the tribes that occupied Gilead were greatly affected by the character of the country. Rich in flocks and herds, and now the lords of a fitting region, they retained, almost unaltered, the pastoral habits of their patriarchal ancestors. Like all Bedawin they lived in a constant state of warfare, just as Jacob had predicted of Gad—"a troop shall plunder him; but he shall plunder at the last" (Gen. xlix. 19). The sons of Ishmael were subdued and plundered in the time of Saul (1 Chr. v. 9 ff.); and the children of Ammon in the days of Jephthah and David (Judg. xi. 32 ff.; 2 Sam. x. 12 ff.). Their wandering tent life, and their almost inaccessible country, made them in ancient times one of the Bedawin tribes—"proctors of the refugee and outlaw. In Gilead the sons of Saul found a home while they vainly attempted to reestablish the authority of their house (2 Sam. ii. 8 ff.). Here, too, David found a sanctuary during the unnatural rebellion of a beleaguered crown; and the surrounding tribes, with a characteristic hospitality, carried presents of the best they possessed to the fallen monarch (2 Sam. xxii. 22 ff.). Elijah the Tishbite was a Gileadite (1 K. xvii. 1); and in his simple garb, wild aspect, abrupt address, wonderfully active habits, and movements so rapid as to evade the search of his watchful and bitter foes, we see all the characteristic of the genuine Bedawin, emodeled by a high prophetic mission. [G.A.D.]

Gilead was a frontier land, exposed to the first attacks of the Syrian and Assyrian invaders, and to the wondering raids of the desert Bedawin. Because Machir the first-born of Manasseh was a man of war, therefore he had Bashan and Gilead "(Josh. xvii. 1). Under the wild and wayward Jephthah, Mizpeh of Gilead became the gathering place of the trans-Jordan tribes (Judg. xi. 29); and in subsequent times the neighboring stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead appears to have been considered the key of Palestine on the east (1 K. xxiii. 3, 4, 6; 2 K. vili. 28, ix. 1).

The name Gilead (Γαλαάς) occurs several times in the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. v. 9 ff.); and also in Josephus, but generally with the Greek termination—Γαλαάςης or Γαλαάδης (Ant. xiii. 14, § 2; B. J. i. 4, § 1). Under the Roman dominion the country became more settled and civilized; and the great cities of Gadara, Pella, and others, with Philadelphia on its southern border, sprang up to opulence and splendor. In one of these (Pella) the Christians of Jerusalem found a sanctuary when the armies of Titus gathered round the devoted city (Enseh. H. E. ii. iii. 5). Under Mohammedan rule the country has again lapsed into semi-barbarism. Some scattered villages amid

the fastnesses of Jebel Ajban, and a few fierce wandering tribes, constitute the whole population of Gilead. They are nominally subject to the Porte but their allegiance sits lightly upon them.

For the scenery, products, antiquities, and history of Gilead, the following works may be consulted. Burckhardt's Tran. in Syr.; Buckingham's Arab Tribes; Iby and Mangles, Travels; Porter's Handbook for Travellers; Five Years in Damascus; Stanley's Sin. and Pal.; Ritter's Pal. and Syria.

2. Possibly the name of a mountain west of the Jordan, near Jezerel (Judg. vii. 3). We are inclined, however, to agree with the suggestion of Clericus and others, that the true reading in this place should be γεννάω, Gideon, instead of γεννήσαι. Gideon was encamped at the "spring of Hard." which is at the base of Mount Gilea. A copist would easily make the mistake, and ignorance of geography would prevent it from being afterwards detected. For other explanations, see Ewald, Gesch. iii. 500; Schwarz, p. 164; Gesen. Thes. p. 894, note.

* * *wards Gilead (2), Jorthean also (Buch der Richter, p. 129), would substitute Gideon for that name in Judg. vii. 3. Keil and Delitzsch hesitate between that view and the conclusion that there may have been a single mountain or a range so called near Jezerel, just as in Josh. xv. 10, we read of a Mount Seir in the territory of Judah otherwise unknown (Com. on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, p. 341). Dr. Wordsworth has the following note on this perplexed question: "Probably the western half-triib of Manasseh expressed its connection with the eastern half-triib by calling one of its mountains by the same name, Mount Gilead, as the famous mountain bearing that name in the eastern division of their tribe (Gen. xxxi. 21-25, xxxvii. 25). Num. xxxii. 1, 40, &c.). May we not see 'a return of the compliment' (if the expression may be used) in another name which has perplexed the commentators, namely, the Wood of Ephraim on the eastern side of Jordan (2 Sam. viii. 6)? Ephraim was on the west of Jordan, and yet the Wood of Ephraim was on the east. Perhaps that half-triib of Manasseh, which was in the east, marked its connection with Ephraim, its brother tribe, by calling a wood in its own neighborhood by that name." (See his Holy Bible with Notes, ii. pt. i. p. 111.) Cassel (Richter, p. 71) thinks that Gilead here may denote in effect character rather than locality: "the Mount of Gilead—the community of the warlike Manassites (Josh. xvii. 1), now so fitly represented by Gideon, sprung from that tribe (Judg. vi. 15). The cowardly deserve no place in the home of such heroes, and should separate themselves from them.

3. The name of a son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh (Num. xxxvi. 29, 30).

4. The father of Jephthah (Judg. xi. 1, 2). It is difficult to understand (comp. ver. 7, 8) whether this Gilead was an individual or a personification of the community.*

5. One of the posterity of Gad, through whom the genealogy of the Gadites in Bashan is traced (1 Chr. v. 14).

GILEADITES, THE (Γαλαάς) Judg. xii.

a * Probably a patronymic = σαυράγης, a Gileadite.

b Jephthah is called both when first and last mentioned (Judg. xi. 1, and xii. 7). The personal name of the father being unknown, that of his country stands in place of it. See Cassel, Richter u. Ruth is Lange's Biblewerk, p. 192.
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1, 8, 15, 17: Judg. xii. 4, 5; Galád: Num. xxvi. 29; Galádá: [Vat. -5ei]; Judg. x. 3, 6; Galádá: [Judg. xi. 1, 40, xii. 7; 2 Sam. xvii. 27; xix. 31; 1 K. ii. 7; Ezr. ii. 61; Neh. vii. 63] ó; Galádáigís[is]: [Vat. -5ei, exc. Judg. xi. 40, Vat. Galádá]; Alex. o Galádáigís, o Galádáigís[is] [and Judg. xii. 5, andpës Galádá: Gileadites, Gilgalites, évir Oth nod]. A branch of the tribe of Manasseh, descended from Gilead. There appears to have been an old standing feud between them and the Ephraimites, who taunted them with being deserts. See Judg. xii. 4, which may be rendered, "And the men of Gilead smote Ephraim, because they said, Runagates of Ephraim are ye (Gilead is between Ephraim and Manasseh);" the last clause being added parenthetically. In 2 K. xv. 25 for "of the Gileadites" the LXX. have ἄνω των τετρακοσίων [Vulg. de filia Gilead uterum].

GILGAL (always with the article but once, τὸ θεῖον Γειλαδ'). [the circuit, the rolling, see below]: Γάλγαλα (plural); [in Deut. xii. 30, Γαλγάλα; Josh. xiv. 6, Rom. Vat. Γαλγάλα:] Gilgala (sing. and plur.)]. By this name were called at least two places in ancient Palestine.

1. The site of the first camp of the Israelites on the east of the Jordan, the place at which they passed the first night after crossing the river, and where the twelve stones were set up which had been taken from the bed of the stream (Josh. iv. 19, 20, comp. 3); where also they kept their first passover in the land of Canaan (v. 10). It was in the "end of the east of Jericho" (Y 'môr Tûmáh lá'îm), apparently on a hillock or rising ground (v. 3, comp. 9) in the Arloth-Jericho (A. V. "the plains"), that is, the hot depressed district of the Ghôr which lay between the town and the Jordan (v. 10). Here the Israelites who had been born on the march through the wilderness were circumcised; an occurrence from which the sacred historian derives the name: "This day I have rolled away (gallithoth) the reproach of Egypt from off you." Therefore the name of the place is called Gilgal to this day." By Josephus (Ant. v. 1, § 11) it is said to signify "freedom" (λατεράνον). The camp thus established at Gilgal remained there during the early part of the conquest (ix. 6, x. 6, 7, 9, 15, 43); and we may probably infer from one narrative that Joshua retired thither at the conclusion of his labors (xiv. 6, comp. 15).

We again encounter Gilgal in the time of Saul, when it seems to have exchanged its military associations for those of sanctity. True, Saul, when driven from the highlands by the Philistines, collected his feeble force at the site of the old camp (1 Sam. xiii. 4, 7); but this is the only occurrence at all connecting it with war. It was now one of the "holy cities" (of ιεροσατέραοι) - if we accept the addition of the LXX. - to which Samuel regularly resorted, where he administered justice (1 Sam. vii. 16), and where anniversaries of peace offerings were accustomcd to be offered "before Jehovah" (x. 8, xi. 15, xii. 8, 9-12, xiv. 21); and on one occasion a sacrifice of a more terrible description than either (xv. 33). The air of the narrative all through leads to the conclusion that at the time of these occurrences it was the chief sanctuary of the central portion of the nation (see v. 8, xi. 14, xiv. 12, 21). But there is no sign of its being a town; no mention of building, or of its being allotted to the priests or Levites, as was the case with other sacred towns, Bethel, Shechem, etc. We again have a glimpse of it, some sixty years later, in the history of David's return to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xix.). The men of Judah came down to Gilgal to meet the king to conduct him over Jordan as if it was close to the river (xix. 15), and David arrived there immediately on crossing the stream, after his parting with Barzillai the Gileadite. How the remarkable sanctity of Gilgal became appropriated to a false worship we are not told, but certainly, as far as the obscure allusions of Hosea and Amos can be understood (provided that they refer to this Gilgal), it was so appropriated by the kingdom of Israel in the middle period of its existence (Hos. iv. 15, ix. 15, xii. 11; Amos iv. 3, v. 5).

Beyond the general statements above quoted, the sacred text contains no indications of the position of Gilgal. Neither in the Apocalypse nor the N. T. is it mentioned. Later authorities are more precise, but unfortunately discordant among themselves. By Josephus (Ant. v. 1, § 4) the encampment is given as fifty stadia, rather under six miles, from the river, and ten from Jericho. In the time of Jerome the site of the camp and the twelve memorial stones were still distinguishable, if we are to take literally the expression of the Epit. Paula (§ 12). The distance from Jericho was then two miles. The spot was left uncultivated, but regarded with great veneration by the residents, "focus desertus . . . ab illius regionis mortalibus natio cultui habitis" (Onom. Gilgala). When Arculf was there at the end of the seventh century the place was shown at five miles from Jericho. A large church covered the site, in which the twelve stones were ranged. The church and stones were seen by Willibald, thirty years later, but he gives the distance as five miles from the Jordan, which again he states correctly as seven from Jericho. The stones are mentioned also by Theutmar, A. D. 1217, and lastly by Ludolf de Suchem a century later. No modern traveller has succeeded in eliciting the name, or in discovering a probable site. In Van de Velde's map (1838) a spot named Moherfer, a little S. of er-Rita, is marked as possible; but no explanation is afforded either in his Syria, or his Memoir.

2. But this was certainly a distinct place from the Gilgal which is connected with the last scenes in the life of Elijah, and with one of Elisha's miracles. The chief reason for believing this is the impossibility of making it fit into the notice of Elijah's translation. He and Elisha are said to "go down" (נָהַל) from Gilgal to Bethel (2 K ii. 1), in opposition to the repeated expressions of the narratives in Joshua and 1 Samuel, in which the way from Gilgal to the neighborhood of Bethel is always spoken of as an ascent, the fact being that the former is nearly 1,200 feet below the latter. Thus there must have been a second Gilgal at

" Such this derivation of the name cannot apply in the case of the other Gilgals mentioned below May it not have been adopted by John the Baptist when he said that God was "able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham?" (Thietmar, Perses, 31).
higher level than Bethel, and it was probably that at which Elisha worked the miracle of healing on the poisonous potage (2 K. iv. 38). Perhaps the expression of 2 K. ii. 1, coupled with the "came again" of iv. 38, may indicate that Elisha resided there. The mention of Saul—shalah (iv. 42) gives a clue to its situation, when taken with the notice of Eusebius (Jown. Betharsis) that that place was fifteen miles from Diospolis (Lydda) towards the north. In that very position stand now the ruins bearing the name of Jiftlich, i. e. Gilgal. (See Van de Velde's map, and Rob. iii. 139.)

3. The "King of the Nations of Gilgal," or rather perhaps the "King of Giom—at Gilgal" (גֶלֶגֶל), is mentioned in the catalogue of the chiefs overthrown by Joshua (Josh. xii. 23). The name occurs next to Dor in an enumeration apparently proceeding southwards, and therefore the position of the Jiftlich just named is not wholly inappropriate, though it must be confessed its distance from Dor—more than twenty-five miles—is considerable: still it is nearer than any other place of the name yet known. Eusebius and Jerome (Junon. Gelgel) speak of a "Gulgulium" six miles from Antiochus. This is slightly more suitable, but has not been identified. What these Gulg were has been discussed under Heathen.

By that word (Judg. iv. 2) or "nations" (Gen. xiv. 1) the name is usually rendered in the A. V. as in the well-known phrase, "Galilee of the nations" (Is. ix. 1; comp. Matt. iv. 15). Possibly they were a tribe of the early inhabitants of the country, who, like the Gerizites, the Avim, the Zemarites, and others, have left only this faint casual trace of their existence there.

A place of the same name has also been discovered nearer the centre of the country, to the left of the main north road, four miles from Shiloh (Sichin), and rather more than the same distance from Bethel (Bethon). This suits the requirements of the story of Elijah and Elisha even better than the former, being more in the neighborhood of the established holy places of the country, and, as more central, and therefore less liable to attack by the wandering nations in the maritime plain, more suited for the residence for the sons of the prophets. In position it appears to be not less than 500 or 600 feet above Bethel (Van de Velde, Mem. ii. p. 179). It may be the Beth-Gilgal of Neh. xii. 29; while the Jiftlich north of Lydai may be that of Josh. xii. 23. Another Gilgal, under the slightly different form of Kiltlich, lies about two miles E. of Keir Lydon. Gilgal is spoken of in Josh. xv. 7, in describing the north border of Judah. In the parallel list (Josh. xviii. 17) it is given as Gilelon, and under that word an attempt is made to show that Gilgal, i. e. the Gilgal near Jericho, is probably correct. G.

GIRDRÉ. An essential article of dress in the East, and worn both by men and women. The corresponding Hebrew words are: (1) גִּלְגַּלְגַּל, and גִּלְגַּלְגַּל, which is the general term for a girdle of any kind, whether worn by soldiers, as 1 Sam. xixi. 4, 2 Sam. xx. 8, 1 K. ii. 5, 2 K. iii. 21; or by women, Is. iii. 24. (2) גִּילַדַּש, especially used of the girdles worn by men; whether by prophets

GILHNITHE, the (גִּלְגֵּנִית), and גִּלְגֵּנִית, [Vat.-var.], Gilghinites [Vat.-var.], Alex. Gilanwites, [Gilghinites (Gilhanites).] i. e. the native of Giloh (as Shiloh, from Shiloh): applied only to Abihophel the famous counsellor (2 Sam. xv. 12; xxii. 34).

GIMZO [גִּמֶּזֶו] [place of scenery]: etc. Alex. Gimmiziai, Gimmiz, a town which with its dependent villages (Hebrew "daughters"?) was taken possession of by the Philistines in the reign of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxviii. 18). The name—which occurs nowhere but here—is mentioned with Timnah, Socho, and other towns in the northwest part of Judah, or in Dan. It still remains attached to a large village between two and three miles S. W. of Lydda, south of the road between Jerusalem and Jaffa, just where the hills of the highland finally break down into the maritime plain. Jinnu is a tolerably large village, on an eminence, well surrounded with trees, and standing just beyond the point where the two main roads from Jerusalem (that by the Beth-horons, and that by Wady Salehnon), which parted at Gilbon, again join and run on as one to Jaffa. It is remarkable for nothing but some extensive rubbish mounds underground, unless it be also for the silence maintained regarding it by all travellers up to Dr. Robinson (ii. 249).

G.

GIN, a trap for birds or beasts; it consisted of a net (תּוּר), and a stick to act as a spring (וּרֹדֶשׁ); the latter word is translated "gin" in the A. V. Am. iii. 5, and the former in Is. viii. 14, the term "snares" being in each case used for the other part of the trap. In Job xli. 24 (marginal translation) the second of these terms is applied to the ring run through the nostrils of an animal. W. L. B.

GINATHI [גִּנֹּת] [production, Fists; or, garden, Gesen.].: Ginnith, father of Tdni, who after the death of Zimri disputed the throne of Israel with Omri (1 K. xvi. 21, 22).

GINNETHON [גִּנְנֶתּוֹן] [gardeners], i. e. Ginnethoth: [Rom. Vat. Alex. omit; FA. Ginnethon, Comp. Vat. Alex.omit: Ginthon], one of the "chiefs (גִנְנֶתּוֹן)" heads of the priests and Levites who returned to Judaea with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii. 4). He is doubtless the same person as

GINNETHON [גִּנְנֶתּוֹן] [as above]: Ginnathon, Ginnathon: [in x. 6, Vat. Tvaroth, Alex. Ginnathon, FA. Avaroth; in xii. 16, Vat. Alex. FA. A varoth; FA. Avaroth], a priest who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 6). He was head of a family, and one of his descendants is mentioned in the list of priests and Levites at a later period (xii. 16). He is probably the same person as the preceding.

GIRDRÉ. An essential article of dress in the East, and worn both by men and women. The corresponding Hebrew words are: (1) גִּילַדַּש, and גִּילַדַּש, which is the general term for a girdle of any kind, whether worn by soldiers, as 1 Sam. xixi. 4, 2 Sam. xx. 8, 1 K. ii. 5, 2 K. iii. 21; or by women, Is. iii. 24. (2) גִּילַדַּש, especially used of the girdles worn by men; whether by prophets

...
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2 K. i. 8; Jer. xiii. 1; soldiers, Is. v. 27; Ez. xxiii. 15, or kings in their military capacity, Job xii. 18.

(3.) מַעֲשֶׂה or מַעֲשֶׁה, used of the girdle worn by men alone, Job xii. 21, Ps. cix. 19, Is. xxiii. 10.

(4.) מַעֲשֶׁה, the girdle worn by the priests and state officers. In addition to these, מַעֲשֶׁה, Is. iii. 24, is a costly girdle worn by women. The Vulgate renders it fascist pectorilia. It would thus seem to correspond with the Latin strophium, a belt worn by women about the breast. In the LXX. however, it is translated χιτών μεσοροφος, "a tunic shot with purple," and Gesenius [Thek.] has "buntes Förgelkleid" (comp. Schroeder, de Vest. Mál. pp. 137, 138, 404). The מַעֲשֶׁה mentioned in Is. iii. 20, Jer. ii. 32, were probably girdles, although both Kimchi and Jarchi consider them as fillets for the hair. In the latter passage the Vulgate has again fascist pectorilia, and the LXX. στροφοδομις, an appropriate bridal ornament.

The common girdle was made of leather (2 K. i. 8; Matt. iii. 4), like that worn by the Bedouins of the present day, whom Bunsen describes as "armed with a long crooked knife, and a pistol or two stuck in a red leather girdle" (Monast. of the Levant, p. 7). In the time of Chardin the nobles of Minægia wore girdles of leather, four fingers broad, and embossed with silver. A finer girdle was made of linen (Jer. xiii. 1; Ez. xv. 10), embroidered with silk, and sometimes with gold and silver thread (Dan. x. 5; Rev. i. 13, xv. 9), and frequently studded with gold and precious stones or pearls (Le Brunn, Frag. iv. 170: comp. Verg. Æn. ix. 359).a Morier (Second Journey, p. 150), describing the dress of the Armenian women, says, "they wear a silver girdle which rests on the hips, and is generally curiously wrought." The manufacture of these girdles formed part of the employment of women (Prov. xxxi. 24).

The girdle was fastened by a clasp of gold or silver, or tied in a knot so that the ends hung down in front, as in the figures on the ruins of Persepolis. It was worn by men about the loins, hence the expressions מַעֲשֶׁה מְעַלְמִים, Is. xi. 5; מַעֲשֶׁה מְעַלְמִים, Is. v. 27. The girdle of women was generally looser than that of the men, and was worn about the hips, except when they were actively engaged (Prov. xxvii. 17). Curzon (p. 58), describing the dress of the Egyptian women, says, "not round the waist, but round the hips a large and heavy Cashmere shawl is worn over the yelk, and the whole gracefulness of an Egyptian dress consists in the way in which this is put on." The military girdle was worn about the waist, the sword or dagger was suspended from it (Judg. iii. 16; 2 Sam. xx. 8; Ps. xlv. 3). In the Nineveh sculptures the soldiers are represented with broad girdles, to which the sword is attached, and through which even two or three daggers in a sheath are passed. Q. Curtius (iii. 3) says of Darius, "zona aurea muliebris cinctus eburnea suspenedatur, cui ex gemma erat vagina." Hence girding up the loins denotes preparation for battle or for active exertion.

In times of mourning, girdles of sackcloth were worn as marks of humiliation and sorrow (Is. iii. 24; xxvii. 12).

In consequence of the costly materials of which girdles were made, they were frequently given as presents (1 Sam. xviii. 4; 2 Sam. xviii. 11), as still the custom in Persia (cf. Morier, p. 93). Villages were given to the queens of Persia to supply them with girdles (Xenoph. Anab. i. 5, § 9; Phat. Alc. i. p. 129).

They were used as pockets, as among the Arabs still (Nielander, Descr. p. 56), and as purses, one end of the girdle being folded back for the purpose (Matt. x. 9; Mark vi. 8). Hence "zoonan peredere," "to lose one's purse" (Hor. Epist. ii. 2, 40; comp. Juv. xiv. 237). Inkrhmas were also carried in the girdle (Ez. ix. 2).

The גִּרְגַּשְׂיִים, or girdle worn by the priests at the close-fitting tunic (Ex. xxviii. 39; xxxix. 29), is described by Josephus (Ant. iii. 7, § 2) as made of linen so fine of texture as to look like the slough of a snake, and embroidered with flowers of scarlet, purple, blue, and fine linen. It was about four fingers' broad, and was wrapped several times round the priest's body, the ends hanging down to the feet. When engaged in sacrifice, the priest threw the ends over his left shoulder. According to Maimonides (de Vos. Sanct. c. 8), the girdle worn both by the high-priest and the common priests was of white linen embroidered with wool, but that worn by the high-priest on the day of Atonement was entirely of white linen. The length of it was thirty-two cubits, and the breadth about three fingers. It was worn just below the arm-pit to avoid perspiration (comp. Ez. xlv. 18). Jerome (Ep. ad Fabianum, de Vest. Sacr.) follows Josephus. With regard to the manner in which the girdle was embroidered, the "needlework" (גִּרְגַּשְׂיִים, Ex. xxviii. 39) is distinguished in the Mishna from the "cunning-work" (גִּרְגַּשְׂיִים, Ex. xxvi. 31) as being worked by the needle with figures on one side only, whereas the latter was woven work with figures on both sides (Cod. Joma, c. 8). So also Maimonides (de Vos. Sanct. viii. 15). But Jarchi on Ex. xxvi. 31, 36, explains the difference as consisting in this, that in the former case the figures on the two sides are the same, whereas in the latter they are different.

In all passages, except Is. xxii. 21, גִּירָגָשְׂיִים is used of the girdle of the priests only, but in that instance it appears to have been worn by Shebna, the treasurer, as part of the insignia of his office; unless it be supposed that he was of priestly rank, and wore a girdle not above his priestly capacity. He is called "high-priest" in the Chronicana Persicale, p. 115 α', and in the Jewish tradition quoted by Jarchi in loc.

The "curious girdle" (גִּירָגָשְׂיִים, Ex. xxviii. 8) was made of the same materials and colors as the ephod, that is of "cold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen." Josephus describes it as sewn to the breastplate. After passing once round it was tied in front upon his loins, the ends hanging down (Ant. iii. 7, § 5). According to Maimonides it was of woven work.

"Girdle" is used figuratively in Ps. cix. 19; Is. xli. 5; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 4; Ps. xxxi. 11, lv. 12; Eph. vi. 14.

GIRGASHITES, THE (גִּירָגָשְׂיִים), i. e. גִּירָגָשְׂיִים
GIRGASITE, THE (Gen. x. 16). See the foregoing.

Gush Chalah: Arab. غاشلة, el-Ishkh, a village in Galilee on a hill about two hours northwest from Safid. It was fortified by order of Josephus, and was the last fortress in Galilee to surrender to the Roman armies (Joseph. B. J. ii. 20, § 6; iv. 2, §§ 1–5). It has been identified by Dr. Robinson as the modern el-Ishkh, which was destroyed by an earthquake in 1837 (Erbdt. Res. iii. 368 ff., 1st ed.). It must have been one of the towns in the circuit of Christ’s labors, and well known to his Galilean disciples. There was a tradition that the parents of Paul emigrated from this place to Tarsus. [See \textit{AHLAB}.

GISTA (גוISTA) [hearkening]: [FA.] Geresa: [Comp. Geräños; Rom. Vat. Alex. FA.] omit: Geryon), one of the overseers of the Nehumim, in “the Ophel,” after the return from Captivity (Neh. xi. 21). By the LXX. the name appears to have been taken as a place.

GITTACH-HEPHIER, Josh. xix. 13. [TATH-HEPHIER.]

GITTAIM (גיתאים). i.e. two wine-prepresses: [in 2 Sam., Detha, [Vat. Detha, Alex. Detha]; in Neh. xi. 33, Rom. Vat. Alex. FA.] omit: FA.] Detha], a place incidentally mentioned in 2 Sam. iv. 3, where the meaning appears to be that the inhabitants of Beeroth, which was allotted to Benjamin, had been compelled to fly from that place, and had taken refuge at Gittaim. Beeroth was one of the towns of the Gileadites (Josh. ix. 17): and the cause of the flight of its people may have been (though this is but conjecture) Saul’s persecution of the Gileadites alluded to in 2 Sam. xxi. 2. Gittaim is again mentioned [Neh. xi. 33] in the list of places inhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the Captivity, with Ramah, Nebatim, Lodi, and other known towns of Benjamin to the N. W. of Jerusalem. The two may be the same; though, if the persecution of the Gileadites proceeded from Benjamin, as we must infer it did, they would hardly choose as a refuge a place within the limits of that tribe. Gittaim is the dual form of the word Gath, which suggests the Philistine plain as its locality. But there is no evidence for or against this.

Gittaim occurs in the LXX. version of 1 Sam. xvi. 33 — "out of Gathaim roll me a great stone." But this is not supported by any other of the ancient versions, which unanimously adhere to the Heb. text, and probably proceeds from a mistake or corruption of the Hebrew word גותים: A. V. "ye have transgressed." It further occurs in the LXX. in Gen. xxxvi. 35 and 1 Chr. i. 40, as the representative of Avith, a change not so intelligible as the other, and equally unsupported by the other old versions.

GITTITES (גちなים, patron. from גתח, [Pethaios, Alex. Pethaios, Gathai]), the 600 men who followed David from Gath, under Ittai the Gittite (Gittite, 2 Sam. xv. 18, 19), and who probably acted as a kind of body-guard. Obad-edom the Levite, in whose house the Ark was for a time placed (2 Sam. vi. 10), and who afterwards served in Jerusalem (1 Chr. xxi. 38), is called "the Gittite" (גちなים). We can scarcely think, however, that he was so named from the royal city of the Philistines. May he not have been from the town of Gittaim in Benjamin (2 Sam. iv. 3; Neh. xi. 33), or from Gath-rimmon, a town of Dan, allotted to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxi. 24), of whom Obad-edom seems to have been one (1 Chr. xxvi. 4)?

J. L. P.

GITTITH (גיתית) [see \textit{inpro}†], a musical instrument, by some supposed to have been used by the people of Gath, and thence to have been introduced by David into Palestine; and by others (who identify יגדית with גיתית, a wine-press, or trough, in which the grapes were trodden with the feet) to have been employed at the festivities of the vintage. The Chaldee paraphrase of יגדית יגדית, occasionally found in the heading of Psalms, is, "On the instrument יגדית יגדית ([Chorn], which was brought from Gath." Rashii, whilst he admits Gittith to be a musical instrument, in the manufacture of which the artisans of Gath excelled, quotes a Talmudic authority which would assign to the word a different meaning. "Our sages," says he, "have remarked: On the nations who are in future to be trodden down like a wine-press." (Comp. Is. lxiii. 3.) But neither of the Psalms, viii., lxxix., or lxxxiv., which have Gittith for a heading, contains any thing that may be connected with such an idea. The interpretation of the LXX. quote a Talmudic authority, "for the wine-presses," is condemned by Aleni-Exra and other eminent Jewish scholars. First (\textit{Concordance}) describes Gittith as a hollow instrument, from יגדית, to depose (synonymous with יגדית). D. W. M.

GIZONITE, THE (גיזונית: 5 פִּילָּחֵי).
GLASS (from ןוֹרֵז מָגָל; Doros: vitrum). The word occurs only in Job xxviii. 17, where in the A. V. it is rendered "crystal." It comes from נור (to be pure), and according to the best authorities means a kind of glass which in ancient days was held in high esteem (J. D. Michaelis, Hist. Vitri quod Habr.; and Hamburger, Hist. Vitri ex antiquitate erudie, quoted by Gesenius, s. v.). Symmachus renders it κρύσταλλος, but that is rather intended by שֶׁבֶל (Job xxviii. 18, A. V. "pears," LXX. γαβις, a word which also means "ice;" cf. Phin. H. N. xxxvii. 2), and שֶׁבֶל (Ez. 22). It seems then that Job xcviii. 17 contains the only allusion to glass found in the O. T., and even this reference is disputed. Besides Symmachus, others also render it διαυγή κρύσταλλον (Schenkener, Thesaur. s. v. בֵלָו), and it is argued that the word בֵלָו frequently means crystal. Thus the Schol. on Aristoph. Nath. 674, defines בֵלָו (when it occurs in old writers) as διαυρης λίθος ἐκκόκκος ὀκρός, and Hesychius gives as its equivalent λίθος τίμων. In Herodotus (iii. 24) it is clear that בֵלָו must mean crystal, for he says, "δε δε δις πολλή καὶ θερμος ὀρθέαται, καὶ Αἴτιλις Θάτις σημειώθη τετραγμενή" (i. 3; Bacher, On Ηεροδ. ii. 44; Heeren, Ideen, ii. 1, 355). Others consider מִילָח to be amber, or electrum, or alabaster (Boehart, Hieros. ii. vi. 872).

In spite of this absence of specific allusion to glass in the sacred writings, the Hebrews must have been aware of the invention. There has been a violent modern prejudice against the belief that glass was early known to, or extensively used by, the ancients, but both facts are now certain. From paintings representing the process of glass-blowing which have been discovered in paintings at Beni-Hassan, and in tombs at other places, we know that the invention is at least as remote as the age of Osiraen the first (perhaps a contemporary of Joseph), 3,500 years ago. A bead as old as 1500 B.C. was found by Captain Hervey at Thebes, "the specific gravity of which, 250.30, is precisely the same as that of the crown glass now made in England." Fragments too of wine-vases as old as the Exodus have been discovered in Egypt. Glass beads known to be ancient have been found in Africa, and also (it is said) in Cornwall and Ireland, which are in all probability the relics of an old Phoenician trade (Wilkinson, in Rowlandson's Herod. ii. 50, i. 475; Anc. Egypt. iii. 88-112). The art was also known to the ancient Assyrians (Layard, Niniveh, i. 42), and a glass bottle was found in the N. W. palace of Ninmurr, which has on it the name of Sargon, and is therefore probably older than 714 B.C. (id. Nin. and Bab. p. 197, 503). This is the earliest known specimen of transparent glass.

The disbelief in the antiquity of glass (in spite of the distinct statements of early writers) is difficult to account for, because the invention must almost naturally arise in making bricks or pottery, during which processes there must be at least a superficial vitrification. There is little doubt that the honor of the discovery belongs to the Egyptians. Pliny gives no date for his celebrated story of the discovery of glass from the solitary accident of some Phoenician sailors using blocks of natron to support hirr sanceners when they were unable to find stones for the purpose (H. N. xxxvi. 65). But this account is less likely than the supposition that vitreous matter first attracted observation from the action of lighting fires on the sand, 'in a country reducing natron or subcarbonate of soda' (Haw- linnson's Herod. ii. 32). It has been pointed out that Pliny's story may have originated in the fact that the sand of the Syrian river Belus,a at the mouth of which the incident is supposed to have occurred, "was esteemed peculiarly suitable for glass-making, and exported in great quantities to the workshops of Sidon and Alexandria, long the

---

a * This Belus is the modern Nahr Na'man which flows into the Mediterranean just south of 44°E, the O. T. Achor and the N. T. Polumas.

---

EGYPTIAN GLASS BLOWERS. (Wilkinson.)
GLEANING

most famous in the ancient world (Dict. of Ant. art.) for where everything requisite to the illustration of the classical allusions to glass may be found. Some find a remarkable reference to this little river (respecting which see Lib. ii. N. v. 17, xxxvi. 65; Joseph. B. J. i. 10, § 2; Tac. Hist. v. 7) in the blessing to the tribe of Zebulun, "they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand" (Deut. xxxiii. 19). Both the name Delos (Reed, quoted in Dict. of Geogr. s. v. and the Hebrew word לִינוֹן, *sand* (Calmet, s. r.) have been suggested as derivations for the Greek ἰαλός, which is however, in all probability, from an Egyptian root.

Glass was not only known to the ancients, but used by them (as Winckelmann thinks) for more extensively than in modern times. They even tells us that it was employed in wallscotching (vitree camera, H. N. xxxvi. 94; Stat. Syr. i. v. 42). The Egyptians knew the art of cutting, grinding, and engraving it, and they could even inlay it with gold or enamel, and "permeate opaque glass with designs of various colors." Besides this they could color it with such brilliancy as to be able to imitate precious stones in a manner which often defied detection (Lib. ii. N. xxxvi. 26, 33, 75). This is probably the explanation of the incredibly large number of glass-finds which are found in various names, e. g. Larcher considers that the emerald column alluded to by Herodotus (iii. 44) was "du verre couleur dont l'intérieur était éclairé par des lampes." Strabo was told by an Alexandrian glass-maker that this success was partly due to a rare and valuable earth found in Egypt (Beckmann, History of Inventions, "Colored Glass," i. 195 f. Eng. Transl., also iii. 208 f., iv. 54). Yet the perfectly clear and transparent glass was considered the most valuable (Lib. xxxvi. 26).

Some suppose that the proper name לִינוֹן (burnings by the waters) contains an allusion to Sidonian glass-factories (Meier on Jos. xi. 8, xiiii. 6), but it is much more probable that it was so called from the burning of Judah's chariots at that place (Lord A. Hervey, On the Genealogies, p. 228), or from hot springs.

In the N. T. glass is alluded to as an emblem of brightness (Rev. iv. 6, xv. 2, xvi. 18). The three other places where the word occurs in the A. V. (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Jam. i. 23), as also the word "glass" (Is. iii. 24), are considered under MIHRONS. For, strange to say, although the ancients were aware of the reflective power of glass, and although the Sidonians used it for mirrors (Lib. ii. N. xxxvi. 66), yet for some unexplained reason mirrors of glass must have proved unsuccessful, since even under the empire they were universally made of metal, which is at once less perfect, more expensive, and more difficult to preserve (Dict. of Ant. art. Speculum).

* F. W. F.

GLEANING (גֶּלֶנֶּה) as applied to produce generally, גָּלֶנֶּה rather to corn. The remarks under GLEAN on the definite character of the rights of the poor, or rather of poor relations and dependents, to a share of the crop, are especially exemplified in the instance of Ruth gleaning in the field of Boaz. Poor young women, recognized as being "his maids," were gleaning his field, and on her claim upon him by near affinity being made known, she was hidden to join them and not go to any other field; but for this, the reaper might have driven her away (Ruth ii. 6, 8, 9). The gleanings of fruit trees, as well as of cornfields, was reserved for the poor. Hence the proverb of Gideon. Judg. viii. 2. Maimonides indeed lays down the principle (Constitutiones de domus poenarum, cap. ii. 1), that whatever crop or growth is fit for food, is kept, and gathered all at once, and carried into store, is liable to that law. See for further remarks, Maimon, Constitutiones de domus poenarum, cap. iv.

H. II.

GLEDE, the old name for the common kite (Milvus ater), occurs only in Deut. xiv. 13 (תּוּרֵן) among the unclean birds of prey, and if תּוּרֵן be the correct reading, we must suppose the name to have been taken from the bird's acuteness of vision; but as in the parallel passage in Lev. xi. 14 we find תּוּרֵן, vultur, it is probable that we should read תּוּרֵן in Deut. also. The LXX. have γαλάζω in both places.

W. D.

GNAT (_packet), mentioned only in the proverbs, expression used by our Saviour in Matt. xxiii. 24, 'Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.' "Strain at, in the A. V., seems to be a typographical error, since the translations before the A. V. had 'strain out,'" the Greek word δοχίαν signifying to strain through (a sieve, etc.), to filter (see Trench, On the Author Vers., 1st ed. p. 131) [2d ed. p. 172]. The Greek κατάρδας is the generic word for gnat.

W. D.

GOAD. The equivalent terms in the Hebrew are (1) תּוּרֵן (Judg. iii. 31), and (2) תּוּרֵן (1 Sam. xiii. 21; Exch. xii. 11). The explanation given by John (Archaeol. i. 4, § 59) that is the former represents the pole, and the latter the iron spike with which it was shod for the purpose of goading. With regard to the latter, however, it may refer to anything pointed, and the tenor of Exch. xii. requires rather the sense of a peg or nail, anything in short which can be fastened; while in 1 Sam. xiii. the point of the ploughshare is more probably intended. The former does probably refer to the goad, the long handle of which might be used as a formidable weapon (comp. Hom. Mus. i. 135), though even this was otherwise understood by the LXX. as a ploughshare (τρόφιμον ὑποτροφίας); it should also be noted that the etymological force of the word is that of guiding (from תּוּרֵן, to teach) rather than goading (Sachschi. Archael. i. 105). There are undoubted references to the use of the goad in driving oxen in Exchus. xxviii. 25. and Acts xxvi. 14. The instrument, as still used in the countries of southern Europe and western Asia, consists of a rod about eight feet long, brought to a sharp point and sometimes curved with iron at the head (Harmer's Observations, iii. 348). The expression ἐν τῷ κωπίῳ αὐτοῦ (Acts iv. 26; A. V. "æt his pike"), was proverbially used by the Greeks for vaunting resistance to superior power (comp. Esch. Agam. 1633, Prom. 323; Eurip. Bacch. 791).

W. L. B.

* The use of the goad in driving animals, which is still common in the East, is implied in 2 K. iv. 24, where it explains a slight obscurity in the verse as given in the A. V. Mounted on her donkey—
GOAT

The favorite mode of travelling with oriental ladies - the Shunammite, intent on the utmost dispatch, directs her servant, running by her side, to urge the animal with the goad to its full speed.

The long ox-goat, used in the field, with an iron point at one end, and an iron paddle at the other to clean the plough in the furrows, often was, and still is, a massive implement. In the hands of a strong and valiant man, like Shamgar, as represented in Judg. iii. 31, it would be a destructive weapon. (See Hackett's Illustr. of Scripture, p. 155.)

GOAT. I. Of the Hebrew words which are translated goat and she-goat in A. V., the most common is יָּרֵךְ = Syr. ܠNavbar, Arab. ܢܢ resize, Phoen. ܢܢ resize.

The Indo-Germanic languages have a similar word in Sanskr. agra = goat, ayā = she-goat, Ger. gera or gems, Greek aigē or aigyn. The derivation from יָּרֵךְ, to be strong, points to go as the original meaning, but it is also specially used for she-goat, as in Gen. xv. 9, xxxi. 28, xxxii. 14; Num. xvi. 37. In Judg. vi. 19 יָּרֵךְ is rendered kid, and in Deut. iv. 4 יָּרֵךְ is rendered the goat, but properly signifies flock of goats. יָּרֵךְ is used elliptically for goats' hair in Ex. xxvi. 7, xxxvi. 14, &c., Num. xxxvi. 29, and in 1 Sam. xix. 13.

2. יָּרֵךְ are wild or mountain goats, and are rendered wild goats in three passages of Scripture in which the word occurs, namely, 1 Sam. xxiv. 2, Job xxxix. 1, and Ps. civ. 18. The word is from a root יָּרֵךְ, to ascend or climb, and is the Heb. name of the ibex, which abounds in the mountainous parts of the ancient territory of Moab. In Job xxxix. 1, the LXX. have τραγαλαύρεος πετράς.

3. יָּרֵךְ is rendered the wild goat in Deut. xiv. 5, and occurs only in this passage. It is a contracted form of יָּרֵךְ, according to Lee, who renders it gazelle, but it is more properly the tragelaphus or goat-hair (Shaw. Suppl. p. 76).

4. יָּרֵךְ, a he-goat, as Gesenius thinks, of four months old - strong and vigorous. It occurs only in the plural, and is rendered by A. V. indifferently goats and he-goats (see Ps. i. 9 and 13). In Jer. i. 8 it signifies he-goats, leaders of the flock, and hence its metaphorical use in Is. xiv. 9 for chief ones of the earth, and in Zech. x. 3, where goats = principal men, chiefs. It is derived from the root יָּרֵךְ, to set, to place, to prepare.

5. יָּרֵךְ occurs in 2 Chr. xxxix. 21, and in Dan. viii. 5, 8 - it is followed by יָּרֵךְ and signifies he-goat of the goats. Gesenius derives it from יָּרֵךְ, to leap. It is a word found only in the later books of the O. T. In Ezr. vi. 17 we find the Chal. form of the word יָּרֵךְ.

6. יָּרֵךְ is translated goat, and signifies properly a he-goat, being derived from יָּרֵךְ, to stand in end, to bristle. It occurs frequently in Leviticus and Numbers (יָּרֵךְ יָּרֵךְ), and is the goat of the sin-offering, Lev. ix. 3, 13, 16. The word is used as an adjective with יָּרֵךְ in Dan. viii. 21 "— and the goat, the rough one, is the king of Javan."

7. יָּרֵךְ is from a root יָּרֵךְ, o strike. It is rendered he-goat in Gen. xxx. 35, xxxix. 15, Prov. xxx. 9, and 2 Chr. xxvii. 11. It does not occur elsewhere.

8. יָּרֵךְ, scape-goat in Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26. On this word see Atonement, Day of, p. 197.

In the N. T. the words rendered goats in Matt. xxv. 32, 35, are θηρίον and θηρίον = a young goat, or kid; and in Heb. ix. 12, 13, 19, and x. 4, θηρίον = he-goat. Goat-skins, in Heb. xi. 37, are in the Greek, εὖ αἰγελόν δίδωσαν; and in Judg. xi. 17 αἰγελόν is rendered goats.

W. D.

There appear to be two or three varieties of the common goat (Hircus saginus) at present bred in Palestine and Syria, but whether they are identical with those which were reared by the ancient Hebrews it is not possible to say. The most marked are the Syrian goat (Capra bannenii, Linn.), with long thick pendent ears, which are, says Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, ii. 150, 2d ed.), a foot long, and the Angoran goat (Capra angorica, Linn.), with fine long hair. The Syrian goat is mentioned by Aristotle (Hist. An. ix. 27, § 3). There is also a variety that differs but little from British specimens. Goats have from the earliest ages been considered important animals in rural economy, both on account of the milk they afford, and the excellency of the flesh of the young animals. The goat is figured on the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. i. 223). Col. Ham. Smith (Griffith's An. King. iv. 308) describes three Egyptian breeds: one with long hair, depressed horns, ears small and pendent; another with horns very spiral, and ears longer than the head; and a third, which occurs in Upper Egypt, without horns.

Goats were offered as sacrifices (Lev. iii. 12, ix. 15; Ex. xii. 5, etc.); their milk was used as food (Prov. xxvii. 27); their flesh was eaten (Deut. iv. 4; Gen. xxviii. 9); their hair was used for the curtains of the tabernacle (Ex. xxvi. 7, xxxvi. 14), and for stuffing cushions (1 Sam. xix. 13); their skins were sometimes used as clothing (Heb. xi. 37).

The passage in Cant. iv. 1, which compares the hair of the beloved to "a flock of goats that eat of Mount Gilgal," probably alludes to the fine hair of the Angoran breed. Some have very plausibly supposed that the prophet Amos (iii. 12), when he speaks of a shepherd "taking out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of an ear," alludes to the long pendulous ears of the Syrian breed (see Harmer's Obs. iv. 162). In Prov. xxx. 31, a goat is mentioned as one of the "four things which are incomy in going;" in allusion, probably, to the stately march of the leader of the flock, which was always associated in the minds of the Hebrews with the notion of dignity. Hence the metaphor in Is. xiv. 9, "all the chief ones (marg., great goats) of the earth." So the Alexandrine version of the LXX. understands the allusion. καὶ τραγόες ἀγγελικές αἰγολοι.α

α Comp. Thesaurus, Ed. viii. 49, "Τραγός, τᾶς ἀνθρώποις ἄγγελος; and Virg. Eccl. vii. 7, "Vir gregis ἐπερεπερεραν."
speaks of these animals: "In all the valleys south of the Modjeb, and particularly in those of Modjeb and El Asia, large herds of mountain goats, called by the Arabs Beden (בְּדוּן), are met with. This is the steinbock a or bouquetin of the Swiss and Tyrol Alps. They pasture in flocks of forty and fifty together. Great numbers of them are killed by the people of Kerek and Tafylé, who hold their flesh in high estimation. They sell the large knotty horns to the Hebrew merchants, who carry them to Jerusalem, where they are worked into handles for knives and daggers. . . . . The Arabs told me that it is difficult to get a shot at them, and that the hunters hide themselves among the reeds on the banks of streams where the animals resort in the evening to drink. They also asserted that, when pursued, they will throw themselves from a height of fifty feet and more upon their heads without receiving any injury." Hasselquist (Trav. p. 160) speaks of rock goats (Capra cervicapra, Linna.) which he saw hunted with falcons near Nazareth. But the C. cervicapra of Linnæus is an antelope (Antilope cervicapra, Pall.).

There is considerable difficulty attending the identification of the akkô (אֵקָה), which the LXX. render by γραβάς, and the Vulg. trigebalus. The word, which occurs only in Deut. xiv. 5 as one of the animals that might be eaten, is rendered "wild goat" by the A. V. Some have referred the akkô to the abu of the Persians, i.e. the Capreolus pygargus, or the "tailless roe" (Skene, Zool. ii. 297), of Central Asia. If we could satisfactorily establish the identity of the Persian word with the Hebrew, the animal in question might represent the akkô of the Pentateuch, which might formerly have inhabited the Lebanon, though it is not found in Palestine now. Perhaps the pusang (Cap. aegagrus, L. v.) which some have taken to be the parent stock of the common goat, and which at present inhabits the mountains of Persia and Caucasus, may have in Biblical times been found in Palestine and may be the akkô of Scripture. But we allow this is mere conjecture.

W. H.
GOLAN

by the account of a third and subsequent fight, which all agree happened at Gath (2 Sam. xxii. 20); 1 Chr. xx. 6), and which, from the terms of the narrative, seems to have occurred at the same place as the others. The suggestion of Nob — which Davidson {Hebr. Text} reports as in many MSS. and which is also found in copies of the LXX. — is not admissible on the account of the situation of that place. G.


*GOLDINESS, MYSTERY OF.* [Baptism, vii. 5, p. 239.]

*GOD SPEED* is the translation of χαιρεμ in 2 John 10, 11, the Greek form of salutation. It has been transferred from the Anglo-Saxon godspettiq, but with a different meaning there, namely, "good-speed." II.

GOG. 1. [גוג: Γογ': [Comp. Abd. גָעַג] Gog' A Jacobite (1 Chr. v. 4); according to the Hebrew text son of Shemahiah. The LXX. have a different text throughout the passage. 2. [Magog.]

3. In the Samarit. Codex and LXX. of Num. xxiv. 7, Gog is substituted for Agag.

GOLAN [גּוֹלָן: a circle, region, Dict. Fürst; migration, Ges.] = Gaulan' [in 1 Chr. vi. 71, Gaulan: Alex. also in Josh. Gaulan: Gaulon, exc. Dict. Golon], a city of Bashan (יַעַר בַּשָּׁן, 1 Sam. iv. 43) allotted out of the half tribe of Manasseh to the Levites (Josh. xiii. 27), and one of the three cities of refuge east of the Jordan (xx. 8).

We find no further notice of it in Scripture; and though Eshehins and Jerome say it was still an important place in their time (Quom. s. v.; Reuand, p. 815), its very site is now unknown. Some have supposed that the village of Nune, on the eastern border of Jordan, around which are extensive ruins (see Handbook for Syr. and Pol.), is identical with the ancient Golon; but for this there is not a shadow of evidence; and Nume besides is much too far to the eastward.

The city of Golan is several times referred to by Josephus (Ἰωάννης, B. J. i. 4, § 4, and 8); he, however, more frequently speaks of the province which took its name from it, Gaulanitis (Ἰωάννητις). When the kingdom of Israel was overthrown by the Assyrians, and the dominion of the Jews in Bashan ceased, it appears that the aboriginal tribes, before kept in subjection, but never annihilated, rose again to some power, and rent the country into provinces. Two of these provinces at least were of ancient origin [Trachonitis and Hauran], and had been distinct principalities previous to the time when Og or his predecessors united them under one sceptre. Before the Babylonian captivity Bashan appears in Jewish history as one kingdom: but subsequent to that period it is spoken of as divided into four provinces — Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Batanaea (Joseph. Ant. iv. 5, § 3, and 7, § 4, i. 6, § 4, xvi. 9, § 1; B. J. i. 20, § 4, iii. 3, § 1, iv. 1, § 1). It seems that when the city of Golan rose to power it became the head of a large province, the extent of which is pretty accurately given by Josephus, especially when his statements are compared with the modern divisions of Bashan. It lay east of Galilee, and north of Gadaritis (Gadara, Joseph. B. J. iii. 3, § 1). Gaulana, an important town on the eastern bank of the Sea of Galilee, now called El-Hasa (see Handbook for Syr. and Pol.), and the province attached to it, were included in Gaulanitis (B. J. iv. 1, § 1).

But the boundary of the provinces of Gadara and Gaulanitis must evidently have been the river Hermonax, which may therefore be regarded as the south border of Gaulanitis. The Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to its fountains at Dan and Cesaron-Philippi, formed the western boundary (B. J. iii. 3, § 5). It is important to observe that the boundaries of the modern province of Joufia (יוּמִּי) is the Arabic form of the Hebrew מִשָּׁר (Mishar) is given in 1 K. xx. 23, 25 — "the plow" in which the Syrians were overthrown by the Israelites, near Aphek, which perhaps stood upon the site of the modern Fik (stanley, App. § 6; Handbook for S. and P. p. 425). The western side of Gaulanitis, along the Sea of Galilee, is steep, rugged, and bare. It is upwards of 2,500 feet in height, and when seen from the city of Tiberias resembles a mountain range, though in reality it is only the supporting wall of the plateau. It was this elevated site that led the classical geographers to suppose that the mountain range of Gilead was joined to Lebanon (Reuand, p. 342).

Further north, along the bank of the upper Jordan, the plateau breaks down in a series of terraces, which, though somewhat rocky, are covered with rich soil, and clothed in spring with the most luxuriant herbage, spangled with multitudes of bright and beautiful flowers. A range of low, round-topped, picturesque hills, extends southwards for nearly 20 miles from the base of Hermon along the western edge of the plateau. These are in places covered with noble forests of prickly oak and terebinth. Gaulanitis was once densely populated, but it is now almost completely deserted. The writer has a list of the towns and villages which it once contained; and in it are the names of 127 places, all of which, with the exception of about twelve, are now unrecognised. Only a few patches of its soil are cultivated; and the very best of its pasture is lost — the tender grass of early spring. The flocks of the Turkmans and el-Fudhul Arabs — the only tribes that remain permanently in this region — are not able to consume it; and the Amaziah, those "children of the East," who spread over the land like locusts, and whose camels are without number (Judg. xii. 12), only arrive about
GOLD

The most valuable of metals, from its color, lustre, weight, ductility, and other useful properties (Plin. H. N. xxxiii. 19). Hence it is used as an emblem of purity (Job xxii. 10) and nobility (Lam. iv. 1). There are six Hebrew words used to denote it, and four of them occur in Job xxviii. 15, 16, 17. These are:

1. בּהֵם (Behem), the common name, connected with בּהֵמ (to be yellow), as gold, from yel, yellow. Various epithets are applied to it: as, "fine" (2 Chr. iii. 5), "refined" (1 Chr. xxviii. 18), "pure" (Ex. xxv. 11). In opposition to these, "beaten" gold (גּוֹד הַיְמֵן) is probably mixed gold; LXX. δαντός; used of Solomon's shields (1 K. x. 16).

2. יִרְצִיז (Yeritz) treasured, i.e. c. fine gold (1 K. vi. 29, vii. 49, &c.). Many names of precious substances in Hebrew come from roots signifying concealment, as יִרְצִיז (Gen. xxxii. 23, A. V. "treasure").

3. יִרְצִי (Yerits), pure or native gold (Job xxviii. 17; Cant. v. 15; probably from יִרְצִי to separate). Rosenmuller (Altehistisches, iv. p. 49) makes it come from a Syrian root meaning solid or massy; but יִרְצִיז (2 Chr. ix. 17) corresponds to יִרְצִי (1 K. x. 18).

The LXX. renders it by λίθος τίμως, χριστόν ἄργυρον (Is. xiii. 12; Theod. ἄργυρον; comp. Thub. ii. 13; Plin. xxxii. 19, otherwise). In Ps. xxxix. 12, the LXX. render it τοῦ ἄργυρου, the Hebrew word being adopted to avoid the repetition of χριστόν (Thes. s. v. τόσσος; Hesych. s. v. τόσσος).

4. יִרְצִי, gold earth, or a mass of raw ore (Job xxii. 24, ἄργυρον, A. V. "gold as dust").

The poetical names for gold are:

1. יִרְצִי (Yeritz) (also implying something concealed): LXX. χριστόν; and in Is. xiii. 12, λίθος τίμως. In Job xxxvii. 22, it is rendered in L. V. "fair weather." LXX. ρέφι χρυσαυγινα. (Comp. Zeoh. iv. 12.)

2. יִרְצִי (Yeritz) = day out (Prov. viii. 10), a general name, which has become special, Ps. lviii. 13, where it cannot mean genus, as some suppose (Boehm, Hist. pop. tom. ii. p. 9). Michaelis connects the word יִרְצִי with the Greek χριστός.

Gold was known from the earliest times (Gen. ii. 11). Phiny attributes the discovery of it (at Mount Pangaeans), and the art of working it, to Cadmus (H. N. vii. 57); and his statement is adopted by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. i. 363, ed. Vott.). It was at first chiefly used for ornaments, etc. (Gen. xxiv. 22); and although Abraham is said to have been "very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold" (Gen. xiii. 2), yet no mention of it as used in purchases, is made till after his return from Egypt. coined money was not known to the ancients (e.g. Hom. H. vii. 473) till a comparatively late period; and on the Egyptian tombs gold is represented as being weighed in rings for commercial purposes. (Comp. Gen. xxiii. 21.) No coins are found in the ruins of Egypt or Assyria (Layard, Nin. ii. 418.). "Even so late as the time of David gold was not used as a standard of value, but was considered merely as a very precious article of commerce, and was weighed like other articles" (Iahn, Arch. Bibl. § 115, 1 Chr. xii. 25).

Gold was extremely abundant in ancient times (1 Chr. xii. 4: 2 Chr. i. 15, ix. 9; Nah. ii. 9; Dan. iii. 1); but this did not depreciate its value, because of the enormous quantities consumed by the wealthy in furniture, etc. (1 K. vi. 22, x. passim; Cant. iii. 9, 10; Esth. i. 10, iv. x. 11; comp. Hom. Od. xix. 55; Herod. ix. 82). Probably too the art of gilding was known extensively, being applied even to the battlements of a city (Herod. i. 98, and other authorities quoted by Layard, ii. 264).

The chief countries mentioned as producing gold are Arabia, Sheba, and Ophir (1 K. ix. 28. x. 1; Job xxii. 24, the word ἀργυρός is used for gold). Gold is not found in Arabia now (Niebuhr's Travels, p. 141), but it is used to be (Artemidor. ap. Strab. xvi. 3, 18, where he speaks of an Arabian river ψεύδια μα χρυσων καταφεϊε). Dioscorides also says that it was found there native (ἀργυρός) in good-sized nuggets (βαλανία). Some suppose that Ophir was an Arabian port to which gold was brought (comp. 2 Chr. ii. 7, ix. 10). Other gold-bearing countries were Uphaia (Jer. x. 9; Dan. x. 5) and Paraim (2 Chr. iii. 6).

Metallurgical processes are mentioned in Is. lxvi. 10, Prov. xv. 23, xxii. 21; and in Is. xvi. 6, the trade of goldsmiths (cf. Judg. xvii. 4, יִרְצִים) is alluded to in connection with the overvaluing of idols with gold-leaf (Rosenmuller's Minerals of Script. pp. 46-51). [Handicraft.] F. W. F. *GOLDSMITH. [Handicraft.]

GOLGOTA ( Garner [a skull]; Golgotho, the Hebrew name of the spot at which our Lord was crucified (Matt. xxvii. 33; Mark xv. 22: John xix. 17). By these three Evangelists it is interpreted to mean the "place of a skull," St. Luke, in accordance with his practice in other cases (compare Gabbatha, Gethsemane, etc.), omits the Hebrew term and gives only its Greek equivalent, κρανίων. The word Calvary, which in Luke xviii. 33 is retained in the A. V. from the Vulgate, as the rendering of κρανίων, obscures the statement of St. Luke, whose words are really as follows: "the place which is called 'a skull'" —not, as in the other Gospels, κρανίων, of a skull; thus employing the Greek term exactly as they do the Hebrew one. [Culverly, Amer. ed.]. This Hebrew, or rather Chaldee, term, was doubtless יִשְׂרָאֵל, Ga'ṭana, in pure Hebrew יִשְׂרָאֵל, applied to the skull on account of its round globular form, that being the idea at the root of the word.

Two explanations of the name are given: (1) that it was a spot where executions ordinarily took place, and therefore surrounded in skulls; but according to the Jewish law these were not bereated, and
Goliath were no more likely to confer a name on the spot than any other part of the skeleton. In this case too the Greek should be τότος κρασιον; "a skull," instead of κρασιον, "of a skull," still less "of skull" as in the Hebrew, and in the Greek of St. Luke. Or (2) it may come from the look or form of the spot itself, bald, round, and skull-like, and therefore a mound or hillock, in accordance with the common phrase — for which there is no direct authority — "Mount Calvary."

Whichever of these is the correct explanation — and there is apparently no means of deciding with certainty — Golgotha seems to have been a known spot. This is to be gathered from the way in which it is mentioned in the Gospels, each except St. Matthew having the definite article — "the place Golgotha" — "the place which is called a skull" — "the place (A. V. omits the article) called of, or after, a skull." It was "outside the gate," ἐκ τῆς πύλης (Heb. xiii. 12) but close to the city, ἐγέρσαι τις πόλεως (John xix. 20); apparently near a thoroughfare on which there were passers-by. This road or path led out of the "country" (ἀγρός). It was probably the ordinary spot for executions. Why should it have been otherwise? To those at least who carried the sentence into effect, Christ was but an ordinary criminal; and there is not a word to indicate that the soldiers in "leading Him away" went to any other than the usual place for what must have been a common operation. However, in the place (ἐν τῷ τῆς) itself — at the very spot — was a garden or orchard (κῆπος).

These are all the indications of the nature and situation of Golgotha which present themselves in the N. T. Its locality in regard to Jerusalem is fully examined in the description of the city. [JERUSALEM.]

A tradition at one time prevalent that Adam was buried on Golgotha, that from his skull it derived its name, and that at the Crucifixion the drops of Christ's blood fell on the skull and raised Adam to life, whereby the ancient prophecy quoted by St. Paul in Eph. v. 14 received its fulfillment — "Awake, thou Adam that sleepest," — so the old versions appear to have run — and arise from the dead, for Christ shall touch thee" (ἐπιφάνειας γιὰ ἐπιφανείας). See Jerome, Comen. on Matt. xxvii. 33, and the quotation in Roland, P. L. p. 800; also Sawulf, in Early Travel. p. 23. The skull commonly introduced in early pictures of the Crucifixion refers to this.

A connection has been supposed to exist between Gath and Golgotha, but at the best this is mere conjecture, and there is not in the original the same similarity between the two names — יִשֵּב and יְשַׁלֵּש — which exists in their English or Latin garb, and which probably occasioned the suggestion. G.

GOLIATH (גּוֹלִיאָת) [ lyon.cour, brilliant, Dietr.; see below]: Goláth: Goliath, a famous giant of Gath, who "morning and evening for forty days" fed the armies of Israel (1 Sam. xvii.). He was possibly descended from the old Rephaim, of whom scattered remnants took refuge with the Philistines after their dispersion by the Ammonites (Deut. ii. 20, 21; 2 Sam. xxi. 22). Some trace of this tradition may be preserved in the giant's name, if it be connected with יִשֵּב, an exile. Simonia, however, derives it from an Arabic word meaning "a stout" (Gesen. Thes. s. v.). His height was "six cubits and a span," which, taking the cubit at 21 inches, would make him 10 feet high. But the LXX. and Josephus read "four cubits and a span" (1 Sam. xvii. 4; Joseph. Ant. vi. 9, § 1). This will make him about the same size as the royal champion slain by Antiochus, brother of Anticlaudus (αὐτοκράτορα μινός μακρόσπονδος βασιλεύς, ap. Strab. xiii. p. 617, with Müller's emendation). Even on this computation Goliath would be, as Josephus calls him, "εὐρύς ταμειγευθήτωρ — a truly enormous man.

The circumstances of the combat are in all respects Homeric; free from any of the pauser legends which oriental imagination subsequently introduced into it — as for instance that the stones used by David called out to him from the brook, "by our means you shall slay the giant," etc. (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. i. 3, p. 111 ff. D'Herbe, s. v. Goliath). The fancies of the Rabbis are yet more extraordinary. After the victory David cut off Goliath's head (1 Sam. xvii. 51; comp. Herod. iv. 6; Xenoph. Anab. v. 4, § 17; Niebuhr mentions a similar custom among the Arabs, Descr. Winer, s. c., which he brought to Jerusalem (probably after his accession to the throne, Ewald, Gesch. iii. 94), while he hung the armor in his tent.

The scene of this famous combat was the Valley of the Terebinth, between Shochoh and Azekah, probably among the western passes of Benjamin, although a confused modern tradition has given the name of 'Ain Jalál (spring of Goliath) to the spring of Harod, or "trembling" (Stanley, p. 342; Judg. vii. 1). [ELAH, VALLEY OF.]

In 2 Sam. xxi. 19, we find that another Goliath of Gath, of whom it is also said that "the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam," was slain by Elnathan, also a Bethlehemite. St. Jerome (Quest. Hebr. ad loc.) makes the unlikely conjecture that Elnathan was another name of David. The A. V. here interposes the words "the brother of," from 1 Chr. xx. 5, where this giant is called "Lahmi." This will be found fully examined under Elnathan.

In the title of the Psalm added to the Psalter in the LXX. we find τό Γαλίας πάνω τῶν Γολοθάς; and although the allusions are vague, it is perhaps possible that this Psalm may have been written after the victory. This Psalm is given at length under David, p. 554 b. It is strange that we find no more definite allusions to this combat in Hebrew poetry: but it is the opinion of some that the song now attributed to Nathan (1 Sam. ii. 1-10) was originally written in commemoration of David's triumph on this occasion (Theol. Gr. Bücher Sam., p. 8; comp. Berthold, Einl. iii. 915; Ewald, Poet. Bücher des A. B. i. ii. 111).

By the Mohammedans Saul and Goliath are called Taluth and Ghaluth (Jalut in Koran), perhaps for the sake of the homoeoteleuton, of which they are so fond (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. i. 3, p. 28). Abulfeda mentions a Canannite king of the name Jalut (Hist. Antiquit., p. 170, in Winer s. v.); and, according to Ahmed al-Fasi, Ghalut was a dynastic name of the old giant-chiefs (D'Herbe, s. v. Falasthin). [GIANTS.] F. W. F.

a St. Matthew too has the article in Codex B.

b But the Vulgate has de villa.
GOMER (גומר) [complete text: פועף; [in Ezck. פועף] Gomer). 1. The eldest son of Japheth, and the father of Ashkenaz, Eliphath, and Togarnah (Gen. x. 2, 3; [1 Chr. i. 5, 6]). His name is subsequently noticed but once (Ez. xxxviii. 6) as an ally or subject of the Great King. He is generally recognized as the progenitor of the early Cimmerians, of the later Cimi and the other branches of the Celta family, and of the modern Cossack and Cymry, the latter preserving with very slight deviation the original name. The Cimmerians, when first known to us, occupied the Thracian Cernose, where they left traces of their presence in the ancient names, Cimmerian Bosphorus, Cimmerian Olus, Mount Cimera, the district of Cimera, and particularly the Cimmerian walls (Her. iv. 12, 45, 100; Ezck. Prom. Vind. 720), and in the modern name Cimuna. They forsook this abode under the pressure of the Scythian tribes, and during the early part of the 7th century B.C. they poured over the western part of Asia Minor, committing immense devastation, and dying for more than half a century the power of the Lydian kings. They were finally expelled by Artaxerxes, with the exception of a few, who settled at Sinope and Antipatris. It was about the same period that Ezekiel noticed them, as acting in conjunction with Armenia (Togarnah) and Magog (Scythia). The connection between Gomer and Armenia is supported by the tradition, preserved by Moses of Chorene (i. 11), that Gamin was the ancestor of the Haueian kings of the latter country. After the expulsion of the Cimmerians from Asia Minor their name disappears in its original form but there can be little reasonable doubt that both the name and the people are to be recognized in the Cimi, whose abodes were fixed during the Roman Empire in the north and west of Europe, particularly in the Cimbrian Cernose (Dacian), on the coast between the Elbe and Ribble, and in Belgium, whence they crossed to Britain, and occupied at one period the whole of the British isles, but were ultimately driven back to the western and northern districts, which their descendants still occupy in two great divisions, the Cossack in Ireland and Scotland, the Cymry in Wales. The latter name preserves a greater similarity to the original Gomer than either of the classical forms, the consonants being identical. The link to connect Cymry with Cimbra is furnished by the forms Cimbra and Cambri-land. The whole Celtic race may therefore be regarded as descended from Gomer, and thus the opinion of Josephus (Ant. i. 6, § 1), that the Cimbrians were sprung from him, may be reconciled with the view propounded. Various other conjectures have been hazarded on the subject: Bocchart (Phyto. ii. 81) identifies the name on zoological grounds with Plutus; Wall (Jus. ii. 274) proposes Capceporus; and Kalbitz (Com. on Gen.) seeks to identify it with the Chonara, a nation in Bactria, noticed by Ptolemy (xiv. 11, § 6).

2. [תעֹּף]. The daughter of Diblahim, and concubine of Hosea (i. 3). The name is significant of a maiden, and signifies well with the name Diblahim, which is also derived from the subject of fruit.

GOMORRAH (גומרות) [complete text: פועף; [in Ezck. פועף] Gomorrah, probably submersion, from פועף, an unused root; in Arabic ﻓَوْضَأ, ﻣُغَمَّر, is to "overwhelm with water"; פּוּפָּה: Gomorrah), one of the five cities of the plain," or "vale of Siddim," that under their respective kings joined battle there with Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv. 2-8) and his allies, by whom they were discomfited till Abram came to the rescue. Four out of the five were afterwards destroyed by the Lord with fire from heaven (Gen. xiv. 23-25). One of them only, Zoor or Bela, which was its original name, was spared at the request of Lot, in order that he might take refuge there. Of these Gomorrah seems to have been only second to Sodom in importance, as well as in the wickedness that led to their overthrow. What that atrocity may have been is gathered from Gen. xiv. 4-8. Their miserable fate is held up as a warning to the children of Israel (Deut. xxix. 23); as a precedent for the destruction of Babylon (Is. xiii. 19), and Jer. i. 40, of Edom (Jer. xiii. 18), of Moab (Zeph. ii. 9), and even of Israel (Am. iv. 11), with the remnant of Judah (2 Pet. ii. 6; Jude, xxv. 4-5), it is made an example unto those that after should live ungodly, or deny Christ. Similarly their wickedness rings as a proverb throughout the prophecies (e.g. Deut. xxxii. 32; Is. i. 9, 10; Jer. xxiii. 14). Jerusalem herself is there unequivocally called Sodom, and her people Gomorrah, for their enormities: just in the same way that the corruptions of the Church of Rome have caused her to be called Babylon. On the other hand, according to the N. T., there is a sin which exceeds even that of Sodom and Gomorrah, that, namely, of which Tyre and Sidon, Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida were guilty, when they "repealed not," in spite of "the mighty works which they had witnessed (Matt. x. 15, and St. Mark has ranged under the same category all those who would not receive the preaching of the kingdom iv. 11).

To turn to their geographical position, one passage of Scripture seems expressly to assert that the vale of Siddim had become the "salt," or dead, "sea" (Gen. xiv. 3), called elsewhere too the "sea of the plain" (Josh. xii. 3): the expression, however, occurs antecedently to their overthrow. Josephus (Ant. i. 9) says that the lake Asphaltites or Dead Sea, was formed out of what used to be the valley where Sodom stood: but elsewhere he declares that the territory of Sodom was not submerged in the lake (B. J. iv. 8, § 4), but still existed parched and burnt up, as is the appearance of that region still: and certainly nothing in Scripture would lead to the idea that they were destroyed by submersion — though they may have been submerged afterwards when destroyed — for their destruction is expressly attributed to the fierceness and fire rained upon them from heaven (Gen. xix. 24; see also Deut. xxiv. 23, and Zeph. ii. 9; also St. Peter and St. Jude before cited). And St. Jerome in the Commentation says of Sodom, "Evitavit..."
GOMORRAH

GORTYNA

Gomorrha (Gomorrah): in the name in which the name Gomorrha is written in the A. V. of the Apocryphal books and the New Testament, following the Greek form of the word, Κωμόρρα (2 Esdr. ii. 8; Matt. x. 15; Mark vi. 11; Rom. ix. 29; Jude 7; 2 Pet. ii. 6).

*GOODMAN OF THE HOUSE (οἰκοδεσπότης), employed in the A. V. of the master of the house (Matt. xx. 11), and simply equivalent to that expression, without any reference to moral character. This was a common usage when the A. V. was made. The Greek term being the same, there was no good reason for saying "goodman of the house" in that verse, and "housekeeper" at the beginning of the parable (ver. 1). See Trench, Authorized Version, p. 96 (1850).

Gopher Wood. Only once in Gen. vi. 14. The Hebrew שֵׁלֶג תַּנֶּג, trees of Gopher, does not occur in the cognate languages. The A. V. has made no attempt at translation: the LXX. (γάλα ῥερπέωνα) and Vulgate (lignum keríggito), elected by means as "of" and "like the cedar" (see 2 K. 25:13), the former having reference to square blocks, cut by the axe, the latter to planks smoothed by the plane, have not found much favor with modern commentators.

The conjectures of cedur (Aben Ezra, Onk Jonath, and Rabbins generally), wood most proper to float (Kimchi), the Greek κερπεδαν (Jun Trench.; Bux, πᾶν (Aven.; Munst.), τοπεαντίον (Castado), are little better than gratuitous. The rendering cedur has been defended by Pilletier, who refers to the great abundance of this tree in Asia, and the durability of its timber.

The Mohammedan equivalent is sîg, by which Herbelot understands the Indian plane-tree. Two principal conjectures, however, have been proposed: (1.) By Is. Vossius (Diss. de LXX. Interc. c. 12) that ἔδαφος = κέδρος, resine; whence σίγις, meaning any of the trees of the resin kind, such as pine, fir, etc. (2.) By Fuller (Miscell. Sac. iv. 5), Bochart (Phaleg, i. 4), Celsius (Hierobot, pt. i. p. 328), Hasse (Entdeckungen, pt. ii. p. 78), that Gopher is cypress, in favor of which opinion (adopted by Gesen. Lxx.) they advance the similarity in sound of gopher and cypress (κατέχω = γορρεί; the suitability of the cypress for building, and the fact that this tree abounded in Babylonia, and more particularly in Adiabene, where it supplied Alexander with timber for a whole fleet (Arrian. vii. p. 161, ed. Steph.).

A tradition is mentioned in Eutychius (Annals, p. 34) to the effect that the Ark was made of the wood Soñf, by which is probably meant not the ebony, but the Juniperus Sibina, a species of cypress (Bochart and Cetk.: Rosenm. Scholl. ad Gen. vi. 14, and Alterthumsk. vol. iv. pt. 1). T. E. B.

Gorgias (Gorgias): [Alex. 1 Mac. iii. 38, 2 Mac. xii. 35, 37, Gorgyes; 1 Mac. iv. 5, Κόρ-γιας], a general in the service of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Mac. iii. 38, αὐθίνθαυνος τῶν ψιλῶν τοῦ Βασιλέα; cf. 2 Mac. viii. 9), who was appointed by his recent Lydias to a command in the expedition against Judas in B. C. 166, in which he was defeated by Judas Maccabeus with great loss (1 Mac. iv. 1 ff.). At a later time (B. C. 164) he held a garrison in Jamnia, and defeated the forces of Joseph and Azarias, who attacked him contrary to the orders of Judas (1 Mac. v. 50 ff.; Joseph. Ant. xii. 8, § 6; 2 Mac. xii. 32). The account of Gorgias in 2 Mac. is very obscure. He is represented there as acting in a military capacity (2 Mac. x. 14, στρατηγὸς τῶν τάκτων (?), hardly of Cœle-Syria, as Grinn (l. c.) takes it), apparently in concert with the Idumeans, and afterwards he is described, according to the present text as, "governor of Idumaea" (2 Mac. xii. 32), though it is possible (Giotius, Grinn, l. c.) that the reading is an error for "governor of Jamnia" (Joseph. Ant. xii. 8, § 6, τῆς Ιουδαίας στρατηγὸς). The hostility of the Jews towards him is described in strong terms (2 Mac. xii. 33, τὸν καταδιδόντα, A. V. "that cursed man"); and while his success is only noticed in passing, his defeat and flight are given in detail, though confusedly (2 Mac. xii. 34-38; cf. Joseph. l. c.).

The name itself was borne by one of Alexander's generals, and occurs at later times among the eastern Greeks.

B. F. W.

Gortyna (Γορτύνα [Γορτύνα in 1 Mac.]), in classical writers, Γορτύνα or Πορτόνυα [Γορτύνα], a city of Crete, and in ancient times its most im-
GOSHEN

The only direct Biblical interest of Gortyna is in the fact that it appears from 1 Macc. xv. 23 to have contained Jewish residents. [VII. 126.] The circumstance alluded to in this passage took place in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor; and it is possible that the Jews had increased in Crete during the reign of his predecessor Ptolemy Philometor, who received many of them into Egypt, and who also rebuilt some parts of Gortyna (Strab. x. p. 478). This city was nearly half-way between the eastern and western extremities of the island; and it is worth while to notice that it was near Fair Havens; so that St. Paul may possibly have preached the gospel there, when on his voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii. 8). He saw Gortyna seems to have been the capital of the island under the Romans. For the remains on the old site and in the neighborhood, see the Museum of Classical Antiquities, ii. 272-286.

J. S. H.

GOSHEN (גֹּשֶן): Ge'rāh; [Gen. xlii. 29, יֵפֹתֵשׁ פָּלאט; for ver. 28 see below:] Gessen), a word of uncertain etymology, the name of a part of Egypt where the Israelites dwelt for the whole period of their sojourn in that country. It is usually called the "land of Goshen," גֹּשֶן גֹּשֶׁן, but also Goshen simply. It appears to have borne another name, "the land of Rameses," רֵעֶשׁ רֵעֶשׁ (Gen. xlii. 11), unless this be the name of a district of Goshen. The first mention of Goshen is in Joseph's message to his father: "Thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, and thou shalt be near unto me" (Gen. xlii. 10). This shows that the territory was near the usual royal residence or the residence of Joseph's Pharaoh. The dynasty to which we assign this king, the nineteenth [Egypt: Joseph], appears to have resided part of the year at Memphis, and part of the year, at harvest-time, at Avaris on the Balastite or Pelusiac branch of the Nile; this, Manetho tells us, was the custom of the first king (Joseph. e. Apen, i. 11). In the account of the arrival of Jacob it is said of the patriarch: "He sent Judah before him unto Joseph, to direct his face unto Goshen: and they came into the land of Goshen. And Joseph made ready his chariot, and went up to meet Israel his father, to Goshen" (Gen. xlii. 28, 29). This land was therefore between Joseph's residence at the time and the frontier of Palestine, and apparently the extreme province towards that country. The advice that Joseph gave his brethren as to their conduct to Pharaoh further characterizes the territory: "When Pharaoh shall call you, and shall say, What [is] your occupation? Then ye shall say, Thy servants have been herdsmen of cattle (גֹּשֶן גֹּשֶׁן) from our youth even until now, both we: and also our fathers; that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen: for every shepherd (גֹּשֶן גֹּשֶׁן) [is] an abomination unto the Egyptians" (xliii. 33, 34). It is remarkable that in Coptic Ṣṯḥc signifies both "a shepherd" and "disgrace" and the like (Rosellini, Monumenti storici, i. 177). This passage shows that Goshen was scarcely regarded as a part of Egypt Proper, and was not peopled by Egyptians—characteristics that would positively indicate a frontier province. But it is not to be inferred that Goshen had no Egyptian inhabitants at this period: at the time of the ten plagues such are distinctly mentioned.

That there was, moreover, a foreign population besides the Israelites, seems evident from the account of the calamity of Pharaoh's house [Beri]ah and the mention of the בְּנֵי גֹּשֶן who went out at the Exodus (Ex. xii. 38), notices referring to the earlier and the later period of the sojourn. The name Goshen itself appears to be Hebraic, or Semitic—although we do not venture with Jerome to derive it from בְּנֵי גֹּשֶן—for it also occurs as the name of a district and of a town in the south of Palestine (infe‖, 2), where we could scarcely expect an appellation of Egyptian origin unless given after the Exodus, which in this case does not seem likely. It is also noticeable that some of the names of places in Goshen or its neighborhood, as certainly Migdol and Bala-zephon, are Semitic (Baal-zaphon), the only positive exceptions being the cities Pitthen and Ramesses, built during the oppression.

The next mention of Goshen confirms the previous inference that its position was between Canaan and the Delta (Gen. xliii. 1). The nature of the country is indicated more clearly than in the passage last quoted in the answer of Pharaoh to the request of Joseph's brethren, and in the account of the settling of the Israelites in the land of Goshen. And Joseph spoke unto Joseph, saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee: the land of Egypt [is] before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and brethren to dwell: in the land of Goshen let them dwell: and if thou knowest any men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle. . . . And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded" (Gen. xliii. 5, 6, 11). Goshen was thus a pastoral country where some of Pharaoh's cattle were kept. The expression "in the best of the land," גֹּשֶן גָּרֶם גָּרֶם (in ye ṭב אֵלֶּי עֵלֶּי, ye Egypti herd), must, we think, be relative, the best of the land for a pastoral people (although we do not accept Michaelis' reading גָּרֶם גָּרֶם, "pastures" by comparison with מַעֲרֹת, Suppl. p. 102f; see Gesen. Thea. s. v. בּוּשָׁן), for in the matter of fertility the richest parts of Egypt are those nearest to the Nile, a position which, as will be seen, we cannot assign to Goshen. The sufficient evidence for this tract for the Israelites, their prosperity there, and their virtual separation, as is evident from the account of the plagues, from the great body of the Egyptians, must also be borne in mind. The clearest indications of the exact position of Goshen are those afforded by the narrative of the Exodus. The Israelites set out from the town of Rameses in the land of Goshen, made two days' journey of this tract for wilderness, and in one day more reached the Red Sea. At the starting-point two routes lay before them, "the way of the land of the Philistines . . . that [was] near," and "the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Ex. xiii. 17, 18). From these indications we infer that the land of Goshen must have in part been near the eastern side of the ancient Delta, Ramesses lying within the valley now called the Wady Tempe, the land of Goshen about thirty miles in a direct course from the ancient western shore of the Arabian Gulf (Exodus, iii).

The results of the foregoing examination of Biblical evidence are that the land of Goshen [in]
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between the eastern part of the ancient Delta and the western border of Palestine, that it was scarcely a part of Egypt Proper, was inhabited by other foreigners besides the Israelites, and was in its geographical names rather Semitic than Egyptian; that it was a pasture-land, especially suited to a shepherd-people, and sufficient for the Israelites, who there prospered, and were separate from the main body of the Egyptians; and lastly, that one of its towns lay near the western extremity of the Wādīt-Tumeylah. These indications, except only that of sufficiency, to be afterwards considered, seem to us decisive to indicate the Wādīt-Tumeylah, the valley along which anciently flowed the canal of the Red Sea. Other identifications seem to us to be utterly untenable. If with Lepsius we place Goshen below Heliopolis, near Bubastis and Bithynia, the distance from the Red Sea of three days' journey of the Israelites, and the separate character of the country, are violently set aside. If we consider it the same as the Bocotia, we have either the same difficulty as to the distance, or we must imagine a route almost wholly through the wilderness, instead of only for the last third or less of its distance.

Having thus concluded that the land of Goshen appears to have corresponded to the Wādīt-Tumeylah, we have to consider whether the extent of this tract would be sufficient for the subsistence of the Israelites. The superficial extent of the Wādīt-Tumeylah, if we include the whole cultivable part of the natural valley, which may somewhat exceed that of the tract bearing this appellation, is probably under 60 square geographical miles. If we suppose the entire Israelite population at the time of the Exodus to have been 1,800,000, and the whole population, including Egyptians and foreigners other than the Israelites, about 2,000,000, this would give no less than between 30,000 and 40,000 inhabitants to the square mile, which would be half as dense as the ordinary population of an eastern city. It must be remembered, however, that we need not suppose the Israelites to have been limited to the valley for pasture, but like the Arabs to have led their flocks into fertile tracts of the desert around, and that we have taken for our estimate its extreme sum, that of the people of the Exodus. For the greater part of the sojourn their numbers must have been far lower, and before the Exodus they seem to have been partly spread about the territory of the oppressor, although collected at Rameses at the time of their departure. One very large place, like the Shepherd-stronghold of Avaris, which Manetho relates to have had at the first a garrison of 240,000 men, would also greatly diminish the disproportion of population to superfluities. The very small superficial extent of Egypt in relation to the population necessary to the construction of the vast monuments, and the maintenance of the great armies of the Pharaohs, requires a different proportion to that of other countries— a condition fully explained by the extraordinary fertility of the soil. Even now, when the population is almost at the lowest point it has reached in history, when villages have replaced towns, and hamlets villages, it is still enough to determine that of the four rich and popula-
ted Yorkshire. We do not think, therefore, that the small superfluities presents any serious difficulty.

Thus far we have reasoned alone on the evidence of the Hebrew text. The LXX. version, however, presents some curious evidence which must not be passed over unnoticed. The testimony of this version in any Egyptian matter is not to be disregarded, although in this particular case too much stress should not be laid on it, since the tradition of Goshen and its inhabitants must have become very faint among the Egyptians at the time when the Pentateuch was translated, and we have no warrant for attributing to the translator or translators any more than a general and popular knowledge of Egyptian matters. In Gen. xiv. 10, for ΓΩΣΗΝ the LXX. has ΓΙΟΤΩI, Ἀραβίας. The explanatory word may be understood either as meaning that Goshen lay in the region of Lower Egypt to the east of the Delta, or else as indicating that the Arabian Nome was partly or wholly the same. In the latter case it must be remembered that the Abydos, the Arabian Nome, was more far-reaching than under the Ptolemies. On either supposition the passage is favorable to our identification. In Gen. xvi. 28, instead of ΓΩΣΗΝ, the LXX. has καθ’ Ἄραμων πόλιν, ἐν τῇ Ραμσησ (or εἰς τῇ Ραμσησ), seemingly identifying Rameses with Heropolis. It is scarcely possible to fix the site of the latter town, but there is no doubt that it lay in the valley not far from the ancient head of the Arabian Gulf. Its position is too near the gulf for the Rameses of Scripture, and it was probably chosen merely because at the time when the translation was made it was the chief place of the territory where the Israelites had been. It must be used, however, that in Exod. xii. 11, the LXX., fol-
lowed by the Septuagint, reads, instead of "Pithom and Rameses," τῷ τῷ Πιθῶμ, καὶ Ραμσης, καὶ Ὄμην, ἢ ἄστοι Χαλδαίας. Eusebius identifies Rameses with Avaris, the Shepherd-stronghold on the Υδατικ branch of the Nile (ap. Cramer, Anecd. Parisii, ii. p. 174). The evidence of the LXX. version therefore lends a general support to the theory we have advocated. [See Exodus, t. i.]

R. S. P.

2. [ΓΩΣΗΝ: Γοσῆα. [Genesen; Josh. x. 41, in Vulg. ed. 1390,] Gosen; [ed. 1393.] Gozen] the "land" or the "country (both ΥΥζ) of Goshen," is twice named as a district in Southern Palestine (Josh. x. 41, xii. 16). From the first of these it would seem to have lain between Gaza and Gibeon, and therefore to be some part of the maritime plain of Judah; but in the latter passage, that plain — the Shefelah, is expressly specified in addition to Goshen (Josh. xii. 16). In the article above, too, the situation of Goshen — if the order of the statement be any indication — would seem to be between the "south" and the Shefelah (A. V. "valley"). If Goshen was any portion of this rich plain, is it not possible that its fertility may have suggested the name to the Israelites? but this is not more than mere conjecture. On the other hand the name may be far older, and may retain a trace of early intercourse between Egypt and the south of the promised land. For such intercourse comp. I Chr. vii. 21.

3. [Γοσῆα: Gosen.] A town of the same name is once mentioned in company with Debir, Socoh, and others, as in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 51). There is nothing to connect this place with the district last spoken of. It has not yet been identified.

G. GOSPELS. The name Gospel (from god and spe1, Ang. Sax. god message or news, which is a translation of the Greek εὐαγγέλιον) is applied to the four inspired histories of the life and teaching
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of Christ contained in the New Testament, of which separate accounts will be given in their place. [Matthew; Mark; Luke; John.] It may be fairly said that the genuineness of these four narratives rests upon better evidence than that of any other ancient writings. They were all composed during the lifetime of the chief characters of the story of St. Matthew and St. Mark some years before the destruction of Jerusalem; that of St. Luke probably about A. D. 64; and that of St. John towards the close of the century. Before the end of the second century, there is abundant evidence that the four Gospels, as one collection, were generally used and accepted. Irenaeus, who suffered martyrdom about A. D. 202, the disciple of Polycarp and Papias, who, from having been in Asia, in Gaul, and in Rome, had ample means of knowing the belief of various churches, says that the authority of the four Gospels was so far confirmed that even the heretics of his time could not reject them, but were obliged to attempt to prove their tenets out of one or other of them (Contra. Her. iii. 11, § 7). Tertullian, in a work written about A. D. 208, mentions the four Gospels, two of them as the works of St. Mark and two as that of the discipulus Apostoli (apostolic); and rests their authority on their apostolic origin (Jusbe. Morcicn, lib. iv. c. 2). Origae, who was born about A. D. 185, and died A. D. 253, describes the Gospels in a character

teristic strain of metaphor as "the four [element]s of the Church's faith, of which the whole world, reconciled to God in Christ, is composed" (In Johan. [tom. i. § 6]). Elsewhere, in commenting on the opening words of St. Luke, he draws a line between the inspired Gospels and such productions as the Muratorian canon and the "Memoirs of the Twelve," and the like (Homil. in Luc., Obs. iii. 932 § 1). Although Theophlius, who became sixth (seventh?) bishop of Antioch about A. D. 188, speaks only of "the Evangelists," without adding their names (Ad Autol. iii. pp. 124, 125), we might fairly conclude with Gieseler that he refers to the collection of four, already known in his time. But from what we know that Theophili arranges the records of the four Evangelists into one work (Epist. ad Alphas, iv. p. 197), Tatian, who died about A. D. 170 (?), compiled a Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels. The Muratorian fragment (Muratori, Antiq. lii. iii. p. 854; Routh, Rel. Sacr. vol. iv. [vol. i. ed. alt.]), which, even if it be not by Taurus and of the second century, is at least a very old monument of the Roman Church, describes the Gospels of Luke and John; but time and tradition have given the first place to the discipulus Apostoli as the Evangelist of the Gospels, as well as to the his testimony as by the spirit, and the flesh is weak," are given precisely as we have them in Matthew. The epistles attributed to Ignatius have a considerable number of expressions which appear to imply an acquaintance with words of Christ preserved by Matthew and John; but they contain no formal quotation of the Gospels; and the uncertainty respecting both the authorship and the text of these epistles is such as to make it unsafe to rest any argument on them. In regard to the Apostolic Fathers, we have, it is true, a number of sayings of Jesus and the facts in his history which they have recorded may have been derived by them from oral tradition. Their writings serve to confirm the truth of the Gospels, but cannot be appealed to as affording direct proof of their genuineness. When we come to Justin Martyr, however, we stand on firmer ground. He, indeed, does not name the Evangelists; and it cannot be said that "many of his quotations are found verbatim in the Gospel of John." His quotations, however, of the "Memoirs of the Apostles," as "Memoirs composed by the Apostles, which are called Gospels" (Apol. i. c. 66), or as he describes them in one place more particularly, "Memoirs composed by Apostles of Christ and their companions" (Dial. e. Tryph. c. 185), are such as to have no reasonable doubt of his use of the first three Gospels; and his use of the fourth Gospel, though contested by most of the critics of the Tubingen school, is now conceded even by Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1865, p. 477). The subject of Justin Martyr's quotations is discussed in a masterly manner by Mr. Norton in his "Genuineness of the Gospels," 1:200-233, and with fuller detail by Semich, der Apostel, Dukungswissenschaft des Martyrius Justinus, Mamb. 184," and Westcott (History of the Gospels, pp. 383-415). It must not be forgotten that the "Memoirs of the Apostle" used by Justin Martyr were sacred books. 

a * Theophili does not use the term "Evangelists," but speaks of "the Prophecies" of the Old Testament and "the Gospels" as alike divinely inspired (Ad Autol. lib. iii. c. 12, p. 218, ed. 1905). He expressly names John as among those "moved by the Spirit," quoting John i. 1 (ibid. ii. 22, p. 120). After citing a passage from the Book of Proverbs on the duty of charity, he says, "But the Evangelists more teach charity yet more imperfectly," quoting Matt. v. 29, 30 (ibid. iii. 13). Further on, he introduces a quotation from Matthew with the expression, "The Gospel says" (ibid. iii. 11).

b Among the writers who bear testimony to the general reception of the Gospels by Christians before the close of the second century, Clement might well have been mentioned, who succeeded Panteum as president of the celebrated Catechetical School at Alexandria about A. D. 199, and was one of the most learned men of the time. Allusions from the sayings of the Gospels are not, however, always authoritative; they are not only most abundant, but he expressly speaks of "the four Gospels which have been handed down to us," in contrast with an obscure apocryphal book, "The Gospel according to the Egyptians," used by certain heretics (Strom. iii. 13, opp. p. 553, ed. Potter).

c * The Muratorian fragment expressly designates the Gospels of Luke and John as the "third" and "fourth" in order; and the imperfect sentence with which it begins applies to Mark. A note of time in the document itself appears to indicate that it was composed not far from A. D. 170, perhaps earlier; but the question of the date is not wholly free from difficulty. Recent critical editions and discussions of this interesting relic of Christian antiquity may be found in Cremer's Greek, des Neuest. Kanon, heraus, von Volckmar (Berlin, 1899), pp. 111-170, 311-394; Hilgenfeld's Der Kanon u. die kritik des N. T. Halle, 1893, pp. 35-43; and Westcott's Hist of the Canon of the N. T. 1873, ed. 1901, pp. 184-194, 494-488. Martyr's quotations are discussed in a masterly manner by Mr. Norton in his "Genuineness of the Gospels," 1:200-233, and with fuller detail by Semich, der Apostel, Dukungswissenschaft des Martyrius Justinus, Mamb. 184," and Westcott (History of the Gospels, pp. 383-415). It must not be forgotten that the "Memoirs of the Apostle" used by Justin Martyr were sacred books.
in 364, and that of the third Council of Carthage in 397, in both of which the four Gospels are numbered in the Canon of Scripture, there can hardly be room for doubt on the solid principle of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, and possibly of St. Mark also, whose words it is more difficult to separate. The quotations from St. Matthew are the most numerous. In historical references, the mode of quotation is more free, and the narrative occasionally unites those of Matthew and Luke: in a very few cases he alludes to matters not mentioned in the canonical Gospels. Besides these, St. Matthew was also employed by the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, by Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus. Eusebius records that Pantemus found in India (?) the south of Arabia (?) Christians who used the Gospel of St. Matthew. 

All this shows that long before the end of the second century the Gospel of St. Matthew was in general use. From the fact that St. Mark's Gospel has few places peculiar to it, it is more difficult to believe that it was not expressly assigned to him; but Justin Martyr and Irenaeus appear to quote his Gospel, and Irenaeus does so by name. St. Luke is quoted by Justin, Irenaeus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus; and St. John by all of these, with the addition of Ignatius, the Epistle to Diognetus, and Polycrates. From these we may conclude that before the end of the second century the Gospel collection was well known and in general use. There is yet another line of evidence; the heretical sects, as well as the Fathers of the Church, knew the Gospels; and as there was the greatest hostility between them, if the Gospels had become known in the Church after the discussion arose, the heretics would never have accepted them as genuine from such a quarter. But the Gnostics and Marcionites arose early in the second century; and therefore it is probable that the Gospels were then accepted, and thus they are traced back almost to the times of the Apostles (Olahansen). A review of all the witnesses, from the Apostolic Fathers down to the Canon of the Laodicean Council read in the churches on the Lord's day, in connection with the Prophecies of the Old Testament (Justin, Apol. i. 122, II. 24); Luke's testimony would be strong enough to establish so easy a phenomenon in the Acts of the Apostles. Confining ourselves to this narrow mode of proof, we arrive at what in a common case would be a satisfactory conclusion. But when we endeavor to strengthen this evidence by appealing to the writings ascribed to Apostolic Fathers, we in fact weaken its force. At the very extremity of the chain of evidence, where it ought to be strongest, we are attacking defective links which will bear no weight.

The direct historical evidence for the genuineness of the Gospels...is of a very different kind from what we have just been considering. It consists in the indisputable fact, that throughout a community of millions of individuals, scattered over Europe, Asia, and Africa, the Gospels were regarded with the highest reverence, as the works of the Apostles to whom they were ascribed, at so early a period that there could be no difficulty in determining whether they were genuine or not, and when every intelligent Christian must have been deeply interested to ascertain the truth. And this fact assumes a far greater importance in the case of the great body of Christians to the genuineness of the gospels, it is itself a phenomenon admitting of no explanation, except that the four Gospels had all been handed down as genuine from the Apostolic age, and had every reason to be regarded as genuine and as received through the world.
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In the fourth Gospel the narrative coincides with that of the other three in a few passages only. Putting aside the account of the Passion, there are only three facts which John relates in common with the other Evangelists. Two of these are, the feeding of the five thousand, and the storm on the sea of Galilee (ch. vi.), which appear to be introduced in connection with the discourse that arose out of the miracle, related by John alone. The third is the anointing of His feet by Mary; and it is worthy of notice that the narrative of John recalls something of each of the other three: the actions of the woman are drawn from Luke, the ointment and its value are described in Mark, and the adoration of the disciples to Jesus appears in Matthew; and John combines in one narrative the three parts.

Whilst the three present the life of Jesus in Galilee, John follows him into Judaea; nor should we know, but for him, that our Lord had journeyed to Jerusalem at the prescribed feasts. Only one discourse of our Lord that was delivered in Galilee, that in the 6th chapter, is recorded by John. The disciple whom Jesus loved had it put into his mind to write a Gospel which should more expressly than the others set forth Jesus as the Incarnate Word of God: if he also had in view the beginnings of the errors of Cerinthus and others before him at the time, as Irenaeus and Jerome assert, the polemical purpose is quite subordinate to the dogmatic. He does not war against a temporary error, but preaches for all time that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, in order that believing we may have life through His name. Now many of the facts omitted by St. John and recorded by the rest are such as would have contributed most directly to this great design; why then are they omitted? The received explanation is the only satisfactory one, namely, that John, writing last, at the close of the first century, had seen the other Gospels, and purposely abstained from writing anew what they had sufficiently recorded. [John 20:24]

The agreement of the Gospels there is a great amount of agreement. If we suppose the history that they contain to be divided into sections, in 42 of these all the three narratives coincide, 12 more are given by Matthew and Mark only, 5 by Mark and Luke only, and 14 by Matthew and Luke. To these must be added 5 peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, and 9 to Luke; and the enumeration is complete. But this applies only to general coincidence as to the facts narrated: the amount of verbal coincidence, that is, the passages either verbally the same, or coinciding in the use of many of the same words, is much smaller. "By far the larger portion," says Professor Andrew Norton (Genuineness, i. p. 210, 2d ed. [Addit. Notes, p. civ. f., Amer. ed.]), "of this verbal agreement is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels amount to less than a sixth part of its contents: and of this about seven eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only about one eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the Evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark, the proportion of coincident passages to the whole contents of the Gospel is about one sixth, of which not one fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other Evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel; and but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative—less than a twentieth part. These proportions should be further compared with those which the narrative part of each Gospel bears to that in which the narrative passages are professedly repeated. Matthew's narrative occupies about one fourth of his Gospel; Mark's about one half, and Luke's about one third. It may easily be computed, therefore, that the proportion of verbal coincidence found in the narrative part of each Gospel, compared with what exists in the other part, is about in the following ratios: in Matthew as one to something more than two, in Mark as one to four, and in Luke as one to ten. Without going minutely into the examination of examples, which would be desirable if space permitted, the leading facts connected with the subject may be thus summed up: The verbal and material agreement of the three first Evangelists is such as does not occur in any other authors who have written independently of one another. The verbal agreement is greater where the spoken words of others are cited than where facts are recorded; and greatest in quotations of the words of our Lord. But in some leading events, as in the call of the four first disciples, that of Matthew, and the Transfiguration, the agreement even in expression is remarkable: there are also narratives where there is no verbal harmony in the outset, but only in the crisis or emphatic part of the story (Matt. viii. 3 = Mark i. 41 = Luke v. 15, and Matt. xiv. 19, 20 = Mark vi. 41-45 = Luke ix. 16, 17). The narratives of our Lord's early life, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, have little in common; while St. Mark does not include that part of the history in his plan. The agreement in the narrative portions of the Gospels begins with the Baptism of John, and reaches its highest point in the account of the Passion of our Lord and the facts that preceded it; so that a direct ratio might almost be said to exist between the amount of agreement and the importance of the facts related to the Passion. After this event, in the account of His burial and resurrection, the coincidences are few. The language of all three is Greek, with Hebrew idioms: the Hebraisms are most abundant in St. Mark, and fewest in St. Luke. In quotations from the Old Testament, the Evangelists, or two of them, sometimes exhibit a verbal agreement, although they differ from the Hebrew and from the Septuagint version (Matt. iii. 3 = Mark i. 3 = Luke iii. 4. Matt. iv. 10 = Luke iv. 8. Matt. xi. 10 = Mark i. 2 = Luke vii. 27, &c.). Except as to 24 verses, the Gospel of Mark contains no principal facts which are not found in Matthew and Luke: but he often supplies details omitted by them, and these are often such as would belong to the graphic account of an eye-witness. There are no cases in which Matthew and Luke exactly harmonize, where Mark does not also coincide with them. In several places the words of Mark have something in common with each of the other narratives, so as to form a connecting link.
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between them, where their words slightly differ. The examples of verbal agreement between Mark and Luke are not so long or so numerous as those between Matthew and Mark, and Matthew and Mark: but as to the arrangement of events Mark and Luke frequently coincide, where Matthew differs from them. These are the leading particulars; but they are very far from giving a complete notion of a phenomenon that is well worthy of that attention and reverent study of the sacred text by which alone it can be fully and fairly apprehended.

These facts exhibit the three Gospels as three distinct records of the life and works of the Redeemer, but with a greater amount of agreement than three wholly independent accounts could be expected to exhibit. The agreement would be no difficulty, without the differences; it would only mark the one divine source from which they are all derived—the Holy Spirit, who spake by the prophets. The difference of form and style, without the agreement, would offer no difficulty, since there may be a substantial harmony between accounts that differ greatly in mode of expression, and the very difference might be a guarantee of independence. The harmony and the variety, the agreement and the differences, form together the problem with which Biblical critics have occupied themselves for a century and a half.

The number of differences is so many, that they can be more easily classified than enumerated. The first and most obvious suggestion would be, that the narrators made use of each other’s works. Accordingly Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, and many others, have endeavored to ascertain which Gospel is to be regarded as the first; which is copied from the first; and which is the last, and copied from the other two. It is remarkable that each of the six possible combinations has found advocates; and this of itself proves the uncertainty of the theory (Hp. Mark’s “Michaelis, iii. p. 172; De Wette, Handbuch, § 22 ff.). When we are told by men of research that the Gospel of St. Mark is plainly founded upon the other two, as Griesbach, Büsching, and others assure us; and again, that the Gospel of St. Mark is certainly the primitive Gospel, on which the other two are founded, as by Whiston (Eichhorn), it is not always relying mainly on facts that lie within the compass of the text, we are not disposed to expect much fruit from the discussion. But the theory in its crude form is in itself most improbable; and the wonder is that so much time and learning have been devoted to it. It assumes that an Evangelist has taken up the work of his predecessor, and without substantial alteration has made a few changes in form, a few additions and retrenchments, and has then allowed the whole to go forth under his name. Whatever order of the three is adopted to favor the hypothesis, the omission by the second or third, of matter in serted by the first, offers a great difficulty; since it would indicate a tacit opinion that these passages are either less useful or of less authority than the rest. The nature of the alterations is not such as we should expect to find in an age little given to literary composition, and in authors so unlearned as these are admitted to be. The replacement of a word by a synonym, neither more nor less apt, the omission of a saying in one place and insertion of it in another, the occasional transposition of events; these are not in conformity with the habits of a time in which composition was little studied, and only practiced as a necessity. Basiles, such deviations, which in writers wholly independent of each other are only the guarantee of their independence, cannot appear in those who copy from each other without showing a certain wilfulness—an intention to contradict and alter—that seems quite irreconcilable with any view of inspiration. These general objections will be found to take a still more cogent shape against any particular form of this hypothesis: whether it is attempted to show that the Gospel of St. Mark, as the shortest, is also the earliest and primitive Gospel, or that this very Gospel bears evident signs of being the latest, a compilation from the other two; or that the order in the canon of Scripture is also the chronological order—and all these views have found defenders at no distant date—the theory that each Evangelist only copied from his predecessors offers the same general features, a plausible argument from a few facts, which is met by insuperable difficulties as soon as the remaining facts are taken in (Gieseler, pp. 35, 36; J. Marshall’s “Michaelis, vol. iii., part ii. p. 171 ff.).

The supposition of a common original from which the three Gospels were drawn, each with more or less modification, would naturally occur to those who rejected the notion that the Evangelists had copied from each other. A passage of Epiphanius has been often quoted in support of this (Harnack, ii. 6), but the ξειάνσις τις πνεύματος no doubt refers to the inspiring Spirit from which all three drew their authority, and not to any earthly copy, written or oral, of His divine message. The best notion of that class of speculations which would establish a written document as the common original of the three Gospels, will be gained perhaps from Bishop Marsh’s (“Michaelis, vol. iii. part ii.) account of Eichhorn’s hypothesis, and of his own additions to it. It appeared to Eichhorn that the portions which are common to all the three Gospels were contained in a certain common document, from which they all drew. Niemeyer had already assumed that copies of such a document had got into circulation, and had been altered and annotated by different hands. Now Eichhorn tries to show, from an exact comparison of passages, that "the sections, whether great or small, which are common to St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not to St. Luke, and at the same time occupy places in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark which correspond to each other, were additions made in the copies used by St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not in the copy used by St. Luke; and, in like manner, that the sections found in the corresponding places of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, but not contained in the Gospel of St. Matthew, were additions made in the copies used by St. Mark and St. Luke” (p. 192). Thus Eichhorn considers himself entitled to assume that he can reconstruct the original document, and also that there must have been four other documents to account for the phenomena of the text. Thus he makes—

1. The original document.
2. An altered copy which St. Matthew used.
3. An altered copy which St. Luke used.
4. A third copy, made from the two preceding, used by St. Mark.

As there is no external evidence worth considering that this original or any of its numerous copies ever existed, the value of this elaborate hypothesis
must depend upon its furnishing the only explanation, and that a sufficient one, of the facts of the text. Bishop Marsh, however, finds it necessary, in order to complete the account of the text, to raise a number of documents to eight, still without producing any external evidence for the existence of any of them; and this, on one side, deprives Eichhorn's theory of the merit of completeness, and, on the other, presents a much broader surface to the obvious objections. He assumes the existence of—

1. A Hebrew original.
3. A transcript of No. 1, with alterations and additions.
4. Another, with another set of alterations and additions.
5. Another, combining both the preceding, used by St. Mark, who also used No. 2.
6. Another, with the alterations and additions of No. 3, and with further additions, used by St. Matthew.
7. Another, with those of No. 4 and further additions, used by St. Luke, who also used No. 2.
8. A wholly distinct Hebrew document, in which our Lord's precepts, parables, and discourses were recorded, but not in chronological order; used both by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

To this it is added, that as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke contain Greek translations of Hebrew materials, which were incorporated into St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, the person who translated St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel into Greek frequently derived assistance from the Gospel of St. Mark, where he had matter in connection with St. Matthew; and in those places, but in those places only, where St. Mark had no matter in connection with St. Matthew, he had frequently recourse to St. Luke's Gospel (p. 581). One is hardly surprised after this to learn that Eichhorn soon after put forth a revised hypothesis (Ehelilung in das N. T. 1804), in which a supposed Greek translation of a supposed Aramaic original took a conspicuous part; nor that Hug was able to point out that even the most liberal assumption of written documents had not provided for one case, that of the verbal agreement of St. Mark and St. Luke, to the exclusion of St. Matthew; and which, though it is quite rare occurrence, would require, on Eichhorn's theory, an additional Greek version.

It will be allowed that this elaborate hypothesis, whether in the form given it by Marsh or by Eichhorn, possesses almost every fault that can be charged against an argument of that kind. For every new class of facts a new document must be assumed to have existed; and Hug's objection does not really weaken the theory, since the new class of documents he mentions only requires a new version of the "original Gospel," which can be supplied on demand. A theory so prolific in assumptions may still stand, if it can be proved that no other solution is possible; but since this cannot be shown, even as against the modified theory of Gratz (Nye Versuch, etc., 1812), then we are reminded of the schoolman's exclamation, "qui non multum prodest quod non additur." To assume for every new class of facts the existence of another complete edition and recension of the original work is quite gratuitous; the documents might have been as easily supposed to be fragmentary memorials, brought in by the Evangelists into the web of the original Gospel; or the coincidences might be, as Gratz supposes, cases where one Gospel has been interpolated by portions of another. Then the "original Gospel" is supposed to have been of such authority as to be circulated everywhere: yet so defective, as to require help from any hand; so little revered, that no hand dared ed it. If all the Evangelists agreed to draw from such a work, it must have been widely if not universally accepted in the Church; and yet there is no record of its existence. The force of this dilemma has been felt by the supporters of the theory: if the work was of high authority, it would have been preserved, or at least mentioned; if of lower authority, it could not have become the basis of three canonical Gospels: and various attempts have been made to escape from it.

Berthold tries to find traces of its existence in the titles of works other than our present Gospels, which were current in the earliest ages; but Gieseler has so diminished the force of his arguments, that only one of them need here be mentioned. Berthold ingeniously argues that a Gospel used by St. Paul, and transmitted to the Christians in Pontus, was the basis of Maricon's Gospel; and assumes that it was also the "original Gospel;" so that in the Gospel of Maricon there would be a transcript, though corrupted, of this primitive document. But there is no proof at all that St. Paul used any written Gospel; and as to that of Maricon, if the work of Hahn had not settled the question, the researches of such writers as Volkmar, Zeller, Ritschl, and Hilgenfeld, are held to have proved that the old opinion of Tertullian and Epiphanius is also the true one, and that the so-called Gospel of Maricon was not an independent work, but an abridged version of St. Luke's Gospel, altered by the heretic to suit his peculiar tenets. (See Berthold, ib. 1208-1223; Gieseler, p. 57; Weisse, Evangelienfrage, p. 73.) We must conclude then that the work has perished without record. Not only has this fact befallen the Aramaic or Hebrew original, but the translation and the five or six recensions. But it may well be asked whether the state of letters in Palestine at this time was such as to make this constant editing, translating, annotating, and enriching of a history a natural and probable process. With the independence of the Jews their literature had declined; from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, so far as they are known and there are records of their works have become known, if at all, in Greek translations through the Alexandrine Jews. That the period of which we are speaking was for the Jews one of very little literary activity, is generally admitted; and if this applies to all classes of the people, it would be true of the humble and uneducated class from which the first converts came (Acts iv. 13; James ii. 5). Even the second law (Bevropö), which is the law of the heathen after the revolt, and the conditions under which the knowledge of the learned class consisted, was handed down by oral tradition, without being reduced to writing. The theory of Eichhorn is only probable amidst a people given to literary habits, and in a class of that people where education was good and literary activity likely to prevail: the conditions here are the very reverse (see Gieseler's able argument, p. 59 ff.). These are only a few of the objections which may be raised, on critical and historical grounds, against the theory of Eichhorn and Marsh.

But it must not be forgotten that this question reaches beyond history and criticism, and has a deep theological interest. We are offered here an...
Jesus, according to which we now rely on the Gospels as pure, true, and genuine histories of the life of Jesus, composed by four independent witnesses inspired for that work, would be taken away. Even the testimony of the writers of the second century to the universal acceptance of these books would be invalidated, from their silence and ignorance about the strange circumstances which are supposed to have affected their composition.

The English student will find in Bp. Marsh's Translation of Michaelis's Introd. to N. T. iii. 2, 1803, an account of Eichhorn's earlier theory and of his own. Veysie's Examination of Mr. Morris's Hypothesis, 1808, has suggested many of the objections. In Bp. Thirlwall's Translation of Schleiermacher on St. Luke, 1825, Introduction, is an account of the whole question. Other important works are, an essay of Eichhorn, in the 9th vol. Allgemeine Bibliothek der literarischen Literatur, 1791; the Essay of Bp. Marsh, just quoted; Eichhorn, Einleitung in das N. T. 1804; Gratz, Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drey ersten Evang. zu erklären, 1812; Bertholdt, Histor. kritische Einleitung in sämtliche k. ev. und apok. Schriften des A. und N. T., 1812-1819; and the work of Gieseler, quoted above. See also De Wette, Lehrbuch, and Westcott, Introduction, already quoted; also Weisse, Evangelienfrage, 1831, and the Supplement of the 4th edition of the subject, see addition to the present article.

There is another supposition to account for these facts, of which perhaps Gieseler has been the most sequestrer. It is probable that none of the Gospels was written until many years after the day of Pentecost, on which the Holy Spirit descended on the assembled disciples. From that day commenced at Jerusalem the work of preaching the Gospel and converting the world. So sedulously were the Apostles in this work that they divested themselves of the labor of ministering to the poor in order that they might give themselves "continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word." (Acts vi. 4.) Prayer and preaching were the business of their lives. Now their preaching must have been, from the nature of the case, in great part historical; it must have been based upon an account of the life and acts of Jesus of Nazareth. They had been the eye-witnesses of a wondrous life, of acts and sufferings that had an influence over all the world: many of their hearers had never heard of Jesus, many others had received false accounts of one whom it suited the Jewish rulers to stigmatize as an impostor. The ministry of our Lord went on principally in Galilee; the first preaching was addressed to people in Judaea. There was no written record to which the hearers might be referred for historical details, and therefore the preachers must furnish not only inferences from the life of our Lord, but the facts of the life itself. The preaching, then, must have been of such a kind as to be to the hearers what the reading of lessons from the Gospels is to us. So far as the records of apostolic preaching in the Acts of the Apostles go, they cannot have had this view. The records of Paul at Antioch, preach alike the facts of the Redeemer's life and death. There is no improbability in supposing that in the course of twenty or thirty years' assiduous teaching, without a written Gospel, the matter of the apostolic preaching should have taken a settled form. Not only might the Apostles think it well that their own accounts should agree, as in substance so in form; but the teachers whom they sent forth, or left behind in the churches they visited, would have to be prepared for their mission; and, so long as there was no written Gospel to put into their hands, it might be desirable that the oral instruction should be as far as possible one and the same to all. It is by no means certain that the interval between the mission of the Comforter and his work of directing the writing of the first Gospel was so long as is here supposed; the date of the Hebrews of Matthew may be earlier. [Matthew.] But the argument remains the same: the preaching of the Apostles would probably begin to take one settled form, if at all, during the first years of their ministry. If they were allowed to ask why God in his providence saw fit to defer the gift of a written Gospel to his people, the answer would be, that for the first few years the powerful working of the Holy Spirit in the living members of the church supplied the place of those records, which, as soon as the brightness of his presence began to be at all withdrawn, became indispensable in order to prevent the corruption of the Gospel history by false teachers.

He was promised as one who should "teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever the Lord had said unto them" (John xiv. 26). And more than once his aid is spoken of as needful, even for the proclamation of facts that are not of immediate interest (John iii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 12); and he is described as a witness with the Apostles, rather than through them, of the things which they had seen during the course of a ministry which they had shared (John xv. 26, 27; Acts v. 32. Compare Acts xv. 28). The personal authority of the Apostles as eye-witnesses of what they preached is not set aside by this divine
and again and again they describe themselves as “witnesses” to facts (Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, x. 39, &c.); and when a vacancy occurs in their number through the fall of Judas, it is almost assumed as a thing of course of that his successor shall be chosen from those “which had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them” (Acts i. 21). The teachings of the Holy Spirit consisted, not in whispering to them facts which they had not witnessed, but rather in revealing the fulness of the promise, and throwing out into their true importance events and sayings that had been esteemed too lightly at the time they took place. But the Apostles could not have spoken of the Spirit as they did (Acts v. 28, unless he were known to be working in and with them and directing them, and manifesting that this was the case by unmistakable signs. Here is the answer, both to the question why was it not the first care of the Apostles to prepare a written Gospel, and also to the scruples of those who fear that the supposition of an oral Gospel would give a precedent for those views of tradition which have been the bane of the Christian church as they were of the Jewish. The guidance of the Holy Spirit supplied for a time such aid as made a written Gospel unnecessary; but the Apostles saw the dangers and errors which a traditional Gospel would be exposed to in the course of time; and, whilst they were still preaching the oral Gospel in the strength of the Holy Ghost, they were admonished by the same divine Person to prepare those written records which were hereafter to be the daily spiritual food of all the church of Christ. Nor is there anything unnatural in the supposition that the Apostles intentionally uttered their witness in the same order, and even, for the most part, in the same form of words. They would thus approach as nearly to the condition in which the church was to be when written books were to be the means of edification. They quote the scriptures of the Old Testament frequently in their discourses; and as their Jewish education had accustomed them to the use of the words of the Bible as well as the matter, they would do no violence to their prejudices in writing down new records to the same end, in reducing them to a “form of sound words.” They were all Jews of Palestine, of humble origin, all alike on earth, we may suppose, for the loving zeal with which they would observe the works of their Master and afterwards propagate his name; so that the tendency to variance, arising from peculiarities of education, taste, and character, would be reduced to its lowest in such a body. The language of their first preaching was the Syrian-Chaldee, which was a poor and scanty language; and though Greek was now widely spread, and was the language even of several places in Palestine (Josephus, Ant. xxii. 14, § 4; I. J. iii. 9, § 1), though it prevailed in Antioch, where the first missions to Greeks and Hellenists, or Jews who spoke Greek, proceeded (Acts xi. 22, xiii. 46), the Greek tongue, as used by Jews, partook of the poverty of the speech which it replaced; as, indeed, it is impossible to honor a whole language without borrowing the habits of thought upon which it has built itself. Whilst modern taste aims at a variety of expression, and abhors a repetition of the same phrases as monotonous, the simplicity of the men, and their language, and their education, and the state of literature, would all lead us to expect that the Apostles would have no such feeling. As to this, we have more than mere conjecture to rely on. Occasional repetitions occur in the Gospels (Luke vii. 19, 20; xix. 31, 34), such as a writer in a more copious and cultivated language would perhaps have sought to avoid. In the Acts, the conversion of St. Paul is three times related (Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.), once by the writer and twice by St. Paul himself; and the two first harmonize exactly, except as to a few expressions, and as to one more important circumstance (ix. 7—xxii. 9), which, however, admits of an explanation,—whilst the third deviates somewhat more in expression, and has one passage peculiar to itself. The vision of Cornelius is also three times related (Acts x. 3—6, 30—32; xii. 13, 14), where the words of the angel in the two first are almost precisely alike, and the rest very similar, whilst the other is an abbreviated account of the same facts. The vision of Peter is twice related (Acts x. 15—16; xi. 3—10), and the repetitions, the agreement is verbally exact. These places from the Acts, which, both as to their resemblance and their difference, may be compared to the narratives of the Evangelists, show the same tendency to a common form of narrative which, according to the present view, may have influenced the preaching of the Apostles. It is supposed, then, that the preaching of the Apostles, and the teaching whereby they prepared others to preach, as they did, would tend to assume a common form, more or less fixed; and that the portions of the three Gospels which harmonize most exactly over their agreement not to the fact that they were copied from each other, although it is impossible to say that the later writer made no use of the earlier one, nor to the existence of any original document now lost to us, but to the fact that the church had already clothed itself in a settled or usual form of words, to which the writers inclined to conform without feeling bound to do so; and the differences which occur, often in the closest proximity to the harmonies, arise from the feeling of independence with which each wrote what he had seen and heard, or, in the case of Mark and Luke, what apostolic witnesses had told him. The harmonies, as we have seen, begin with the baptism of John; that is, with the conservation of the Lord to his messianic office; and with this event probably the ordinary preaching of the Apostles would begin, for its purport was that Jesus is the Messiah, and that as Messiah he suffered, died, and rose again. They are very frequent as we approach the period of the Passion, because the sufferings of the Lord would be much in the mouth of every one who preached the Gospel, and all would become familiar with the words in which the Apostles declared St. Matthew and St. Mark only; and if the passage implies an intention to supersede the writings added to, then these two Evangelists cannot be included amongst genuine partial or reminiscences of the preaching of the Apostles, written with a given aim but without authority, are attended: and, if we may argue from St. Luke’s sphere of observation, they were probably composed by Greek converts.
and, that the divergence from the intention of each Evangelist to contribute something towards the weight of evidence for this central truth. Accordingly, all the four, even St. Mark (xvi. 14), who often throws a new light upon old ground and opens out neglected angles and aspects of the Lord to establish that he was risen indeed. The verbal agreement is greater where the words of others are recorded, and greatest of all where they are those of Jesus, because here the apostolic preaching would be especially exact; and where the historical fact is the utterance of certain words, the duty of the historian is narrowed to a bare record of them. (See the works of Gieseler, Norton, Westcott, Weiss, and others already quoted.)

That this opinion would explain many of the facts connected with the text is certain. Whether, besides conforming to the words and arrangement of the apostolic preaching, the Evangelists did in any cases make use of each other's work or not, it would require a more careful investigation of details to discuss than space permits. Every reader would probably find on examination some places which could best be explained on this supposition. Nor does this involve a sacrifice of the independence of the narrator. If each of the three drew the substance of his narrative from the one common strain of preaching that everywhere prevailed, to have departed entirely in a written account from the common form of words to which Christian ears were beginning to be familiar, would not have been independence but willfulness. To follow here and there the words and arrangement of another written Gospel already current would not compromise the writer's independent position. If the principal part of the narrative was the voice of the whole church, a few portions might be confounded to another writer without altering the character of the testimony. In the separate articles on the Gospels it will be shown that, however close may be the agreement of the Evangelists, the independent position of each is preserved from the contents of his book, and has been recognized by writers of all ages. It will appear that St. Matthew describes the kingdom of Messiah, as founded in the Old Testament and fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; that St. Mark, with so little of narrative peculiar to himself, brings out by many minute circumstances a more vivid delineation of our Lord's completely human life; that St. Luke puts forward the work of Redemption as a universal benefit, and shows Jesus not only as the Messiah of the chosen people but as the Saviour of the world; that St. John, writing last of all, passed over most of what his predecessors had related, in order to set forth more fully all that he had heard from the Master who loved him, of his relation to the Father, and of the relation of the Holy Spirit to both. The independence of the writers is thus established; and if they seem to have here and there used each other's account, which it is perhaps impossible to prove or disprove, such cases will not compromise that claim which alone gives value to a plurality of witnesses.

How does this last theory bear upon our belief in the inspiration of the Gospels? This moments question admits of a satisfactory reply. Our blessed Lord, on five different occasions, promised to the apostles the divine guidance, to teach and enlighten them in their dangers (Matt. x. 19; Luke xii. 11, 12; Mark xii. 11; and John xiv., xv., xvi.). He bade them take no thought about defending them selves before judges; he promised them the Spirit of Truth to guide them into all truth, to teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance. That this promise was fully realized to them the history of the Acts sufficiently shows. But if the divine assistance was given them in their discourses and preaching, it would be rendered equally when they were about to put down in writing the same gospel which they preached, and, as this would be their greatest time of need, the aid would be granted then most surely. So that, as to St. Matthew and St. John, we may say that their Gospels are inspired because the writers of them were inspired, according to their Master's promise; for it is impossible to suppose that He who put words into their mouths when they stood before a human tribunal, with no greater fear than that of death before them, would withhold his light and truth when the want of them would mislead the whole Church of Christ and turn the light that was in it into darkness. The case of the other two Evangelists is somewhat different. It has always been held that they were under the guidance of Apostles in whom the Holy Spirit was — St. Mark under that of St. Peter, and St. Luke under that of St. Paul. We are not expressly told, indeed, that these Evangelists themselves were persons to whom Christ's promises of supernatural guidance had been extended, but it certainly was not confined to the twelve to whom it was originally made, as the case of St. Paul himself proves, who was admitted to all the privileges of an apostle, though, as it were, "born out of due time;" and as St. Mark and St. Luke were the companions of apostles — shared their dangers, confronted hostile tribunals, had to teach and preach — there is reason to think that they equally enjoyed what they equally needed. In Acts xxv. 28, the Holy Ghost is spoken of as the common guide and light of all the brethren, not of apostles only; nay, to speak it reverently, as one of themselves. So that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke appear to have been admitted into the church, not from the example of their authors, but in free and close communication with inspired apostles. But supposing that the portion of the three first Gospels which is common to all has been derived from the preaching of the Apostles in general, then it is drawn directly from a source which we know from our Lord himself to have been inspired. It comes to us from those Apostles into whose mouths Christ promised to put the words of his holy Spirit. It is not from an anonymous writing, as Eichhorn thinks — it is not that the three witnesses are real ones, as Story and others have suggested in the theory of copying — but that the daily preaching of all apostles and teachers has found three independent transcribers in the three Evangelists. Now the inspiration of an historical writing will consist in its truth, and in its selection of events. Everything narrated must be substantially and exactly true, and the comparison of the Gospels one with another offers us nothing that does not answer to this test. There are differences of arrangement of events; here some details of a narrative or a discourse are supplied which are wanting there; and if the writer had professed to follow a strict chronological order, or had pretended that his record was not only true but complete, then one inversion of order, or one omission of a
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ny liable, would condign him of inaccuracy. But if it is plain—if it is all but avowed—that minute chronological data are not part of the writer's purpose—if it is also plain that nothing but a selection of the facts is intended, or, indeed, possible (John xxi. 23)—then the proper test to apply is, whether each gives us a picture of the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth that is self-consistent and consistent with the others, such as would be suitable to the use of those who were to believe on His Name for this higher evidenced intention. About the answer there should be no doubt. We have seen that each Gospel has its own features, and that the divine element has controlled the human, but not destroyed it. But the picture which they conspire to draw is one full of harmony. The Saviour they all describe is the same loving, tender guide of his disciples, sympathizing with them in the sorrows and temptations of earthly life, yet ever ready to enlighten that life by rays of truth out of the infinite world where the Father sits upon his throne. It has been said that St. Matthew portrays rather the human side, and St. John the divine; but this holds good only in a limited sense. It is in St. John that we read that "Jesus wept;" and there is nothing, even in the last discourse of Jesus, as reported by St. John, that opens a deeper view of his divine nature than the words in St. Matthew xi. 27, beginning, "But to him that loved us."]

Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes." All reveal the same divine and human Teacher; four copies of the same portrait, perhaps with a difference of expression, yet still the same, are drawn here, and it is a portrait the like of which no one had ever delineated before, or, indeed, could have done, except from having looked on it with observant eyes, and from having had the mind opened by the Holy Spirit to comprehend such features of such unspeakable radiance. Not only does this highest "harmony of the Gospels" manifest itself to every pious reader of the Bible, but the lower harmony—the agreement of fact and word in all that relates to the ministry of the Lord, in all that would contribute to a firm view of his apostolic character—exists also, and cannot be denied. For in our judgment it will tell us alike that Jesus was transfigured on the mount; that the shekinah of divine glory shone upon his face: that Moses the lawgiver and Elias the prophet talked with him; and that the voice from heaven bare witness to him. Is it any imputation upon the truth of the histories that St. Matthew alone tells us that the witnesses fell prostrate to the earth, and that Jesus raised them? or that St. Luke alone tells us that for a part of the time they were heavy with sleep? Again, one Evangelist, in describing our Lord's temptation, follows the order of the occurrences, another arranges according to the degree of temptation, and the third, passing over all particulars, merely mentions that our Lord was tempted. Is there anywhere here to shake our faith in the writers as credible historians? Do we treat other histories in this exacting spirit? Is not the very independence of treatment the pledge to us that we have really three witnesses to the fact that Jesus was tempted like as we are? for if the Evangelists were copyists, nothing would have been more easy than to remove such an obvious difference as this. The histories are true according to any test that should be applied to a history: and the events that they select—though we could not pre-

GOSPELS

some to say that they were more important than what are omitted, except from the fact of the omission—are at least such as to have given the whole Christian Church a clear conception of the Redeemer's life, so that none has ever complained of insufficient means of knowing him.

There is a perverted form of the theory we are considering which pretends that the facts of the Redeemer's life remained in the state of an oral tradition till the latter part of the second century and that the four Gospels were written till that time. The difference is not of degree but of kind between the opinion that the Gospels were written during the lifetime of the Apostles, who were eye-witnesses, and the notion that for nearly a century after the oldest of them had passed to his rest the events were only preserved in the changeable and insecure form of an oral account. But for the latter opinion there is not one spark of historical evidence. Heretics of the second century who would gladly have rejected and exposed a new gospel that made against them never hint that the Gospels are spurious; and orthodox writers ascribe without contradiction the authorship of the books to those whose names they bear. The theory was invented to accord with the assumption that miracles are impossible, but upon no evidence whatever; and the argument when exposed runs in this vicious circle: "If there are no miracles, then the accounts of them must have grown up in the course of a century from popular exaggeration, and as the accounts are not contemporaneous it is not proved that there are miracles!" That the Jewish mind in its lowest decay should have invented the character of Jesus of Nazareth, and the sublime system of morality contained in his teaching—that four writers should have fixed the popular impression in four plain, simple, unadorned narratives, without any outbursts of national prejudice, or any attempt to give a political tone to the events they wrote of—would be in itself a miracle harder to believe than that Lazarus came out at the Lord's call from his four days' tomb.

It will be an appropriate conclusion to this imperfect sketch to give a conjectural of the harmony of the Gospels, by which the several theories may be tested. We beg to call the attention of our readers to the ingenious and careful labours of Mr. Macknight, who has been the most diligent in detail. Let it be remembered, however, that a complete harmony, including the chronological arrangement and the exact succession of all events, was not intended by the sacred writers to be constructed; indeed the data for it are pointedly withheld. Here most of the places where there is some special difficulty, and where there has been a question whether the events are parallel or distinct, are marked by verses in different type. The sects might in many cases have been subdivided but for the limits of space, but the reader can supply this defect for himself as cases arise. (The principal works employed in constructing it are, Griesbach, Synopsis Evangeliorum, 1776; De Wette and Luecke, Syn. Evang., 1818, 1822; Kliger, Syn. Evang., 1820; Chauven, Quatrain Evang. Tabula Synopsis, 1822; Greenwell's Harmony [Harmoniae Evangelicae, ed. 5th, Oxon, 1856] and Dissertations [21 ed., 4 vols. in 5, Oxford, 1837], a most important work; the Rev. J. Williams On the Gospels, Thirle's Greek Testament; and Tischendorf's Syn. Evang. 1854 [21 ed. 1864]; besides the well-known works of Lightfoot, Macknight, Newcome, and Robinson.) [For other works of this class, see an additon to the present article.] W. T. j
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**TABLE OF THE HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Matthew</th>
<th>St. Mark</th>
<th>St. Luke</th>
<th>St. John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preach to Theophilus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation of the Baptist's birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation of the birth of Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:20-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary visits Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:39-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of John the Baptist</td>
<td>1:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:23-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>i. 18-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Genealogies</td>
<td>i. 1-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The watching Shepherds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 8-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Circumcision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation in the Temple</td>
<td>ii. 1-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 40-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wise men from the East</td>
<td>ii. 12-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight to Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 29-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputing with the Doctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of John the Baptist</td>
<td>iii. 11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>iii. 13-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Temptation</td>
<td>iv. 1-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 1-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew and another see Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, now Cephas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 41, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip and Nathanael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. 43-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The water made wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover (1st) and cleansing the Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 12-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and John baptizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 25-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The woman of Samaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist in prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 14-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 16-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The synagogue at Nazareth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 46-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nobleman's son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capernaum. Four Apostles called</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoniac healed there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon's wife's mother healed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit round Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing a leper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ stills the storm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demoniacs in hand of Gadarenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jairus's daughter. Woman healed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind men, and demoniac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing the paralytic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew the publican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thy disciples eat not &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to Jerusalem to 2d Passover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool of Bethesda. Power of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plucking ears of corn on Sabbath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The withered hand. Miracles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Twelve Apostles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sermon on the Mount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The centurion's servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The widow's son at Nain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messengers from John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woe to the cities of Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to the meek and suffering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anointing the feet of Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second circuit round Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Sower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Candle under a Bushel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; the Sower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; the Wheat and Tares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Grain of Mustard-seed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Leaven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On teaching by parables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES.**

1. The word "Genealogies," it is to be understood that some special difficulty besets the harmony where one or more references under a given section are in light, and one or more in heavy type, it is to be understood that the former are given as in their proper place, and that it is more or less doubtful whether the latter are to be considered as parallel narratives or not.

---

The references are printed in the Gospels as follows:

- **St. Matthew**: iv. 1-8, ix. 1-9, xii. 1-24, xx. 1-12.
- **St. Mark**: iv. 1-37, ix. 1-17, xii. 1-22, xx. 1-12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Topic</th>
<th>St. Matthew</th>
<th>St. Mark</th>
<th>St. Luke</th>
<th>St. John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat and tares explained</td>
<td>xiii. 36-43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The treasure, the pearl, the net</td>
<td>xiii. 44-52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His mother and His brethren</td>
<td>xii. 40-50</td>
<td>iii. 31-35</td>
<td>viii. 19-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception at Nazareth</td>
<td>xiii. 53-58</td>
<td>vi. 1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third circuit round Galilee</td>
<td>ix. 35-58; xi. 1</td>
<td>vi. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending forth of the Twelve</td>
<td>x.</td>
<td>vii. 7-13</td>
<td>ix. 1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod’s opinion of Jesus</td>
<td>xiv. 1, 2</td>
<td>vi. 14-16</td>
<td>ix. 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of John the Baptist</td>
<td>xiv. 3-12</td>
<td>vi. 17-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach of Passover (3d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding of the five thousand</td>
<td>xiv. 13-21</td>
<td>vi. 30-44</td>
<td>ix. 10-17</td>
<td>vi 1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on the sea</td>
<td>xiv. 22-33</td>
<td>vi. 45-52</td>
<td></td>
<td>vi 16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracles in Gennesaret</td>
<td>xiv. 34-56</td>
<td>vi. 59-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>v 92-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brees of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The washing hands</td>
<td>xv. 1-20</td>
<td>vii. 1-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Syrophoenician woman</td>
<td>xv. 21-28</td>
<td>vii. 24-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracles of healing</td>
<td>xv. 29-31</td>
<td>vii. 31-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding of the four thousand</td>
<td>xv. 32-39</td>
<td>vii. 1-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sign from heaven</td>
<td>xvi. 1-4</td>
<td>viii. 10-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leaven of the Pharisees</td>
<td>xvi. 5-12</td>
<td>viii. 14-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind man healed</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 22-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter’s profession of faith</td>
<td>xvi. 13-19</td>
<td>viii. 27-29</td>
<td>ix. 18-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Passion of our Lord</td>
<td>xvi. 29-28</td>
<td>viii. 30-34</td>
<td>ix. 21-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Transfiguration</td>
<td>xvi. 7-10</td>
<td>viii. 21-27</td>
<td>ix. 28-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>xvi. 10-13</td>
<td>ix. 11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lunatic healed</td>
<td>xvi. 14-21</td>
<td>ix. 14-29</td>
<td>ix. 37-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Passion again foretold</td>
<td>xvi. 22-23</td>
<td>ix. 30-32</td>
<td>ix. 43-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish caught for the tribute</td>
<td>xvi. 24-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The little child</td>
<td>xvi. 1-5</td>
<td>ix. 33-37</td>
<td>ix. 46-48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One casting out devils</td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 38-41</td>
<td>ix. 49, 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences</td>
<td>xvi. 6-10</td>
<td>ix. 42-48</td>
<td>xvii. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lost sheep</td>
<td>xvi. 10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 4-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness of injuries</td>
<td>xvi. 15-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding and loosing</td>
<td>xvi. 18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness. Parable</td>
<td>xvi. 21-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Salted with fire&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 39, 50</td>
<td>ix. 51</td>
<td>vii. 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey to Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 52-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire from heaven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 57-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers to disciples</td>
<td>viii. 19-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>x. 1-16</td>
<td>vii. 11-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seventy disciples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions at Feast of Tabernacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. 12-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman taken in adultery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 1-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute with the Pharisees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x. 1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The man born blind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The return of the Seventy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good Samaritan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary and Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer</td>
<td>vi. 9-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer effectual</td>
<td>vii. 7-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Through Bebzelub&quot;</td>
<td>xii. 22-37</td>
<td>iii. 20-30</td>
<td>xi. 14-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The uncovn spirit returning</td>
<td>xii. 43-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 24-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sign of Jonah</td>
<td>xii. 38-42</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 29-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The light of the body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pharisees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Master, speak to my brother!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileans that perished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman healed on Sabbath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grain of mustard-seed</td>
<td>xiii. 31, 32</td>
<td>iv. 30-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The heaven</td>
<td>xiii. 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are there few that be saved?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning against Herod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;O Jerusalem, Jerusalem&quot;</td>
<td>xxiii. 37-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Matthew</td>
<td>St. Mark</td>
<td>St. Luke</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TABLE OF THE HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS</strong> (continued.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsy healed on Sabbath-day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the chief rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 7-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Great Supper</td>
<td>xii. 1-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 15-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Christ with the Cross</td>
<td>x. 37, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 25-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parables of Lost Sheep, Piece of Money, Prodigal Son, Unjust Steward, Rich Man and Lazarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xv. xvi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences</td>
<td>xvii. 6-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Merit</td>
<td>xvii. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 5-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ten lepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 11-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the kingdom cometh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xvii. 20-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Unjust Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xviii. 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the Pharisee and Publican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xviii. 9-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>xix. 1-12</td>
<td>x. 1-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants brought to Jesus</td>
<td>xix. 13-15</td>
<td>x. 13-16</td>
<td>xviii. 15-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rich man inquiring</td>
<td>xix. 16-26</td>
<td>x. 17-27</td>
<td>xviii. 18-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promises to the disciples</td>
<td>xix. 27-30</td>
<td>x. 28-31</td>
<td>xviii. 28-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers in the vineyard</td>
<td>xx. 1-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Christ foretold</td>
<td>xx. 17-19</td>
<td>x. 32-34</td>
<td>xviii. 31-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request of James and John</td>
<td>xx. 29-28</td>
<td>x. 35-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind men at Jericho</td>
<td>xx. 29-34</td>
<td>x. 46-52</td>
<td>xviii. 35-43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaccheus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xix. 1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Ten Talents</td>
<td>xxv. 14-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>xix. 11-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x. 22-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising of Lazarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x. 40-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Sanhedrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xi. 1-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ in Ephraim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xi. 45-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The anointing by Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xi. 54-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ enters Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleansing of the Temple (3d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The barren fig-tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray, and forgive</td>
<td>vi. 14, 15</td>
<td>x. 24-26</td>
<td>x. 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;By what authority,&quot; etc.</td>
<td>xi. 23-27</td>
<td>x. 27-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Two Sons</td>
<td>x. 28-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the Wicked Husbandmen</td>
<td>xii. 33-46</td>
<td>xii. 1-12</td>
<td>x. 9-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the Wedding Garment</td>
<td>xii. 1-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 16-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tribute-money</td>
<td>xii. 13-22</td>
<td>xii. 13-17</td>
<td>x. 20-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state of the risen</td>
<td>xii. 23-33</td>
<td>xii. 18-27</td>
<td>x. 27-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The great Commandment</td>
<td>xii. 34-40</td>
<td>xii. 28-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David's Son and David's Lord</td>
<td>xii. 41-46</td>
<td>xii. 35-37</td>
<td>x. 41-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the Pharisees</td>
<td>xii. 1-30</td>
<td>xii. 38-40</td>
<td>xii. 45-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The widow's mite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ's second coming</td>
<td>xiv. 1-51</td>
<td>xii. 1-37</td>
<td>xii. 5-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parable of the Ten Virgins</td>
<td>xxv. 1-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the Talents</td>
<td>xxv. 14-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>xix. 11-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Last Judgment</td>
<td>xxv. 31-46</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 20-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks visit Jesus. Voice from heaven.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 36-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections of John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Passover (4th). Jews conspire</td>
<td>xxv. 1-5</td>
<td>xiv. 1, 2</td>
<td>xii. 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Iscariot</td>
<td>xxv. 14-16</td>
<td>xiv. 10, 11</td>
<td>xii. 3-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal Supper</td>
<td>xxv. 17-29</td>
<td>xiv. 12-25</td>
<td>xii. 7-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contention of the Apostles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 24-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter's fall foretold</td>
<td>xxvi. 30-35</td>
<td>xiv. 26-31</td>
<td>xii. 31-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last discourse. The departure; the Comforter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiii. 36-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vine and the branches. Abiding in love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv. 1-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of the Comforter in disciples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xv. 1-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prayer of Christ</td>
<td>xxvi. 30-46</td>
<td>xiv. 32-42</td>
<td>xiii. 1-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gethsemane</td>
<td>xxvi. 47-56</td>
<td>xiv. 43-52</td>
<td>xii. 1-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The betrayal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xii. 1-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Annas (Caiphas). Peter's denial</td>
<td>xxvi. 59-68</td>
<td>xiv. 55-65</td>
<td>xii. 54-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the Sanhedrim</td>
<td>xxvii. 1</td>
<td>xiv. 1-5</td>
<td>xii. 63-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before Pilate</td>
<td>xxvii. 2, 11-14</td>
<td>xiv. 1-5</td>
<td>xiii. 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xvi. 27-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Theory which bears the name of Strauss could hardly have originated anywhere but in Germany, nor is it easy for an Anglo-Saxon mind to conceive of its being seriously propagated and actually believed. It is far from being clearly defined and self-consistent in the author's own statement; and his Life of Jesus, while a work of great learning in detail, is singularly deficient in comprehensiveness and unity.

The theory, in brief, is this. Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary. In his childhood he manifested unusual intelligence and promise, as compared with his external advantages, and was the object of admiration in the humble family circle in which his lot was cast. He early became a disciple of John the Baptist; and, from strong sympathy with his enthusiastic expectation of the speedy advent of the Messiah (an expectation vividly entertained by all loyal Jews of that day), he conceived the idea of assuming that character himself, and personating it so successfully as to become his own dupe, and thus to pass unconsciously from imposture to self-delusion. He made disciples, chose disciples, uttered discourses which impressed themselves profoundly upon the popular mind, and drew upon himself the hostility of the chief men of the nation, especially of the Pharisees. They procured his execution as a traitor; but his disciples, believing that the Messiah could not die, maintained that he must have risen alive from the sepulchre, and, as he had not been seen among men after his crucifixion, that he had ascended to heaven. This simple life-story became the basis of a series of myths—narratives not intentionally false or consciously invented, but some of them the growth of popular credulity, others, symbolical forms in which his disciples sought to embody the doctrines and precepts which had been the staple of his discourses. His miraculous birth was imagined and believed, because it seemed impossible that the Messiah should have been born like other men. Supernatural works were ascribed to him, because the Hebrew legends had ascribed such works to the ancient prophets, and it could not be that he who was greater than they, and of whom they were thought to have written glowing predictions, should not have performed more numerous and more marvellous miracles than any of them. His appearances after his resurrection were inferred, defined as to time and place, and incorporated into the faith of his disciples, because it was inconceivable that he should have returned to life without being seen. These myths had their origin chiefly outside of the circle of the Apostles and the persons most closely intimate with Jesus, and were probably due in great part to the constructive imaginations of dwellers in portions of Galilee where he had tarried but a little while, or of admirers who had been his companions but for a brief period.

The mythical element, once introduced into his history, had a rapid growth for some thirty, forty, or fifty years after his death, and new incidents in accordance with the Messianic ideal were constantly added to the multiform oral Gospel propagated and transmitted by his disciples. Within that period, various persons, none of them apostles or intimate friends of Jesus, compiled such narratives as had come to their ears; and of these narratives there have come down to us our four Gospels, together with other fragmentary stories of equal authority, which bear the popular designation of the Apocryphal Gospels.

Such was the completion of Strauss's mythic theory, as developed in his Life of Jesus, published in 1863-35, repeatedly reprinted, and sufficiently well known in this country by a cheap reprint of a moderately good English translation. In his new work, issued in 1864, The Life of Jesus, for the
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* Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet.
German People, he departs from his former position so far as to charge the propagandists and historians of Christianity with willful and conscious falsifications, and to maintain with the critics of the Tubingen school that the four Gospels were written, in great part, to sanction and promote the dogmatism of their respective authors, and that they thus represent so many divergent theological tendencies. In assuming this ground, Strauss enlarges the definition of the term myth, which no longer denotes merely the fabulous outgrowth or embodiment of an idea without fraudulent intent, but includes such wanton falsehoods as are designed to express, promulgate, or sanction theological dogmas. We have said that Strauss's attempt to historicalize the myths of the mythical structure proposed by the Evangelists. How is this basis to be determined? How are we to distinguish between facts and myths?

1. The usual order of nature cannot in any instance, way, or measure, have been interrupted. Therefore every supernatural incident must be accounted as mythical.

2. Jesus having been regarded as the Messiah, it was inevitable that representations should have been made of him in accordance with the Messianic notions of his time and people, and with the predictions deemed Messianic in the writings of the Hebrew prophets. Consequently, all such representations, though involving nothing supernatural, such as his descent from David and his flight into Egypt, are at least suspicious, and may be safely set down as myths.

3. His admirers would have been likely to attribute to him sayings and deeds corresponding with those recorded of various distinguished persons in Jewish history. Therefore, every portion of the narrative which bears any resemblance or analogy to any incident related in the Old Testament, is mythical. But, on the other hand, Jesus was a Hebrew, confined within the narrow circle of Jewish ideas, and not under any training or influence which could have enlarged that circle. Consequently every alleged utterance of his, and every idea of his mission and character, that is broader and higher than the narrowest Judaism, is also mythical. Thus we have an historical personage, of whom the critics denies at once everything national and everything extra-national. By rarity of reasoning, we might, in the biography of Washington, cast suspicion on everything that he is alleged to have said or done as a loyal American, because he was a white man, and his biographer would of course ascribe to him the attributes of an American; and on everything that he is alleged to have said or done from the impulse of a larger humanity, because, being an American, it was impossible that he should have been anything more—a style of criticism which, with reference to any but a sacred personage, the world would regard as simply idiotic. But this is not all. (5.) Though among secular historians, even of well-known periods and events, there are discrepancies in minor details, and these are held to be confirmations of the main facts, as evincing the mutual independence of the writers considered as separate authorities, for some unexplained and to us insurmountable reason, this law does not apply to the Gospels. In them, every discrepancy, however minute, casts just suspicion on an alleged fact or a recorded discourse or conversation. This suspicion is at least as weighty an obstacle to the varied narrative of very slight particulars, with- out making any allowance for the different points of view which several independent witnesses must of necessity occupy, or for the different portions of a prolonged transaction or discourse which would reach their eyes or ears, according as they were nearer or more remote, early or late in the ground, precise or less absorbed in what was passing. All, therefore, in which the Evangelists vary from one another, is mythical. But while their variance always indicates a myth (6), their very close agreement demands the same construction; for wherever the several narrators coincide circumstantially and verbally, their coincidence indicates some common legendary source. Thus mutually inconsistent and contradictory are the several tests employed by Strauss to separate myth from fact. Practically, were Strauss's Life of Jesus lost to the world, one might reconstruct it, by classing as a myth, under one or more of the heads that we have specified, every fact in the history of Jesus, and every deed or utterance of his, which indicates either the divinity of his mission, his unparalleled wisdom, or the transcendent loveliness, purity, and excellence of his character.

Yet, while Jesus is represented as in part self-deluded, and in part an impostor, and his biography as in all its distinctive features utterly fictitious, strange to say, Strauss recognizes this biography as symbolical of the spiritual history of mankind. What is false of the individual Jesus is true of the race. Humanity is God manifest in the flesh," the child of the visible mother, Nature, and the invisible father, Spirit. It works miracles; it subdues Nature in and around itself by the power of the Spirit. It is sinful; for pollution cleaves to the individual, but does not affect the race or its history. It dies, rises, and ascends to heaven; for the suppression of its personal and earthly life—in other words, the annihilation of individual men by death—is a reunion with the All-Father, Spirit. Faith in this metaphysical farago is justifying and sanctifying Christian faith. Thus a history, which is the joint product of imposture and credulity, by a strange chance, (for providence there is none,) has become a symbolical representation of true spiritual philosophy.

We will now offer some of the leading considerations, which are fairly urged against the mythical theory.

1. This theory assumes that miracles are impossible. But why are they impossible, if there be a God? The power which established the order of nature includes the power to suspend or modify it, as the greater includes the less. If that order was established with a moral and spiritual purpose, for the benefit of reasoning, accountable, immortal beings, and if that same purpose may be served by the suspension of proximate causes at any one epoch of human history, then we may expect to find authentic vestiges of such an epoch. All that is needed in order to make miracles credible is the discovery of an adequate purpose, a justifying end. Such a purpose, such an end, is the development of the highest forms of goodness in human conduct and character; and whether miracles—red or imagined—have borne an essential part in such development, is an historical question which we are competent to answer. Suppose that we write down the names of those who have left a reputation for eminent excellence,—Orientals, Greeks, Romans, ancient, modern, the lights of dark ages, the chosen representatives of every philosophical school, the
finished product of the highest civilization of every type, reformers, philanthropists, those who have adored the loveliest stations, those who have made lowly stations illustrious. Let us proceed to separate the names into two columns, writing the Christians in one column, all the rest in the other. We shall find that we have made a horizontal division,—that the least in the Christian column is greater than the greatest out of it. From Paul, Peter, and John; from Feneon, Xavier, Boyle, Doddridge, Martyn, Hecer, Judson, Channing, men whose genius and culture conspired with their piety to make them the best good, down to the unlettered Bedford tinker, John Pond the cobbler, the Dairyman's daughter, with just education enough to read her Bible and to know the will of her Lord, we find traits of character, which in part are not shared in any degree, in part are but remotely approached, by the best men out of the Christian pale. Now when we look into the forming elements and processes of these Christian characters, we shall find that the miracles of the New Testament hold a foremost place, and we shall find it impossible even to conceive of their formation under the mythical theory. It is absurd to think of Paul as compassing sea and land, laying bare his back to the scourge, reaching after the crown of martyrdom, to defend a mythical resurrection and ascension of humanity; of Martyn or Judson as forsaking all the joys of civilized life, and encountering hardships worse than death, to preach Strassmansion; of the Gospel according to Strauss as taking the place of Matthew's or John's Gospel in the hands of the tinker or the dairy-maid, developing the sainily spirit, heralding the triumphant deaths, of which we have such frequent record in the annals of the poor. These holy men and women have been guided and sustained in virtue by the authority of a divinely commissioned Lawgiver, whose words they have received because he had been proclaimed and attested as the Son of God by power from on high. They have had a working faith in immortality,—such a faith as no reasoning, or analogy, or instinct ever has given,—because they have stood in thought by the bier at the gates of Xain and by the tomb of Bethany; because they have seen the light that streams from the broken sepulchre of the crucified, and have made a part of the contentment of the poor. Now if the development of the highest style of human character is a purpose worthy of God, and if in point of fact a belief in miracles has borne an essential part in the development of such characters, then are miracles not only possible, but antecedently probable and intrinsically credible. And this is an argument which cannot be impeached till Strassmansion has furnished at least a few finished characters, which we may drop down to the unlettered tinker and the dairy-maid. If now the development of these conditions that have been formed by faith in a miraculously empowered and endowed Teacher and Saviour.

Miracle, living as it does clearly within the scope of omnipotence, needs only adequate testimony to substantiate it. Human testimony is indeed appealed to in proof of the unbroken order of nature; but, so far as it goes, it proves the opposite. We can trace back no line of testimony which does not reach a miraculous epoch. Nay, if there be any element of human nature which is universal, with exceptions as rare as idiocy or insanity, it is the appettity for miracle. So strong is this, that at the present day none are so ready to receive the driftings of hyper-electrified women as utterances from departed spirits, and to accept the ab-
surdities of the newest form of necromancy, as those who set aside the miracles of the New Testament and cast contempt on the risen Saviour. Such being the instinctive craving of human nature for that which is above nature, it is intrinsically probable that God has met this craving by authentic voices from the spirit-realm, by authentic glimpses from behind the veil of sense, by authentic forth-lookings of the omnipotent arm from beneath the mantle of proximate causes.

2. Strauss is self-refuted on his own ground. He maintains the uniformity of the law of causation in all time, equally in the material and the intellectual universe, so that no intellectual phenomenon can make its appearance, except from causes and under conditions adapted to bring it into being. Myths, therefore, cannot originate, except from causes and under conditions favorable to their birth and growth. Now, if we examine the undoubted myths connected with the history and religion of the ancient nations, we shall find that they had their origin prior to the era of written literature; that their evident nucleus is to be sought in historical personages and events of a very early date; that they grew into fantastic forms and vast proportions by their transmission from tongue to tongue, whether in story or in song; that their various versions are the result of oral tradition through different channels, as in the separate states of Greece, and among the aboriginal tribes and pre-historical colonists of Italy; and that they received no essential additions or modifications after the age at which authentic history begins. Thus the latest of the gods, demigods and wonder-working heroes of Grecian fable—such of them as ever lived—lived seven centuries before Herodotus, and not less than four centuries before Hesiod and Homer; the various accounts we have of them appear to have been extant in the earliest period of Greek literature; and we have no proof of the origin of any extended fable or of the existence of any personage who became mythical, after that period. The case is similar with the distinctively Roman myths and the mythical portions of Roman history. They are all very considerably anterior to the earliest written history and literature of Rome. The mythical and the historical periods of all nations are not co-extensive. Every nation's mythology, and the Christian era falls far within the historical period. Single prodigies are indeed related in the history of that age, as they are from time to time in modern and even recent history; but the leading incidents of individual lives and the successive stages of public and national affairs in that age are detailed with the same literalness with which the history of the seventeenth or eighteenth century is written. Yet, had these conditions not the growth of myths existed, there were not wanting, then, personages, whose vast abilities, strange vicissitudes of fortune, and extended fame would have made them mythical. It is hardly possible that there could have been a fuller supply of the material for myths in the life of Hercules, or of Cæsar, or of Mohammed, than in that of Julius Cesar, or of Marcus Antoninus, or of Charlemagne. Nor is it maintained that in this respect Judea was at an earlier and more primitive stage of culture than Rome or Egypt. Josephus, the Jewish historian, was born about the time of the death of Jesus Christ, and wrote very nearly at the period assigned by Strauss for the composition of the earliest of our Gospels. In addition to what we believe to have been the
miracles of the Old Testament, he records many un doubted myths of the early Hebrew ages; but his history of his own times, with now and then a touch of the marvellous, has no more of the mythical element or tendency than we find in the narratives of the same epoch by Roman historians. In fine, there was nothing in that age more than in this, which could give rise or currency to a mythical history.

3. Myths are vague, dateless, incoherent, dreamy, poetical; while the Gospels are eminently prosaic, circumstantial, abounding in careful descriptions of persons, and designations of places and times. The genealogies given in Matthew and Luke are represented by Strauss as mythical; but nothing could be more thoroughly opposed to our idea of a myth, and to the character of the acknowledged myths of antiquity, than such catalogues of names. We believe both these genealogies to be authentic; for Matthew alone professes to give the natural and actual ancestry of Joseph, while Luke expressly says that he is giving the legal genealogy of Jesus, (as he was legally reckoned being the literal rendering of the words employed by the Evangelist, δεήσεως) and it is well known that the legal genealogy of a Jew might diverge very widely from the line of his actual parentage. But even were we to admit the alleged inconsistency of the two, they both bear incontestable marks of having been copied from existing documents, and not imagined or invented. All through the Gospels we find, in close connection with the miracles of Christ, details of common Jewish life, often so minute and trivial, that they would have been wholly beneath the aim of ambitious fiction or tawdly fancy, and could have found a place in the narrative only because they actually occurred. The miracles are not in a setting of their own kind, as they would have been in a fictitious narrative. They are imbedded in a singularly natural and lifelike, humble and unpretending history. The style of the Evangelists is not that of men who either wondered themselves, or expected others to wonder, at what they related; but it is the unambitious style of men who expected their audience to be incredulous, and who were perfectly familiar with the marvellous events they described. Had they related these events from rumor, from a euted imagination, or with a disposition to deceive, they must have written in an inflated style, with a profusion of epithets, with frequent appeals to the sentiment of the marvellous, not unmixed with the show of argument to convince the incredulous. When we find on the current of the Gospel history not a ripple of swollen diction, not a quickening of the rhetorical pulse, not a deviation from the quiet, prosaic, circumstantial flow of narrative, in describing such events as the walking upon the sea, the raising of Lazarus, the ascension of Jesus Christ to heaven, we can account for this unparalleled literary phenomenon only by supposing that the writers had become so conversant with miracle, either in their own experience or through their intimacy with eye-witnesses, that events aside from the ordinary course of nature had ceased to be contemplated with amazement.

4. Another conclusive argument against the mythical theory is derived from the sufferings and the martyrdoms of the primitive Christians. Strauss admits that the earliest of our Gospels assumed its present form within thirty or forty years after the death of Jesus. At that time there were still living great multitudes, who must have been contemporary and coeval with Jesus, and who had the means of ascertaining the truth with regard to his personal history. Mere fable, which involved no serious consequences to those who received it, might have passed unquestioned, and might have been devoured by weak men and superstitious women with easy credulity. But men are not wont to stake their reputation, their property, their lives, on stories which they have the means of testing, without looking carefully into the evidence of their truth. Now no fact in history is more certain than that, within forty years from the death of Christ, large numbers of persons, many of them natives of Judea, suffered the severest persecution, and incurred painful and ignominious death by fire, by crucifixion, and by exposure to wild beasts, in consequence of their professed belief in the divine mission, the miraculous endowments, and the resurrection of Jesus. Many of these persons were men of intelligence and cultivation. They must have known how far the alleged facts of the life of Jesus were confirmed by eye-witnesses, and how far and on what grounds they were called in question. They lived at a time when they could have tried the witnesses, and they must have been more or less than human if they threw away their lives for mere exaggerations or fables. The genuineness of several of Paul's epistles is admitted by Strauss, and neither he nor any one else doubts the fact of Paul's protracted sacrifices and sufferings, and his ultimate martyrdom as a Christian believer. Paul's epistles show him to have been a man of eminent power and culture,—in the opinion of many, the greatest man that God ever made; in the judgment of all, far above mediocrity. Born a Jew, educated in Jerusalem, familiar with the alleged scenes and witnesses of the miracles of Jesus, at first a persecutor of the infant church, he could have become a believer and a champion of the Christian faith only on strong evidence, and with a full knowledge of the grounds for unbelief and doubt; and we have his own statement of what he believed, and especially of his undoubting belief in the crowning miracle of the resurrection of Jesus. We know of no man whose testimony as to the present state of things is as firm and as certain as Paul's; and the time of the epistles of Jesus could be worth so much as his; and it is inconceivable that he, of all men, should have suffered or died in attestation of what he supposed or suspected to be myths. But we must multiply his testimony by hundreds, nay, by thousands, in order to represent the full amount and weight of the testimony of martyrdom. Now while we have not the slightest doubt that our Gospels were written, three of them at least at an earlier date than Strauss assigns to the first, and all of them by the men whose names they bear, we should deem them, if possible, more surely authenticated as to their contents, did we suppose them anonymous works of a later date; for in that case they would embody narratives already sealed by the martyr-blood of a cloud of witnesses, and thus would be not the mere story of their authors, but the story of the collective church.

5. The character of the primitive Christians is an impregnable argument for the truth of the Gospel-history, as opposed to the mythical theory. There is no doubt whatever that from the lifetime of Jesus commenced the moral regeneration of humanity. Virtues which had hardly a name before, sprang into being. Vices which had been embalmed in song and cherished in the heart of the highest civilization of the Roman empire, were con-
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denied and denounced. A lofty ethical standard—a standard which has not yet been improved upon—was held forth by the earliest Christian writers, and recognized in all the Christian communities. There were among the early Christians types of character, which have never been surpassed, hardly equalled since. Strauss maintains that there are no uncaused effects,—no effects which have not causes fully commensurate with themselves. A Jewish youth, half-enthusiast, half-impostor, must have been immeasurably inferior to those great philosophers, who, with no other stock, and no other means of accounting for his superiority over all other teachers of truth and duty, unless we believe that he held by the gift of God a precociousness, which his alleged sway over nature and victory over death were but the natural and fitting expression.

6. Strauss bases his theory on the assumption that our Gospels were not written by the men whose names they bear, but that the productions of authors now unknown, at later and uncertain periods: and he admits that the mythical fabric which he supposes the Gospels to be could not have had its origin under the hands, or with the sanction, of apostles or their companions. But the genuineness of no ancient, we might almost say, of no modern work, rests on stronger evidence than does the authorship of our Gospels by the men whose names they bear. In the earlier ages their compositions were not reputed sacred, nor were they ever denied or called in question,—not even by the heretics who on dogmatic grounds rejected some of them, and would have found it convenient to reject all,—not even by Jewish and Gentile opponents of Christianity, who argued vehemently and bitterly against their contents without impeaching their genuineness. Justin Martyr, who wrote about the middle of the second century, speaks repeatedly of Memoirs of the Apostles called Gospels, and in his frequent recapitulation of what he professes to have drawn from this source there are numerous coincidences with our Gospels, not only in the facts narrated, but in words and in passages of considerable length. From his extant works we could almost reproduce the gospel history. He was a man of singularly inquisitive mind, of philosophical training, of large and varied education; and it is impossible that he should not have known whether these books were received without question, or whether they rested under the suspicion of spurious authorship. Irenaeus, who wrote a little later, gives a detailed description of our four Gospels, naming their respective authors, and stating the order in which and the circumstances under which they were composed; and he writes, not only in his own name, but in that of the whole church, saying that these books were not and had not been called in question by any. These are hot specimens of very numerous authorities that might be cited. About the same time, Cebus wrote against Christianity, and he drew so largely from our Gospels as the authorized narratives of the life of Christ, that a connected history of that life might almost be made from the extant passages quoted from his writings by his Christian opponents.

In the middle and the latter half of the second century, there were large bodies of Christians in every part of the civilized world, and the copies of the Gospels must have been numbered by many thousands. Their universal reception as the works of the men whose names they now bear can be accounted for only by their genuineness. Suppose that they were spurious, yet written and circulated in the lifetime of the Apostles,—it is impossible that they should not have openly denied their authorship, and that this denial should not have left traces of itself in the days of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. Suppose that they were first put in circulation under the names they now bear, after the death of the Apostles,—it is inconceivable that there should not have been men shrewd enough to ask why they had not appeared while their authors were living, and their late appearance would have given rise to endless controversy and questions which would not have been quieted for several generations. Suppose that they were first issued and circulated anonymously,—there must have been a time when the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were first attached to them, and it is impossible that the attaching of the names of well-known men as authors to books which had been anonymous should not have been attended by grave doubt.

The statement of Luke in the Introduction of his Gospel, and the very nature of the case render it certain that numerous other accounts, more or less authentic, of the life of Christ were early written, and some such accounts, commonly called the Apocryphal Gospels, are still extant. But we have ample evidence that no such writings were ever received as of authority, read in the churches, or sanctioned by the office-bearers and leading men in Christiinity; and that none of them has ever possessed a character which would make them dangerous to the Church.

We have then abundant reason to believe, and no reason to doubt, that the ancient four Gospels were written by the men whose names they bear; and if this be proved, by the confession of Strauss himself the mythical theory is untenable.

A. P. P.

*Literature. The preceding article would be incomplete without some further notice of the literature of the subject, which it will be convenient to distribute under several heads.
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been sold), numerous popular commentaries have appeared in this country, representing more or less the theological views of different religious denominations, as by H. J. Ryley (Baptist), 2 vols. Boston, 1837-38; Jos. Longfing (Methodist), 4 vols. 16mo, New York, 1841-44; A. A. Livermore (Unitarian), 2 vols. Boston, 1841-42; L. E. Pusey (Universalist), 2 vols. Boston, 1844-45; M. W. Jacobs, 3 vols. New York, 1848-50; C. H. Hall (Episcopal), 2 vols. New York, 1857; J. J. Owen, 3 vols. New York, 1857-60; D. D. Whedon (Methodist), 2 vols New York, 1860-66; and I. P. Warren, *Nieu Test. with Notes*, vol. 1 Boston, 1857 (Amer. Tr. Soc.). Of works illustrating portions of the Gospels, A. Trench's *Notes on the Parables* (1841, 9th ed. 1864), *Notes on the Miracles* (1846, 7th ed. 1890), and *Studies in the Gospels* (1867), of all of which we have American editions, deserve particular mention. Wichelhaus has written an elaborate commentary on the history of the Passion Week (*Ausführ. Komm. zu d. Gesch. des Leidens Jesus Christi*, Halle, 1853). Of the works named above, the most valuable in a critical and philological point of view are those of Meyer, De Wette, and Bleek. For treatises on the separate Gospels, see their respective names; see also the article JESUS CHRISTUS.

A. GOTHOLIAS. Josias, son of Gotholias (Γοθολίας; Gothic), was one of the sons of Elam who returned from Babylon with Esdras (1 Esdr. viii. 33). The name is the same as ATHIAHILL, with the common substitution of the Greek ɣ for the Hebrew guttural ʕ. In the passage compared with 2 K. xi. 1, 1 (see shows that Athaliah was both a male and female name.

GOTHONIEL. (Γοθονῆς, i.e. Othnial; [Sin.1 Βοθονήν, gen. Βοθονήδας] Gotholiah, father of Caleb, who was one of the governors (ἀποστολας) of the city of Bethulia (Jud. vi. 15).

GOURD. I. Ἰτέλλω, only in Jon. iv. 6-10: κολοκύνθης; hedera. A difference of opinion has long existed as to the plant which is intended by this word. The argument is as old as Jerome, whose rendering was emended by Augustine as a heresy! In reality Jerome's rendering was not intended to be critical, but rather as a kind of *pis aller* necessitated by the want of a proper Latin word to express the original. Besides he was unwilling to leave it in merely Latinized Hebrew (קְוָרֹן), which might have occasioned misapprehensions. Augustine, following the LXX. and Syr. Versions, was in favor of the rendering *gourd*, which was adopted by Luther, the A. V., etc. In Jerome's description of the plant called in Syr. κάρα and Punic el-kor, Celsius recognizes the *Ricinus communis*, or castor-oil plant (Hieron. ii. 273 ff; Bochart, Hieroz. ii. 233, 623). The *Ricinus* was seen by Niebuhr (Descript. of *Arab.* p. 148) at Basra, where it was distinguished by the name el-kor; by Rauwolf (Trav. p. 52) it was noticed in great abundance near Tripoli, where the Arabs called it el-kor; while both Hassedquist and Robinson observed very large speci- mens of it in the neighborhood of Jericho (*Ricinus in altitudine arboris insignissim*; Hassedq. p. 555; see also Rob. i. 553).

Niebuhr observes that the Jews and Christians at Mosaic (Nineveh) maintained that the tree which sheltered Jonah was not "el-kor," but "el-kerra," a sort of gourd. 'His revival of the Augustan rendering has been defended by J. E. Faber (Notes et Harmer's Observations, etc. i. 145). And it must be confessed that the evidently miraculous charac- ter of the narrative in Jon. deprives the *Polian Christi* of any special claim to identification on the ground of its rapid growth and tree, as described by Niebuhr. More important, however, is it to observe the tree-like character of this plant, rendering it more suitable for the purpose which it is stated to have fulfilled; also the authority of the *Palestine Jews* who were contemporaries of Jerome, as compared with that of the Mosaic Jews conversed with by Niebuhr. But most decisive of all seems the derivation of the Hebrew word from the Egypt- tion *kik* (Herod. ii. 94; comp. Bahr, *loc. cit.* and Judkensy, *Opusc. pt. i. p. 110) established by Cel- sius, with whose arguments Michaelis declares him- self entirely satisfied (J. D. Mich. Suppl.); and confirmed by the Talmudical יַלְדָּן יֵאֵל וְלָא, aFig-oil, prepared from the seeds of the *Ricinus* (Buxt. Lex. Chid. Talmud, vol. 2029), and Dioscorides, iv. 164, where κράτων (Polian Christi) is described under the name of *kik*, and the oil made from its seeds is called *kikwn wllw*. II. יתלדנ and ילבּאלח. (1) In 2 K. iv. 39: a fruit used as food, disagreeable to the taste, and supposed to be poisonous. (2.) In 1 K. vi. 18, vii. 24, as an architectural ornament, where A. V. "knaps." In Hebrew the *plant* is described as לַדֶת יִפְלָר וְאֵפֶּר: riten silver- *trem*: whence in A. V. "wild vine" [2 K. iv. 39]. The *fruits* is called in Hebrew as above: *הַלּאָפָר: אָפָר: אָפָר: *wild gourds," A. V.

The inconsistency of all these renderings is man- ifest; but the fact is that the Hebrew name of the *plant* may denote any shrub which grows in ten- drels, such as the coilocynth, or the cucumber. Rosenmüller and Gesenius pronounce in favor of the wild cucumber, Cucumis agrestis or asinum (Cels. Hierobot. i. 393 ff). This opinion is con- firmed by the derivation from ילבאלח to burst. The wild cucumber bursts at the touch of the finger, and scatters its seeds, which the coilocynth does not (Rosem. Alterthuns. iv. pt. 1, 1). T. E. B.

There can, we think, be no reasonable doubt that the *kikya* which afforded shade to the prophet Jonah before Nineveh is the *Ricinus communis*, or castor-oil plant, which, formerly a native of Asia, is now naturalized in America, Africa, and the south of Europe. This plant, which varies considerably in size, being in India a tree, but in England seldom attaining a greater height than three or four feet, receives its generic name from the resemblance its fruit was anciently supposed to bear to the *acinus* ("tick") of that name. See Dioscorides (iv. 161, ed. Sprengel) and Pliny (H. N. xv. 7). The leaves are large and palmy, with serrated lobes, and would form an excellent shelter for the sun-stricken prophet. The seeds contain the oil so well known under the name of "castor-oil," which has for ages been in high repute as a medicine.

With regard to the "wild gourds" (יַלְדָּן וְלָא, pokkaith) of 2 K. iv. 39, which one of the "sons of the prophets" gathered ignorantly, supposing them to be good for food, there can be no doubt
that it is a species of the gourd tribe (Cucurbitaceae), which contain some plants of a very bitter and dangerous character. The leaves and tendrils of this family of plants bear some resemblance to those of the vine. Hence the expression, "wild vine;" and as several kinds of Cucurbitaceae, such as melons, pumpkins, etc., are favorite articles of refreshing food amongst the Orientals, we can easily understand the cause of the mistake.

The plants which have been by different writers identified with the pkhkwth are the following: the colocynth, or colocynthia (Citrullus colocynthis); the Cucumis prophetarum, or globe cucumber; and the Cucumen (Momordica) peltata; all of which have claims to denote the plant in question. The etymology of the word from בֶּשְׁלִיק, "to split or burst open," has been thought to favor the identification of the plant with the Ecbalium elaterium, or "squirt ing cucumber," so called from the elasticity with which the fruit, when ripe, opens and scatters the seeds when touched. This is the ἔριξις ἡμών of Dioscorides (iv. 152) and Theophrastus (vii. 6, § 4, &c.), and the Cucumis yl-nestri of Pliny (H. N. xx. 2). Celsius (Hist. i. 283), Rosenmüller (Böd. Bot. p. 128), Winer (Böd. Res. i. 525), and Gesnerus (Thes. p. 1122), are in favor of this explanation, and it must be confessed, not without some reason. The old versions, however, understand the colocynth, the fruit of which is about the size of an orange. The drastic medicine in such general use is a preparation from this plant. Michaelis (Suppl. Lex. Heb. p. 344) and Oedlmann (Vern. Samen. iv. 88) adopt this explanation; and since, according to Kitto (Pict. Böd. i. c.), the dry gourds of the colocynth, when crushed, burst with a crashing noise, there is much reason for being satisfied with an explanation which has authority, etymology, and general suitableness in its favor. All the above-named plants are found in the East.

W. H. 

* There is a Letter relating to Jonah's Gourd in the Bible, Euseb. xii. 196 ff., from the late Rev. H. Loebell, Missionary at Mosul in Mesopotamia. He says that "the Mohammedans, Christians, and Jews all agree in referring the plant to the kert, a kind of pumpkin peculiar to the East. The leaves are large, and the rapidity of the growth of the plant is astonishing. Its fruit is, for the most part, eaten in a fresh state, and is somewhat like the squash. It has no more than a generic resemblance to the gourd of the United States, though I suppose that both are species of the cucurbitas. It is grown in great abundance on the alluvial banks of the Tigress, and on the plain between the river and ruins of Nineveh, which is about a mile wide." He gives reasons for supposing that the LXX kolokynth was really meant to designate that plant. Dr. Pusey (Jonah, p. 258) follows those who adopt our marginal rendering as correct, namely, palmercot or the castor-oil plant as described above. He remarks concerning this plant (which must be true, perhaps, of any plant with which the ἱκίας was identical) that while the rapidity of its growth was supernatural, it was a growth in conformity with the natural character of the product.

H.

GOVERNOR. In the A. V. this one English word is the representative of no less than ten Hebrew and four [five] Greek words. To discriminate between them is the object of the following article.

1. פַּלְטָנָה, alliph, the chief of a tribe or family, פַּלְטָנָה, elaph (Judg. vi. 15; Is. ix. 22; Mic. v. 2), and equivalent to the "prince of a thousand" of Ex. xviii. 21, or the "head of a thousand" of Num. i. 16. It is the term applied to the "dukes" of Edom (Gen. xxxiv.). The LXX. have retained the etymological significance of the word in rendering it by καλαίρως in Zech. ix. 7; xii. 5, 6 (comp. יִלְעֶה, from יִלָּעַה). The usage in other passages seems to imply a more intimate relationship than that which would exist between a chieftain
and his fellow-clerics, and to express the closest friendship. *Allāyp* is then a "guide, director, counsellor" (Ps. lv. 13; Prov. ii. 17; Jer. iii. 4), the object of confidence or trust (Mic. v. 2).

2. מַכְּלָךְ, מַכְּלָךְ (Judg. v. 9), and מַכְּלָךְ (Judg. v. 14), denote a ruler in his capacity of *toungiier* and dispenser of justice (Gen. xix. 10; Prov. viii. 15; comp. Judg. v. 14, with Is. x. 1).

4. מְשֶה, mēsheh, a ruler considered especially as having power over the property and persons of his subjects; whether his authority were absolute, as in Judg. xix. 11 of Sihon, and in Ps. cxv. 26, or delegated, as in the case of Abraham's steward (Gen. xxiv. 2), and Joseph as second to Pharaoh (Gen. xvii. 8, 26, Ps. cxv. 21). The "governors of the people" in 2 Chr. xxiii. 20 appear to have been the king's body-guard (cf. 2 K. xii. 19).

5. מִנְגִּיד, minēgid, is connected etymologically with מַנְגָּיב יָד, and denotes a prominent personage, whatever his capacity. It is applied to a king as the military and civil chief of his people (2 Sam. v. 2, vi. 21; 1 Chr. xvi. 11), to the chief of an army (2 Chr. xxxii. 21), and to the head of a tribe (2 Chr. xix. 11). The heir-apparent to the crown was thus designated (2 Chr. xii. 22), as holding a prominent position among the king's sons. The term is also used of persons who fulfilled certain offices in the temple, and is applied equally to the high-priest (2 Chr. xxxi. 10, 13), as to inferior priests (2 Chr. xxxv. 8) to whose charge were committed the treasures and the dedicated things (1 Chr. xxvi. 24), and to Levites appointed for special service (2 Chr. xxi. 12). It denotes an officer of high rank in the palace, the lord high chamberlain (2 Chr. xxviii. 7), who is also described as "over the household" (1 K. iv. 6), or "over the house" (1 K. xviii. 3). Such was the office held by Shebna, the scribe, or secretary of state (Is. xxii. 15), and in which he was succeeded by Elizakim (2 K. xvii. 15). It is perhaps the equivalent of ἐκκόμος, Rom. xvi. 23, and of ἐκταραττός, 1 Esd. vii. 2 (cf. 1 Esd. i. 8).

6. מְשֹׁרֵי, mēshore. The prevailing idea in this word is that of elevation. It is applied to the chief of a tribe (Gen. xxv. 20, 26, etc.), to the heads of sections of a tribe (Num. iii. 32, vii. 2), and to a powerful sheikh (Gen. xxvii. 6). It appears to be synonymous with *allāyp* in 2 Chr. i. 2, מְשֹׁרֵי מְשֹׁרַר = מְשֹׁרַר מְשֹׁרֵי (cf. 2 Chr. v. 2).

In general it denotes a man of elevated rank. In later times the title was given to the president of the great Sanhedrin (Selden, De Synedrisis, ii. 6, § 1).

7. פֶּכְּחָה, pekhāh, is probably a word of Assyan origin. It is applied in 1 K. x. 15 to the petty chieftains who were tributary to Solomon (2 Chr. x. 14); to the military commander of the Syrians (1 K. xx. 24); the Assyrians (2 K. xvii. 24), the Chaldeans (Jer. lii. 23), and the Medes (Jer. lii. 28). Under the Persian viceroys, during the Babylonian captivity, the land of the Hebrews appear, to have been portioned out among "governors" (נָפָחַה, pekhāh) inferior in rank to the satraps (Ezr. viii. 44), like the other provinces which were under the dominion of the Persian king (Neh. ii. 7, 9).

It is impossible to determine the precise limits of their authority, or the functions which they had to perform. They formed a part of the Babylonian system of government, and are expressly distinguished from the נָפָחַה, naphāh (Jer. lii. 23, 28), to whom, as well as to the satraps, they seem to have been inferior (Dan. iii. 2, 3, 27); as also from the שלים, širim (Esth. iii. 12, viii. 9), who, on the other hand, had a subordinate jurisdiction. Sheshbazar, the "prince" (עֵנֶשׁ בְּצָר, Ezr. i. 8) of Judah, was appointed by Cyrus a "governor" of Jerusalem (Ezr. v. 14), or "governor of the Jews," as he is elsewhere designated (Ezr. vi. 7), an office to which Nehemiah afterwards succeeded (Neh. v. 14) under the title of Tirshatha (Ezr. vi. 63; Neh. viii. 9). Zerubbabel, the representative of the royal family of Judah, is also called the "governor" of Judah (Hag. i. 1), but whether in consequence of his position in the tribe or from his official rank is not quite clear. Tattenai, the "governor" beyond the river, is spoken of by Josephus (Ant. xi. 4, § 4) under the name of Sisines, as ἐραγόσας of Syria and Phoenicia (cf. 1 Esd. vi. 3); the same term being employed to denote the Roman proconsul or procurator as well as the procurator (Jos. Ant. xx. 8, § 1). It appears from Ezr. vi. 8 that these governors were intrusted with the collection of the king's taxes; and from Neh. vi. 18, xii. 26, that they were supported by a contribution levied upon the people, which was technically termed "the bread of the governor" (comp. Ezr. iv. 14). They were probably assisted in discharging their official duties by a council (Ezr. iv. 7, vi. 6). In the Peshito version of Neh. iii. 11. Pahath Moab is not taken as a proper name, but is rendered "chief of Moab," and a similar translation is given in other passages where the words occur, as in Ezr. ii. 6, Neh. vii. 11, x. 14. The "governor" beyond the river had a judgment-seat at Jerusalem, from which probably he administered justice when making a progress through his province (Neh. iii. 7).

8. פֶּכְּבָד, pekbād, denotes simply a person appointed to any office. It is used of the officers proposed to be appointed by Joseph (Gen. xliii. 34); of Zebul, Abimelech's lieutenant (Judg. ii. 28); of an officer of the high-priest (2 Chr. xxiv. 11), inferior to the mēgīd (2 Chr. xxxi. 12, 13), or pekbēd mēgīd (Jer. xx. 1), and of a priest or Levite of high rank (Neh. xi. 14, 22). The same term is applied to the eunuch who was over the men of war (2 K. xx. 19; Jer. iii. 25), and to an officer appointed for special service (Esth. ii. 3). In the passage of Jer. xx. above quoted it probably denotes the captain of the temple guard mentioned in Acts iv. 1, v. 24, and by Josephus (B. J. vi. 5, § 3).

9. מְשֹׁלָל, mēšolah, a man of authority. Applied to Joseph as Pharaoh's prime minister (Gen. xliii. 6); to Arioch, the captain of the guard, to the king of Babylon (Dan. ii. 15), and to Daniel as third in rank under Belshazzar (Dan. v. 29).

10. נִרְעָה, nirā, a chief, in any capacity. The term is used equally of the general of an army (Gen. xxii. 22), or the commander of a division (1 K. xvi. 9, xi. 24), as of the governor of Pharaoh's prison (Gen. xxxix. 21), and the chief of his butlers and bakers (Gen. xi. 2), or herdsmen (Gen. xliii. 4). The chief officer of a city, in his civic capacity, was thus designated (1 K. xii. 26; 2 K. xxii. 8). The same dignity is elsewhere described as svw
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11. "W. Upoffrd Trjs and who he ethnarchy, Archelaus, from is exercised under the Persian kings.

12. "The concept of a governor under Aretas, the Arabian king of Damascus. It is not easy to determine the capacity in which he acted. The term is applied in 1 Mac. xiv. 47, xv. 1 to Simon the high-priest, who was made general and ethnarch of the Jews, as a vessel of Domitian. From this the office would appear to be distinct from a military command. The jurisdiction of Archelaus, called by Josephus (B. J. ii. 6, § 3) an ethnarchy, extended over Idumaean, Samaria, and all Judaea, the half of his father’s kingdom, which he held as the emperor’s vassal. But, on the other hand, Strabo (xvii. 13), in enumerating the offices who formed part of the machinery of the Roman government in Egypt, mentions ethnarch as apparently as inferior both to the military commanders and to the monarchs, or governors of districts. Again, the prefect of the colony of Jews in Alexandria (called by Philo θεσπάργης, lib. in Flacc. § 10) is designated by this title in the edict of Claudius given by Josephus (Ant. xix. 5, § 2).

According to Strabo (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, § 2) he exercised the prerogatives of an ordinary independent ruler. It has therefore been conjectured that the ethnarch of Damascus was merely the governor of the resident Jews, and this conjecture receives some support from the parallel narrative in Acts ix. 24, where the Jews alone are said to have taken part in the conspiracy against the Apostle. But it does not seem probable that an officer of such limited jurisdiction would be styled “the ethnarch of Aretas the king;” and as the term is clearly capable of a wide range of meaning, it was most likely intended to denote one who held the city and district of Damascus as the king’s vassal or representative.

13. "Guzan, the procurator of Judæa under the Romans (Matt. xxvii. 2, etc.). The verb is employed (Luke ii. 2) to denote the nature of the jurisdiction of Quirinus over the imperial province of Syria.

14. "Guzan, a steward; apparently intrusted with the management of a minor’s property.

15. "Guzan, John ii. 9, “the governor of the feast.” It has been conjectured, but without much show of probability, that this officer corresponded to the συμποσιαρχος of the Greeks, whose duties are described by Plutarch (Sympsis. Quaed. 4), and to the latter bishop of the Roman Lightfoot supposes him to have been a kind of chaplain, who pronounced the blessings upon the wine that was drunk during the seven days of the marriage feast. Again, some have taken him to be equivalent to the ταυτάκοποι, who is defined by Philox (Theol. vi. 1) as one who had the charge of all the servants at a feast, the carvers, entertainers, etc. But there is nothing in the narrative of the marriage-feast at Cana which would lead to the supposition that the ἀρχιτριτίλειος held the rank of a servant. He appears rather to have been on intimate terms with the bridegroom, and to have presided at the banquet in his stead. The duties of the master of a feast are given at full length in Ecles. xxxvi. (xxxi.).

In the Apocryphal books, in addition to the common words, ἀρχων, δεσπότης, στρατηγός, which are rendered “governor,” we find ἐπιστάτης (1 Esdr. 1; Jud. ii. 14), which closely corresponds to τάφαρχος used of Zeerbubl and Tatna (1 Esdr. vi. 3, 29, vii. 1), and ἀρχιτριτίλειος, applied to Sheshhazzar (1 Esdr. ii. 12), both of which represent τάφαρχος: ἐπιστάτης (1 Esdr. vii. 2) and προστάτης του ἵππου (2 Mac. iii. 4), “the governor of the temple” — τάφαρχος (cf. 2 Chr. xxiv. 8) and στρατηγός (1 Esdr. iii. 21), a “satrap,” not always used in its strict sense, but as the equivalent of στρατηγός (Jud. v. 2, vii. 8).

W. A. W.

16. "The edéwos, the governor (dirigens, Vulg.), Jas. iii. 4, where the pilot or helmsman is meant. Both κοπρείρας (Acts xxvii. 11 and Rev. xvii. 17) and the Latin gubernator, whence our “governor” is derived, denote the man at the helm of the vessel.

GOZAN (Πηνυκα, perh. quarry, Gez.; poss. fired, First: Γαζα, v. v. 2, 6, Γααρ, and 1 Chr. xxvii. 1; Gozan, [in Is., Gozam]) seems in the A. V. of 1 Chr. v. 26 to be the name of a river; but in Kings (2 K. vii. 6, and xviii. 11) it is evidently applied not to a river but a country. "Where Kings and Chronicles differ, the authority of the latter is weak; and the name Gozan will therefore be taken in the present article for the name of a tract of country.

Gozan was the tract to which the Israelites were carried away captive by Pult, Tighath-Pilser, and Shalmaneser, or possibly Sargon. It has been variously placed; but it is probably identical with the town called of Homem (Geographe, v. 18), and may be regarded as represented by the Mygdonia of other writers (Strab., Polyb., etc.). It was the tract watered by the Habor (Ἀβάρδας, Αβάρδας), the modern Khabur, the great Mesopotamian affluent of the Euphrates. Mr. Layard describes this region as one of remarkable fertility (Nineveh and Babylon, pp. 290–313). According to the LXX. Halah and Habor were both rivers of Gozan (2 K. vii. 6); but this is a mistranslation of the Hebrew text, and it is corrected in the following chapter, where we have the term “river” used in the singular of the Halah only. Halah seems to have been a region adjoining Gozan. [HALAH] With respect to the term Mygdonia, which became the recognized name of the region in classic times, and which Strabo (xvi. 1, § 27) and Plutarch (Livid. xix. e. 52) abridgely connect with the Mygdonian Mygdones, it may be observed that it is merely gozan, with the participial or adverbial ἐπί prefixed. The Greek writers always represent the Semitic ẹ by their own ọ. Thus Goza became Gozan, etc. But the Latin word which became the Phrae, and Mygdonian Mygum. The conjunction of Gozan with Haran or Haran in Isaiah (xxvii. 12) is in entire agreement with was on the river, and a ford there (see above) may have given name to both.

II.
GRABA

the position here assigned to the former. As Gozan was the district on the Khabour, so Haran was that upon the Bilk, the next affluent of the Euphrates. [See Charran.] The Assyrian kings, having conquered the one, would naturally go on to the other.

G. R.

GRABA ('Aryan' [so Aid.; Vat.] Alex. [and 10 other MSS.]: 'Aryan' : Aramaeco), 1 Esdr. v. 29. [Hagbard.] As is the case with many names in the A. V. of the Apocryphal books, it is not obvious whence our translators got the form they have here employed — without the initial A, which even the corrupt Vulgate retains.

* GRAFT (Rom. xi. 17 ff.). [See Olive.]

GRAPE. [Vine.]

GRASS. 1. This is the ordinary rendering of the Heb. word הָרָגָא (haragah), which signifies properly an inclosed spot, from the root הָרָגָא, to inclose; but this root also has the second meaning to flourish, and hence the noun frequently signifies "folder," "food of cattle." In this sense it occurs in 1 K. xvii. 8; Job xi. 15; Ps. civ. 14: Is. xx. 6, 8. As the herbage rapidly fades under the parching heat of the sun of Palestine, it has afforded to the sacred writers an image of the fleeting nature of human fortunes (Job viii. 12; Ps. xxxvii. 2), and also of the brevity of human life (Is. xi. 6, 7; Ps. xc. 5). The LXX. render הָרָגָא by ὤμαιναν and πῶς, but most frequently by αἱρεῖν, a word which in Greek has passed through the very same modifications of meaning as its Hebrew representative: αἱρεῖν = gaven, "folder," is properly a con or inclosed space for cattle to feed in (Homo. II. xi. 774), and then any feeding-place whether inclosed or not (Drr. ἱπ. T. 134, αἱρεῖν εὐθειάρος).

Gesenius questions whether הָרָגָא, αἱρεῖν, and the Sam. הֵרָגָא "green" may be traceable to the same root.

2. In Jer. i. 11, A. V. renders הָרָגָא as the heifer at press, and the LXX. ὡμαίναν ὂμαιναν. It should be "as the heifer treading out corn" (comp. Hos. x. 11). הָרָגָא comes from הָרָגָא, cederers, tritivare, and has been confounded with הָרָגָא, gaven, from root הָרָגָא, to germinate. This is the word rendered press in Gen. i. 11, 12, where it is distinguished from הָרָגָא, the latter signifying herba suitable for human food, while the former is herbage for cattle. Gesenius says it is used chiefly concerning grass, which has no seed (at least none obvious to general observers), and the smaller weeds which spring up spontaneously from the soil. The LXX. render it by αἱρεῖν, as well as by αἱρεῖν, ὡμαιναν, and πῶς.

3. In Num. xxii. 4, where mention is made of the ox licking up the grass of the field, the Heb. word is הוֹרָגָא, which elsewhere is rendered green, when followed by הָרָגָא or הָרָמָא, as in Gen. i. 30, and Ps. xxxvii. 2. It answers to the German des Grasen, and comes from the root הָרָגָא, to flourish like grass.

4. הָרָגָא is used in Deut., in the Psalms, and in the Prophets, and, as distinguished from הָרָגָא, signifies herbs for human food (Gen. i. 30; Ps. civ. 14), but also folder for cattle (Deut. xi. 15; Jer. xiv. 6). It is the grass of the field (Gen. ii. 5 Ex. ix. 22) and of the mountain (Is. xiii. 15 Prov. xxvii. 25).

In the N. T. wherever the word grass occurs it is the representative of the Greek "GRAPE." [L. D.

* GRASS ON THE HOUSE-TOP. [ANA-

THOTH, Amer. ed.]

GRASSHPPPER. [LOCUST.]

* GRATE. [ALTAR.]

GRAVE. [BURIAL.]

GREALVES (776). This word occurs in the A. V. only in 1 Sam. xvii. 6, in the description of the equipment of Goliath — "he had greaves of brass upon his legs." Its ordinary meaning is a piece of defensive armor which reached from the foot to the knee, and thus protected the shin of the wearer. This was the case with the "kynal of the Greeks, which derived its name from its covering the kynal, i. e. the part of the leg above-named. But the Mishneh of the above passage can hardly have been armor of this nature. Whatever the armor was it was not worn on the legs, but on the feet (777) of Goliath. It appears to have been derived from a root signifying brightness, as of a star (see Gesenius and Fürst). The word is not either in the dual or plural number, but is singular. It would therefore appear to have been more a kind of shoe or boot than a "greave;" though in our ignorance of the details of the arms of the Hebrews and the Philistines we cannot conjecture more closely as to its nature. At the same time it must be allowed that all the old versions, including Josephus, give it the meaning of a piece of armor for the leg — some even for the thigh.

G.

GREECE, GREEKS, GRECIANS. The histories of Greece and Palestine are so little connected as those of any other two nations exercising the same influence on the destinies of mankind could well be.

The Homeric Epos in its widest range does not include the Hebrews, while on the other hand the Mosaic idea of the Western world seems to have been sufficiently indefinite. It is possible that Moses may have derived some geographical outlines from the Egyptians; but he does not use them in Gen. x. 2-5, where he mentions the descendants of Javan as peopling the islands of the Gentiles. This is merely the vaguest possible indication of a geographical locality; and yet it is not improbable that his Egyptian teachers were almost equally in the dark as to the position of a country which had not at that time arrived at a unity sufficiently imposing to arrest the attention of its neighbors. The amount and precision of the information possessed by Moses must be measured by the nature of the relation which we can conceive as existing in his time between Greece and Egypt. Now it appears from Herodotus that prior to the Trojan war the current of tradition, sacred and mythical, set from Egypt towards Greece; and the first quasi-historical event which awakened the curiosity and stimulated the imagination of the Egyptian priests,
the story of Paris and Helen (Herod. ii. 43, 51, 52, and 112). At the time of the Exodus, therefore, it is not likely that Greece had entered into any definite relation whatever with Egypt. Withdrawn from the sea-coast, and only gradually fighting their way to it during the period of the Judges, the Hebrews have had no opportunity of forming connections with the Greeks. From the time of Solon, it is true, the Greeks, as we may notice in the two elements of the Greeks in the Hebrew writings, except that which was contained in the word *Javan* (Gen. x. 2); and it does not seem probable that during this period the word had any peculiar significance for a Jew, except in so far as it was associated with the idea of islanders. When, indeed, they came into contact with the Ionians of Asia Minor, and recognized them as the long-lost islanders of the western migration, it was natural that they should mark the similarity of sound between Vpy = Η and Ione, and the application of that name to the Asiatic Greeks would tend to satisfy in some measure a longing to realize the Moshe ethnography. Accordingly the O. T. word which is *Grecia* in A. V. *Greece, Greeks, etc.* is in Hebrew פ*ג, Jerusalem, Isaiah xxxv. 8; Dan. viii. 21; the Hebrew, however, is sometimes retained (Is. lxvi. 19; Ez. xxvii. 13). In Gen. x. 2, the LXX. have καὶ Ἱουαναὶ καὶ Εβραίων, with which Rosenmuller compares Herod. ii. 56-58, and professes to discover the two elements of the Greek race. From Ίουαναί he gets the Ionian or Pelasgian, from *Εβραίων (for which he supposes the Hebr. original נ*ג), the Hellenic element. This is excessively fanciful, and the degree of accuracy which it implies upon an ethnological question cannot possibly be attributed to Moses, and is by no means necessarily involved in the fact of his divine inspiration.

The Greeks and Hebrews met for the first time in the slave-market. The medium of communication seems to have been the Tyrian slave-merchant. About 8. c. 800 Joel speaks of the Tyrians as selling the children of Judah to the Greeks (Joel iii. 6); and in the 3rd century B.C. the Greeks are mentioned as bartering their,brazen vessels for slaves. On the other hand, Bechart says that the Greek slaves were highly valued throughout the East (Geogr. Soc. pt. i. lib. iii. c. 3, p. 175); and it is probable that the Tyrians took advantage of the calamities which befell either nation to sell them as slaves to the other. Abundant opportunities would be afforded by the attacks of the Libyan monarchy on the one people, and the Syrian on the other; and it is certain that Tyre would let slip no occasion of replenishing her slave-market.

Prophehtical notice of Greece occurs in Dan. viii. 21, etc., where the history of Alexander and his successors is rapidly sketched. Zechariah (ix. 13) foretells the triumphs of the Maccabees against the Greek-Syrian empire, while Isaiah looks forward to the conversion of the Greeks, amongst other Gentiles, through the instrumentality of Jewish missionaries (lxvi. 19). For the connection between the Jews and the quasi-Greek kingdoms which sprung out of the divided empire of Alexander, reference should be made to other articles.

The presence of Alexander himself at Jerusalem, and his respectful demeanor, are described by Josephus (Ant. xi. 8, § 3); and some Jews are even said to have joined him in his expedition against Versus (Heb. ap. Joseph. c. Apion, ii. 4), as the

Samaritans had already done in the siege of Tyre (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, §§ 4-6). In 1 Macc. xii. 5-23 (about B. c. 180), and Joseph. Ant. xii. 4, § 10, we have an account of an embassy and letter sent by the Lacedaemonians to the Jews. [AREUS; OXH.

The most remarkable feature in the transaction is the claim which the Lacedaemonians prefer to kindred with the Jews, and which Arcus professes to establish, by reference to a book. It is by no means unlikely that two declining nations, the one crowning beneath a Roman, the other beneath a Graeco-Syrian invader, should draw together in face of the common calamity. This may have been the case, or we may with John (Heb. Comm. ix. 9, note) regard the affair as a piece of pompous trilling or idle curiosity, at a period when all nations were curious to ascertain their origin, and their relationship to other nations.

The notices of the Jewish people which occur in Greek writers have been collected by Josephus (c. Apion, i. 22). The chief are Pythagoras, Herodotus, Cheriaus, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hecataus. The main drift of the argument of Josephus is to show that the Greek authors derived their materials from Jewish sources, or with more or less distinctness referred to Jewish history. For Pythagoras, see verses Herinnipus's life; for Aristotle, Cicaclus; but it should be remembered that the Neo-Platonism of these authorities makes them comparatively worthless; that Herinnipus in particular belongs to that Alexandrian school which made it its business to fuse the Hebrew traditions with the philosophy of Greece, and propitiated the genius of Orientalism by denying the merit of originality to the great and independent thinkers of the West. The style of thought was further developed by Cicaclus; and a very good specimen of it may be seen in Lecher's notices on Grotius, de Verr. It has been ably and vehemently assailed by Ritter, Hist. Phil. b. i. c. 3.

Herodotus mentions the *Euphrates of Palæstina* as confessing that they derived the rite of circumcision from the Egyptians (ii. 104). Bihler, however, does not think it likely that Herodotus visited the interior of Palestine, though he was acquainted with the sea-coast. (On the other hand see Dallmann, pp. 55, 56, Engl. transl.) It is almost impossible to suppose that Herodotus could have visited Jerusalem without giving us some more detailed account of it than the merely incidental notices in ii. 159 and iii. 5, not to mention that the site of Καστόρ is still a disputed question.

The victory of Phraor-Anecho over Josiah at Megiddo is recorded by Herodotus (comp. Herod. ii. 159 with 2 K. xvii. 22-23, 2 Chr. xxxv. 20-22). It is singular that Josephus should have omitted these references, and cited Herodotus only as mentioning the rite of circumcision.

The work of Theophrastus cited is not extant; he enumerates amongst other oaths that of *Corbin*. Cheriaus is supposed by Josephus to describe the Jews in a by no means flattering portrait of a people who accompanied Xerxes in his expedition against Greece. The chief points of identification are, their speaking the Phoenician language, and dwelling in the Solývems mountains, near a broad lake, which according to Josephus was the Dead Sea.

The Hecatans of Josephus in Hecataus of Abdera, the contemporary of Alexander the Great, and Pharnaces son of Lacus. The authenticity of the History of the Jews attributed to him by Jose
GREECE, GREEKS, ETC.

phasis has been called in question by Origen and others.

After the complete subjugation of the Greeks by the Romans, and the absorption into the Roman empire of the kingdoms which were formed out of the dominions of Alexander, the political connection between the Greeks and Jews as two independent nations no longer existed.

The name of the country, Greece, occurs once in N. T., Acts xx. 2, "Ελλάς = Greece, i. e. Greece Proper, as opposed to Macedonia. a In the A. V. of O. T. the word Greek is not found; either Javan is retained, or, as in Joel iii. 6, the word is rendered by Grecian. In Maccaebes Greeks and Grecians seem to be used indifferently (comp. 1 Mac. i. 10, vi. 2; also 2 Mac. iv. 10, Greekish). In N. T., on the other hand, a distinction is observed, "Ελλάς being observed Greek, and Ελληνι- στής Grecian. The difference of the English terminations, however, is not sufficient to convey the difference of meanings. "Ελλάς in N. T. is either a Greek by race, as in Acts xvi. 1-3, xviii. 17, Rom. i. 14; or more frequently a Gentile, as opposed to a Jew (Rom. ii. 9, 10, etc.); so fem. 'Ελληνις, Mark vii. 26, Acts xviii. 21. "Ελληνι- στής (properly "one who speaks Greek") is a foreign Jew; opposed, therefore, not to Ιουδαῖος, but to Εβραίος, a home-Jew, one who dwelt in Palestine. So Schleusner, etc.; according to Salmusius, how- ever, the Hellenists were Greek proselytes, who had become Christians; so Wolf, Parkhurst, etc., arguing from Acts xi. 20, where 'Ελληνισταί are contrasted with Ιουδαῖοι in 19. The question resolves itself partly into a textual one, Griesbach having adopted the reading "Ελληνισταί, and so also Lach- man. b

* GREEK LANGUAGE. [Hellenist; Language of the New Testament.]

GREETING. [SALUTATION.]

GREYHOUND, the translation in the text of the A. V. (Prov. xxx. 31) of the Hebrew words זִיצֵי נַחַל (zarzir mothirgin), i. e. "one girl about the loins." See margin, where it is conjectured that the "horse" is the animal de- noted by this expression. The Alexandrine version of the LXX. has the following interpretation, ἀλεποῦν ἑπετριπτὴν ἐν θηλαις εὐφορον, i. e. "a cock as it proudly struts amongst the hens." Somewhat similar is the Vulgate, "gallus succinc- tus lumbos." Various are the opinions as to what animal "comely in going" is here intended. Some think "a leopard," others "an eagle," or "a man girl with armor," or "a zebra," etc. Gesenius (Thea. p. 433), Schultens (Comment. ad Prov. l. c.), Bochart (Hieroz. li. 684), Rosenmüller (Schol. ad Prov. i. c., and Not. ad Boch. l. c.), Fuller (Miscell. Sac. v. 12), are in favor of a "war-horse girl with trappings" being the thing signified. But,

Sacred symbolic Tree of the Assyrians. From Lord Abercrombie's Black Stone. (Ferguson's Nineveh and Persepolis, p. 298.)

GRINDERS, Eccl. xii. 3. [ALMOND.]

GRINDING. [MILL.]

GROVE. A word used in the A. V., with two exceptions, to translate the mysterious Hebrew term Aserah (יָשָרֶה). This term is examined under its own head (p. 173), where it is observed that almost all modern interpreters agree that an idol or image of some kind must be intended, and not a grove, as our translators render, following the version of the LXX. (Δασός) and of the Vulgate (lucus). This is evident from many passages, and especially from 2 K. xxvii. 6, where we find that Josiah "brought out the Asherah " (translated by our version "the grove ") b from the house of the

H. * "Ελλάς stands there for the stricter ΑΧΛΑΣ (see Acts xviii. 12 and xix. 21). Wetstein has shown (Nov. Test. ii. 500) that Luke was justified in that use of the term.

A. Also, Tischendorf, De Wette, Meyer, and others, adopt Ελληνισταί, partly on external, and partly on in-

ternal grounds. It is a question of mixed evidence without this reading it is impossible to see how the sphere of the speakers in ver. 19 differs from that of those in ver. 20. It would have been nothing new at this time to preach to the Greek-speaking Jews; see e. g., Acts ii. 9, and ix. 20. b
Lord" (comp. also Judg. iii. 7; 1 K. xiv. 23, xvii. 19). In many passages the "groves" are grouped with maidens and graven images in a manner that leaves no doubt that some idol was intended (2 Chr. xxxiii. 19, xxxiv. 3, 4; Is. xvii. 8). There has been much dispute as to what the Asherah was; but in addition to the views set forth under Asher- rah, we must not omit to notice a probable connection between this symbol or image — whatever it was and the sacred symbolic tree, the representation of which occurs so frequently on Assyrian sculptures, and is shown in the preceding woodcut. The connection is ingeniously maintained by Mr. Fergusson in his Nineveh and Persepolis restored (pp. 299-304), to which the reader is referred.

2. The two exceptions noticed above are Gen. xxi. 33 and 1 Sam. xxii. 6 (margin), where a "grove" is employed to render the word מְדִילֶה, Medil, which in the latter of the passage, and in 1 Sam. xxxvi. 13, is translated "tree." Professor Stanley (S. & P. § 77; also p. 21, note) would have Medil to be a tamarisk; but this is controverted by Bonar (Land of Promise), on the ground of the thin and shadeless nature of that tree. It is now, however, generally recognized (amongst others, see Gesen. Thes. p. 50 b; Stanley, S. & P. App. § 76, 3, p. 142 note, 220 note, and Passow), that the word אלה, Elleh, which is uniformly rendered by the A. V. "groves," signifies a grove or plantation. Such were the Elah of Manare (Gen. xxiii. 18, xiv. 18, xviii. 1); of Moreh (Gen. xii. 6; Deut. xi. 30); and of Medin (Judg. iv. 15, or Josh. xiv. 33); of the pillar (Judg. ix. 6); of Monemenin (Judg. ix. 37); and of Tabor (1 Sam. x. 3). In all these cases the LXX. have πώρας or βαλακρίνας: the Vulgate — which the A. V. probably followed — calles or convallis, in the last three, however, quercus.

In the religions of the ancient heathen world groves play a prominent part. In old timesaltors only were erected to the gods. It was thought wrong to shut up the gods within walls, and hence, as Pliny expressly tells us, trees were the first temples (H. N. xii. 2; Tac. Germ. 9; Lucian, de Sacer. 19; see Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 332), and from the earliest times groves are mentioned in connection with religious worship (Gen. xii. 6, 7, xiii. 18; Deut. xi. 30; A. V. "plain;" see above). Their high antiquity, refreshing shade, solemn silence, and awe-inspiring solitude, as well as the striking illustration they afford of natural life, marked them out as the fit localities, or even the actual objects of worship (ναοί in et in silentia ipsa adoramus; Plin. xii. 1; "Secretum loci .... et admiratio umbra silvis tibi nunmis facet," Sen. Ep. xii.; "Quo possis viso dicere Numen habet," Or. First. ii. 260; "Sacra nemus accebit umbra," Virg. Georg. iii. 334; Or. Met. viii. 743; Ev. vi. 13; Is. vii. 5; Hos. iv. 13). This last passage hints at another and darker reason why groves were important for the degraded services of idolatry; their shadow hid the atrocities and obscenities of heathen worship. The groves which were generally found connected with temples, and often had the right of offering an asylum (Tac. Germ. 9, 40; Herod. ii. 138; Virg. Æn. i. 441, 512; Sil. Ital. i. 81). Some have supposed that even the Jewish Temple had εἰδώλια planted with palm and cedars (Ps. xixii. 12, 15) and olive (Ps. lii. 8) as the mosque which stands on its site now has. This is more than doubtful; but we know that a celebrated Ask stoio by the sanctuary at Sebcbh (Jos. xxii. 20; Judg. ix. 6; Stanley, S. & P. p. 142). We find repeated mention of groves consecrated with deep superstition to particular gods (L iv. vii. 13, xxiv. 3, xxxvi. 51; Tac. Ann. ii. 12, 51, etc., iv. 73, etc.). For this reason they were stringently forbidden to the Jews (Ex. xxxiv. 13; Jer. xvii. 2; Ez. xx. 28), and Maimonides even says that it is forbidden to sit under the shade of any green tree where an idol statue was (Fabric. Bibl. Antiq. p. 230). Yet we find abundant indications that the Hebrews felt the influence of groves on the mind ("the spirit in the woods," Wordsworth), and therefore selected them for solemn purposes, such as great national meetings (Judg. ix. 6, 37) and the burial of the dead (Gen. xxxvi. 8; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13). Those connected with patriarchal history were peculiarly liable to superstitions reverenee (Am. v. 5, viii. 14), and we find that the groves of Manare were long a place of worship (Sozomen, H. E. ii. 4; Euseb. Tit. Constant. 81; Irenaeus, Past. p. 714). There are in Scripture many memorable trees; e. g. Allon-bauchit (Gen. xxxvi. 8), the tamarisk (but see above) in Gilgal (1 Sam. xxii. 6), the terebinth in Shechem (Jos. xiv. 26, under which the law was set up), the palm-tree of Deborah (Judg. iv. 5, the terebinth of enchantments (Judg. ix. 37), the terebinth of wanderers (Judg. iv. 11) and others (1 Sam. x. 3; x. 4, sometimes "plain" in A. V., Vulg. "convalis").

This observation of particular trees was among the heathen extended to a regular worship of them. "Tree-worship may be traced from the interior of Africa, not only into Egypt and Arabia, but also onward uninterruptedly into Palestine and Syria, Assyria, Persia, India, Thibet, Siam, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan, and Syleria; also westward into Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and other countries; and in most of the countries here named it obtains in the present day, combined as it has been in other parts with various forms of idolatry." (Gen. of Earth and Man, p. 139.) "The worship of trees even goes back among the Iranians to the rules of Homa, called in the Zend-Avesta the promulgator of the old law. We know from Herodotus the delight which Xerxes took in the great plane-tree in Lydia, on which he bestowed golden ornaments, and appointed for it a sentinel in the person of one of the "immortal ten thousand." The early veneration of trees was associated, by the moist and refreshing canopy of foliage, with that of sacred fountains. In similar connection with the early worship of Nature were among the Hellenic nations the fame of the great palm-tree of Delos, and of an aged palmus in Arcadia. The Buddhists of Ceylon venerate the colossal Indian fig-tree of Anurah-depa .... As single trees thus became objects of veneration from the beauty of their form, so did also groups of trees, under the name of gardos of groves." (Pausanias (i. 21, § 9) is full of the praise of a grove belonging to the temple of Apollo at Gymnion in Eolis; and the grove of Colone is celebrated in the renowned chorus of Sophocles) (Humphreys, Grecia, iii. 96, Eng. ed.). The custom of adorning trees "with jewels and ornaments was very ancient and universal (Herod. vii. 31; Ilian. V. H. ii. 14; Theor. Id. ii. 18; Or. Met. vii. 728, 745; Arnoh. arg. Gentil. i. 39), and even still exists in the East.

The ocellar trees of antiquity are well known.
GUARD

The Hebrew terms commonly used had reference to the spurious duties which the body-guard of a monarch had to perform.

(1) Tabbāch (תַּבָּך) originally signified a "cook," and as butchering fell to the lot of the cook in Eastern countries, it gained the secondary sense of "butcher." It is applied to the body-guard of the kings of Egypt (Gen. xxxvi. 36), and Babylon (2 K. xv. 8; Jer. xxxix. 9, xl. 1; Dan. vii. 14). [EXECUTIONER.]

(2) Rātā (רתא) properly means a "runner," and is the ordinary term employed for the attendants of the Jewish kings, whose office it was to run before the chariot (2 Sam. xv. 1; 1 K. i. 5), like the cur senes of the Roman Emperors (Senee. Ep. 87, 125). That the Jewish "runners" superseeded the ordinary duties of a military guard, appears from several passages (1 Sam. xxii. 17; 2 K. x. 27, xi. 6; 2 Chr. xii. 19). It was their office also to carry despatches (2 Chr. xxx. 6). They had a guard-room set apart for their use in the king's palace, in which their arms were kept ready for use (1 K. xiv. 28; 2 Chr. xii. 11). [FOOTMAN.]

(3) The terms mishmereth (מְשֶׁמֶרֶת) and mishmâr (מִשְׁמַר) express properly the act of watching, but are occasionally transferred to the persons who kept watch (Neh. iv. 9, 22, vii. 3, xii. 9; Job xii. 12). The A. V. is probably correct in substituting mishmarot (מִשְׁמָרֹת) for the present reading in 2 Sam. xxiii. 23, Benalish being appointed "captain of the guard," as Josephus (Ant. vii. 14, § 4) relates, and not privy counsellor: the same error has crept into the text in 1 Sam. xxii. 14, where the words "which goeth at thy bidding" may originally have been "captain of the body-guard." For the duties of the captain of the guard, see [CAPTAIN], and [CAPTAIN OF THE GUARD, Amer. ed.]

W. L. B.

GUDGODAH (with the art. יִגְּדוֹדָה גְּדוֹדָה) Gadgoda, Deut. x. 7. [HOR HAGIDGAD.]

GUEST. [HOSPITALITY.]

* GUEST-CHAMBER. [HOUSE.]

* GUILTY. The phrase "guilty of death" (A. V.) Num. xxxvi. 31; Tob. vi. 12; Matt. xxvi. 36, Mark xiv. 64, contrary to the present idiom of pur language, signifies "deserving the penalty of death," being perhaps an imitation of the Latin res multis. "He is guilty" in Matt. xxiii. 1 (A. V.), is the translation of the same Greek word (σαφαδίως) which in ver. 16 is rendered "he is a debtor." A better translation in both cases would be, "he is bound," i.e. by his oath.

GUL/LOTH (גלוֹת) [spring, bubbling], plural of גל, a Hebrew term of unfrequent occurrence in the Bible, and used only in two passages — and those identical relations of the same occurrence — to denote a natural object, namely, the springs added by the great Caleb to the south land in the neighborhood of Debir, which formed the down of his daughter Achsah (Josh. xv. 19; Judg. i. 15). The springs were "upper" and "lower" — possibly one at the top and the other at the bottom of a ravine or glen; they may have derived their unusual name from their appearance being different from [from] that of the ordinary springs of the country. The root (גל) has the force of rolling or tumbling over, and perhaps this may imply that they welled up in that round or mushroom form which is not uncommon here, though apparently most rare in Palestine. The rendering of the Vat. LXX. is singular. In Jos. it has θέραμον (so Rom. Vat. Codex Boeth.); and the Gower, the latter doubtless a mere corruption of the Hebrew. The Alex. MS., as usual, is faithful to the Hebrew text [reading Γαλααδ]. In Judges both have λόφος. An attempt has been lately made by Dr. Rosen to identify these springs with the 'Ain Nukur near Hebron (see Zeitschrift der D. M. G. 1857); but the identification can hardly be received without fuller confirmation (Stanley, S. of P. App. § 84). [DELIB.]

GUN'IM (גנ'ים) [sorrowful, afflicted, Dicta.:

1. [Faw'i [Vat.-ve'ı], or Faw'i [Vat.-ve'ı]; Alex. Faw'i: Γανίτες. A son of Nachthi (Gen. xlii. 24; 1 Chr. vii. 13), the founder of the family of the Gunites (Num. xxvi. 48). Like several others of the early Israelite names, Gunit is a patronymic — "Gunite;" as if already a family at the time of its first mention (comp. Aroli, Hushim, etc.).

2. [Faw'ı.] A descendant of God; father of Abdil, a chief man in his tribe (1 Chr. v. 15).

GUN'ITES, THE (גנ'ים [the Gunites]: ὡνίς [the Gunites]; or Faw'i: [Vat.-ve'ı; Alex. Faw'i]: Γανίτες), the "family" which sprang from Gunit, son of Naphthi (Num. xxvi. 48). There is not in the Hebrew any difference between the two names, of the individual and the family.

GUR, THE GOING UP TO (גּוֹר בַּעַפְיָהּ) = the ascent or steep of Gur, or the lion's whelp, Gen. Hes. p. 275: εν τῷ ἀναβαίνοντι Γαλί. [Comp. εν τῷ ἀναβαίνοντι Ποίγισ: ascensus (Greer), an ascent or rising ground, at which Ahaziah received his death-blow while flying from Jehu after the slaughter of Joram (2 K. ix. 27). It is described as at (2) Hileam, and on the way between Jezreel and Beth-hag-gan (A. V. "the garden-house."). As the latter is identified with tolerable probability with the present Jenin, we may conclude that the ascent of Gur was some place more than usually steep on the difficult road which leads from the plain of Esdraelon to Jenin. By Josephus it is a * Dr. Robinson thinks that 'Ain Nukur may have some relation to these springs (Phys. Geogr. p 249).
mentioned (Ant. ix. 6, § 4) merely as "a certain accent" (ἐν τῷ τινι προσανέλαβε). Neither it nor Idem have been yet recovered.

For the details of the occurrence see JEH. For other accents see ADUMMIM, ARRABIM, ZIZ.

GUR-BAAL (גּוּר-בָּאל [sole of Baal]): πετρα: Gurbaal), a place or district in which dwelt Arabians, as recorded in 2 Chr. xxvi. 7. It appears from the context to have been in the country lying between Palestine and the Arabian peninsula: but this, although probable, and although the LXX. reading is in favor of the conjecture, cannot be proved, no site having been assigned to it. The Arab geographers mention a place called Baal, on the Syrian road, north of El-Medeneh (Jarash), s. v. [רַעֹ] צֶכֶר (יִשָּׁר). The Targum, as Winer (s. v.) remarks, reads רַעֹ צֶכֶר יִשָּׁר — "Arabs living in Gerar" — suggesting רַעֹ instead of רַעֹ but there is no further evidence to strengthen this supposition. [See also GERAR.] The ingenious conjectures of Kochert (Phalag, ii. 22) respecting the Mehemim, who are mentioned together with the "Arabians that dwelt in Gur-Baal," may be considered in reference to the Mehemim, although they are faintly traced. [MIDEMIM.]

* GUTTER. This word occurs in the difficult passage 2 Sam. v. 6-8, translated in the A. V. as follows: "(6.) And the king and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land; which spake unto David, saying, Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither; thinking, David cannot come in hither. (7.) Nevertheless, David took the stronghold of Zion; the same is the city of David. (8.) And David said on that day, Whosoever getheth up to the gutter, and smiteth the Jebusites, and the blind and the lame, he shall be chief and captain. Whereupon they said, the blind and the lame shall not come into the house." So long ago as 1546, Sebastian Münster (Hebrew Bible, fol. ed., in loc.) said of this passage, "Est locus ille valde obscurus." The lapse of more than 300 years has not much mended the matter, and the passage is still widely obscured. Our limits here forbid a full discussion of the points at issue. But without attempting to examine every grammatical difficulty, we may reach a better translation than the above, by attending to the following points: (1.) The two clauses, "except thou take away the blind and the lame," and "thou shalt not come in hither," are improperly transposed in the above version: and this transposition puts the next following clause out of its proper connection, and makes it meaningless. (2.) The words rendered "except thou take away the blind and the lame," should be translated, "but the blind and the lame will turn thee away." (3.) The apodosis, or after-clause, corresponding to the expression, "any one that smites" (= if any one smites), is not expressed in the Hebrew. This is a favorite Hebrew idiom, where for any reason it is left to unnecessary to complete the construction. E. g., Ex. xxxii. 32, in the A. V. Here, the object was two-fold: first, to state what David proposed to his warriors as the means of capturing the stronghold; and secondly, to account for the proverbial saying that arose from this occurrence. Neither of these objects required the completion of the sentence, which would readily be understood to be the offer of a reward for the service. A dash should therefore be put (as in the A. V. Ex. xxxii. 32) after the word "soul" (omitting the words in italics), to indicate that the sentence is incomplete.

In ver. 8 there is also, as in ver. 6, an improper transposition of two clauses, "whosoever getheth up to the gutter," "and smiteth the Jebusites." (5.) In ver. 8, instead of "the Jebusites" (plural with the def. art.), we should translate, "a Jebusite." (6.) The word translated "gutter," בֹּלֶלֶב, is here properly a water-course. It is derived from a verb which apparently expresses the sound of rushing water. It occurs in only one other passage, Ps. xili. 8, and is there applied to a mountain torrent, or a cataract (A. V. "water-paths"). (7.) The words, "the blind and the lame," may be taken in the same construction as "a Jebusite" (even the blind and the lame); or, as the sentence is manifestly left unfinished, they may be regarded as a part of the incomplete construction, having no grammatical relation to the preceding words.

Thus without resorting to the violent method of conjectural emendation of the text, which Maurer, Thienes, Hdbcher, and others, think necessary, or to a change of punctuation and an unauthorized sense of the word בֹּלֶלֶב, proposed by Wäsb and adopted by Keil, we obtain the following grammatically correct rendering: "And the king and his men went to Jerusalem, to the Jebusite inhabiting the land. And he spake to David, saying, Thou shalt not come in hither; but the blind and the lame will turn thee away, saying, David shall not come in hither." (7.) And David took the stronghold of Zion; that is, the city of David. (8.) And David said on that day, Any one that smites a Jebusite, and gets to the water-course, and the lame and the blind hated of David's soul — therefore they say, Blind and lame shall not come into the house." Gutter, Jebusites, confident in the strength of their show that they are not in the Hebrew text. To the common reader, with nothing but the translation to guide him, they seem to be "elusive; but of the ale," as the English version expresses. But a reference to 1 Chr. xi. 6 shows that these words, though they have no right here, are not a pure invention of the translator. The reader of the Hebrew text, if those words are necessary to make sense of the passage, was in the same case as the English reader of the A. V. would be without them.

T. J. C.

* The above translation is nearly word for word the same as that of De Wette: which is so close to the Hebrew that any literal rendering must be almost verbally coincident with it.

T. J. C.
position, which had successfully resisted repeated attempts to capture it, sneeringly said to David, “the blind and the lame will turn thee away;” needing only to say, “David shall not come in hither;”

David took this stronghold (ver. 7); and how this was effected is intimated in ver. 8. If the water-course could be reached, by which water was supplied to the besieged, the reduction of the stronghold must soon follow. On the import of the last clause in ver. 8, compare the suggestion in the article Jerusalem, II., fourth paragraph, foot-note.

A review of the principal interpretations of Jewish and Christian scholars would be interesting and instructive; but there is no space for it here.

T. J. C.

H.

HAHASHTARI (חֹאֲשָׁתָרִי), with the article, the Ahasharite [perh. courier, messenger, Fürst]: [to the Αὐασθῆ; [Vat. Αὐασσαί]: Alex. Αὐασθῆ: Haftori], a man, or a family, immediately descended from Ashur, “father of Tekoa” by his second wife Naarah (1 Chron. iv. 6). The name does not appear again, nor is there any trace of a place of similar name.

HABATAH [3 syll.] [חֹבָת-a], in Neh. 7:17: [but MSS. and editions vary in both places; whom Jehoehu protects]: Ασσέλ, E'Bia: Alex. Ο'Ssαα, [E'βεια; in Neh., Vat. E'βενα, P'A Ασιέτα] Hob'a, Hohri.

Bene-Chalapha were among the sons of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, but whose genealogy being imperfect, were not allowed to serve (Ezra ii. 61; Neh. vii. 63). It is not clear from the passage whether they were among the descendants of Barzillai the Gileadite.

In the lists of 1 Esdras the name is given as Ommi (marg. Hobahiah).

HABAKKUK or HABBAKKUK (חֹבַקְקָק, [embaracing, as a token of love, Ges., Fürst]: Jerome, Pro. in Heb., renders it by the Greek περὶκλησι: Ἀμβακούοι: Houbaco). Other Greek forms of the name are Ἀμβακούοι, which Suidas erroneously renders παρὰ γέρωνοι, Ἀμβακούοι (Geog. Codrars), Ἀμβακούοι, and Ἀμβακοῦοι (Dorothem, Doctr. 2). The Latin forms are Ambacuom, Ambacues, and Hobicus.

1. Of the facts of the prophet’s life we have no certain information, and with regard to the period of his prophecy there is great division of opinion.

The Rabbinical tradition that Habakkuk was the son of the Shumamite woman whom Elisha restored to life is repeated by Abbariael in his commentary, and has no other foundation than a fanciful etymology of the prophet’s name, based on the expression in 2 K. iv. 16. Equally unfounded is the tradition that he was the sentinel set by Isaiah to watch for the destruction of Babylon (comp. Isa. xxl. 16 with Hab. ii. 1). In the title of the history of Bel and the Dragon, as found in the LXX. version in Origen’s Tetrapol, the author is called Habakkuk, the son of Josha, of the tribe of Levi.

Some have supposed this apocryphal writer to be identical with the prophet (Jerome, Proem. in Dom.). The psalm in ch. 3 and its title are thought to favor the opinion that Habakkuk was a Levite (Delitzsch, Hdbbkuk, p. iii.). Pseudo-Epiphanius (vol. ii. p. 240, de Vita Prophetarum) and Dorotheum (Chron. Pasch. p. 150) say that he was of Bethboch or Bohoctov (Bethokh, Isid. Hispal. c. 47), of the tribe of Simon. This may have been the same as Bethzecharias, where Judah Macceaeus was defeated by Antonius Epaphor (1 Mace. vii. 32, 33). The same authors relate that when Jerusalem was sacked by Nebuchadnezzar, Habakkuk fled to Ostcarine, and remained there till the Chaldeans had left the city, when he returned to his own country and died at his farm two years before the return from Babylon, v. c. 556. It was during his residence in Judaea that he is said to have carried food to Daniel in the den of lions at Babylon. This legend is given in the history of Bel and the Dragon, and is repeated by Eusebius, Bar-Hecceias, and Eutychius. It is quoted from Joseph ben Goriion (B. J. xi. 3) by Abbariael (Comm. on Heb.), and seriously refuted by him on chronological grounds. The scene of the event was shown to medieval travellers on the road from Jerusalem to Bethel (Erod. Trogr. Pers. p. 23). Habakkuk is said to have been buried at Keilah in the tribe of Judah, eight miles E. of Eleutheropolis (Eusebius, Onomasticon). Rabbinical tradition places his tomb at Chukkok, of the tribe of Nahsholi, now called Jakil. In the days of Zelemus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, according to Niephorus (H. E. xii. 48) and Nazometh (H. E. xii. 28), the remains of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah were discovered at Keilah.

2. The Rabbinical traditions agree in placing Habakkuk with Joel and Nahum in the reign of Manasseh (of Sedor Olim Robba and Zatu, and Tanach Da‘riv). This date is adopted by Kimchi and Abbariael among the Rabbis, and by Witsius, Kalynsky, and Jahn among modern writers. The general corruption and looseness which prevailed in the reign of Manasseh are supposed to be referred to in Hab. i. 2-4. Both Kalynsky and Jahn conjecture that Habakkuk may have been one of the prophets mentioned in 2 K. xxi. 10. Symmachus (Chronographei, pp. 214, 230, 240) makes him contemporary with Ezekiel, and extends the period of his prophecy from the time of Manasseh to that of Daniel and Joshua the son of Josedeek.

The Chronicon Paschale places him later, first mentioning him in the beginning of the reign of Josiah (Olymp. 32), as contemporary with Zephaniah and Nahum; and again in the beginning of the reign of Cyrus (Olymp. 42), as contemporary with Daniel and Ezekiel in Persia, with Haggai and Zechariah in Judaea, and with Baruch in Egypt. Davidson (Horne’s Intr. ii. 968), following Keil, decides in favor of the early part of the reign of Josiah. Calmet, Jaeger, Ewald, De Wette, Rosenmuller, Knobel, Maurer, Hitzig, and Meier agree in assigning the commencement of Habakkuk’s prophecy to be defended by a couple of men against any force, before the invention of fire-arms. The escarpment was probably carried down to the valley in a succession of terraces; the large amount of rubbish, however, will not allow anything to be seen clearly.” (See Ochiann. Survey of Jerusalem, p. 61, Lond. 1855.)

H.
the reign of Jehoiakim, though they are divided as to the exact period to which it is to be referred. Knobel (Der Propheten, d. Hebr.) and Meier (Gesch. d. poet. nat. Liter. d. Hebr.) are in favor of the commencement of the Chaldean era, after the battle of Carchemish (n. c. 609), when Judah was first threatened by the victors. But the question of the date of Habakkuk's prophecy has been discussed in the most exhaustive manner by Delitzsch (Der Prophet Habakkuk, Einl. § 3), and though his arguments are rather ingenious than convincing, they are well deserving of consideration as based upon internal evidence. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Habakkuk delivered his prophecy about the 12th or 13th year of Josiah (n. c. 630 or 629), for reasons of which the following is a summary. In Hab. i. 5 the expression "in your days" shows that the fulfillment of the prophecy would take place in the lifetime of those to whom it was addressed. The same phrase in Jer. xvi. 9 embraces a period of at most twenty years, while in Ez. xii. 25 it denotes about six years, and therefore, reckoning backwards from the Chaldean invasion, the date above assigned would involve no violation of probability, though the argument does not amount to a proof. From the similar passages in Jer. ii. 29 and Zeph. i. 1 and Delitzsch infers that the latter is an imitation, the former being the original. He supports this conclusion by many collateral arguments. Now Zephaniah, according to the superscription of his prophecy, lived in the time of Josiah, and from iii. 5 must have prophesied after the worship of Jehovah was restored, that is, after the twentieth year of that king's reign. It is probable that he wrote about n. c. 624. Between this period therefore and the 12th year of Josiah (n. c. 630) Delitzsch places Habakkuk, but Jeremiah began to prophesy in the 13th year of Josiah, and many passages are borrowed by him from Habakkuk (cf. Hab. ii. 13 with Jer. li. 58, etc.). The latter therefore must have written about 630 or 624 n. c. This view receives some confirmation from the position of his prophecy in the O. T. Canon. A special name is appended upon the prophecy as an organic whole, Rosenmuller divided it into three parts corresponding to the chapters, and assigned the first chapter to the reign of Jehoiakim, the second to that of Jehoiachin, and the third to that of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was besieged for the third time by Nebuchadnezzar. Kafinsky (Vaticun. Chronic. et Not.) makes four divisions, and refers the prophecy not to Nebuchadnezzar, but to Esarhaddon. But in such an arbitrary arrangement the true character of the composition as a perfectly developed poen is entirely lost sight of. The prophet commences by announcing his office and important mission (i. 1). He bewails the corruption and social disorderization by which he is surrounded, and cries to Jehovah for help (i. 2-4). Next follows the reply of the Deity, threatening swift vengeance (i. 5-11). The prophet, transferring himself to the near future foreshadowed in the divine threatenings, sees the rapidity and beastful impiety of the Chaldean hosts, but, confident that God has only employed them as the instruments of correction, assumes (ii. 1) an attitude of hopeful expectancy, and waits to see the issue. He receives the divine command to write in an enduring form the vision of God's retributive justice, as revealed to his prophetical eye (ii. 2, 3). The doom of the Chaldeans is first foreshadowed in gen-
The poet of the Hebrews has to show in this species of composition. He exhibits the greatest strength and fullness, an imagination capable of the loftiest flights, without ever sacrificing beauty and clearness. His rhythm is at the same time perfectly free, and yet measured. His diction is fresh and pure. (See his Einl. in das A. Test., p. 338, 35e Ausg.) Lowth awards him the highest sublimity (Lect. xxviii, in his Poetry of the Hebrews), "the anthem" at the close of the book, says Isaac Taylor, "unequaled in majesty and splendor of language and imagery, gives expression in terms the most affecting to an intense spiritual feeling; and, on this ground, it so fully embodies these religious sentiments as to satisfy Christian piety, even of the loftiest order." (See his Spirit of the Hebrew Poets, p. 255, Amer. ed.) The doctrine impersonated in the prophet's experience is that the soul, though stripped of all outward possessions and cut off from every human resource, may still be happy in God alone as the object of its confidence and the bestower of the ample spiritual consolations which that trust secures. (Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 8 ff.)

HABAZINIAH (חֵבֶזְיָה) [perh. light of Jehovah, Gen.: collection by Joth, First:] Xαβαζιόν; [Vat. F. - Χαβαζίων] Habazin; apparently the head of one of the families of the Rechabites: his descendant Jazanannah was the chief man among them in the time of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxv. 3).

HAB'BACUC (חָבָאכֵו) Habucce, the form in which the name of the prophet HABAKUK is given in the Apocrypha (Bel, 39-39).

HABERGEON, a coat of mail covering the neck and breast. The Hebrew terms are הַבֶּרֶגֶון, and הַבֶּרֶוגֶון. The first, tachara, occurs only in Ex. xxviii. 32, xxxix. 23, and is noticed incidentally to illustrate the mode of making the aperture for the head in the sacerdotal meil. It was probably similar to the linear corselet (λειυθρόπνης), worn by the Egyptians (Her. ii. 182, iii. 47), and the Greeks (H. ii. 529, 330). The second, shiraq, occurs only in Job xli. 26, and is regarded as another form of shirayn (ךֶרֶאשׁ), a "breastplate" (Is. lix. 17); this sense has been questioned, as the context requires offensive rather than defensive armor; but the objection may be met by the suppression of an extended sense being given to the verb, according to the grammatical usage known as exagmen. The third, shiryon, occurs as an article of defensive armor in 1 Sam. xvii. 5, 2 Chr. xxviii. 14, and Neh. iv. 16. W. L. B.

HABOR (חָבְרֵר) [perh. rich in vegetation, Dietr.; but see First:] Α'βαρ, Χαβαρ; [Vat. 2 K. xixii. 11. Αβαρ:] Habor, the "river of Goran" (2 K. xvii. 6, and xviii. 11 [also 1 Chr. v. 26]) has been already distinguished from the Chebar or Chobar of Ezekiel. [CHEBAR.] It is identified beyond all reasonable doubt with the famous affluent of the Euphrates, which is called Aborhas (Αβορέας) by Strabo (xiv. 1, § 27) and Procopius (Bell. Pers. ii. 5); Aboras (Αβορας) by Isidore of Charax (p. 4); Abor (Αβόρα) by Zosimus (iii. 12); and Chobares (Χαβαράς), by

Pliny and Ptolemy (v. 18). The stream in question still bears the name of the Khobur. It flows from several sources in the mountain-chain, which in about the 37th parallel closes in the valley of the Tigris upon the south — the Mono Masius of Strabo and Ptolemy, at present the Khwaraj Day. The chief source is said to be "a little to the west of Marvina" (Layard, Nin. and Babs. p. 309, note); but the upper course of the river is still very imperfectly known. The main stream was seen by Mr. Layard flowing from the northwest as he stood on the conical hill of Koubib (about lat. 30° 20', long. 41°); and here it was joined by an important tributary, the Jenjier, which flowed down to it from Nishib. Both streams were here fordable, but the river formed by their union had to be crossed by a raft. It flowed in a tortuous course through rich meads covered with flowers, having a general direction about S. S. W., to its junction with the Euphrates at Karkesy, the ancient Circesium. The country on both sides of the river was covered with mounds, the remains of cities belonging to the Assyrian period.

The Khobur occurs under that name in an Assyrian inscription of the ninth century before our era. G. R.

HACHILAH (חָכִילָה) [from Jehovah appelli, Gen. 6:4 Anp.; ] Χαξίλια, Αξιάλα; [Vat. Χαξιλεια, Αξιαλα; Αξιαλα; Αξιαλα:] Hechiya, Ichiliya), the father of Nehemiah (Neh. i. 1: x. 1).

HACHILAH, THE HILL (חָכִילָה) [hill of darkness, Ges. or of barrenness, First:] α βοούς το (and α but Alex. τοο) Αξιαλα; [in 1 Sam. xxvi. 1, Vat. Χαξιλεια, Alex. Αξιαλα:] collis, and Gabab, Ichili), a hill apparently situated in a wood (ךֶרֶאשׁ) in the wilderness or waste land (ךֶרֶאשׁ) in the neighborhood of Ziph; in the fastnesses, or passes, of which David and his six hundred followers were lurking when the Ziphites informed Saul of his whereabouts (1 Sam. xxiii. 19; comp. 14, 15, 18). The special topographical note is added, that it was "on the right (xxii. 19, A. V. "south") of the Jeshimon," or, according to what may be a second account of the same transaction (xxvi. 1-3), "facing the Jeshimon" (ךֶרֶאשׁ, A. V. "before"), that is, the waste barren district. As Saul approached, David drew down from the hill into the lower ground (xxvi. 3), still probably remaining concealed by the wood which then covered the country. Saul advanced to the hill, and bivouacked there by the side of the road (ךֶרֶאשׁ, A. V. "way"), which appears to have run over the hill or close below it. It was during this nocturnal halt that the romantic adventure of the spear and curse of water took place. In xxviiii. 14 and xxvii. 13 this hill would seem (though this is not quite clear) to be dignified by the title of "the mountain" (ךֶרֶאשׁ): in the latter, the A. V. has "hill," and in both the article is missed; but, on the other hand, the same eminence appears to be again designated as "the cliff" (xxvii. 25,ךֶרֶאשׁ, A. V. "a rock") from b which David descended

a For the "wool" the LXX. have τo ψηλωκι. reading שׁבָנִים for שׁבָנֹים. And so too Josephus.

b The Hebrew exactly answers to our expression "descended the cliff." the "into" in the text of the
into the midbar of Moan. Places bearing the names of Ziph and Moan are still found in the south of Judah—in all probability the identical sites of those ancient towns. They are sufficiently close to each other for the district between them to bear indiscriminately the name of both. But the wood has vanished, and no trace of the name Hachilah has yet been discovered, nor has the ground been examined with the view to see if the minute indications of the story can be recognized. By Eusebius and Jerome (Commentary on Ezechiel) is named as a village then standing; but the situation—seven miles from Eleutheropolis, i. e. on the N. W. of Hebron—would be too far from Ziph and Moan: and as Rechan has pointed out, they probably conformed it with Kedlah (comp. Onom. "Cecilah"); and Rechan, p. 745.

G. HACHMONI, SON OF, and THE HACHMONITE (1 Chr. xxvii. 32; xl. 11), both renderings— the former the correct one—of the same Hebrew words צ"ולאנסטאשנוזאשש is son of a Hachmonite: צ"ולאאנשאש ר' א衡阳א: [Vat. Ayαμας, Ayαμας: [Gesen. Αχαμαμάν] Alex. Αχαμαμάν: Richommoni.] Two of the Bene-Hachmoni [sons of H.] are named in these passages. Jehuel, in the former, and Jashobeam in the latter. Hachmoni or Hachmonith was no doubt the founder of a family to which these men belonged: the actual father of Jashobeam was Zabeel (1 Chr. xxvii. 2), and he is also said to have belonged to the Korhites (1 Chr. xii. 6), possibly the Levites descended from Korah. But the name Hachmoni nowhere appears in the genealogies of the Levites. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 8 the name is altered to Tachcmonite. [TACHMIONITE.] See Kennicott, Diss. p. 241. After the time of the exile who calls attention to the fact that names given in Chronicles with Ben are in Samueled without the Ben, but with the definite article.

G. HADAD (תַחַד) [sharpness, Gesen, powerful, First: Ἀδαδ, [Ἀδάδ, Χόρδας: Hador.] This name occurs frequently in the history of the Syrian and Edomite dynasties. It was originally the indigenous appellation of the sun among the Syrians (Maerob. Sortimam. i. 23; Plin. xxxviii. 12), and was thence transferred to the king, as the highest of earthly authorities, in the forms Hadad, Ben-hadad ("worshipper of Hadad"), and Hadab-ezer (assisted by Hadad). Gesen. Thes. p. 219. The title appears to have been an official one, like Pharaoh; and perhaps it is so used by Nicaeus Damascenus, as quoted by Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, § 2), in reference to the Syrian king who aided Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii. 5). Josephus appears to have used the name in the same sense, where he substitutes it for Benhadad (Int. ix. 8, § 7, compared with 2 K. viii. 21). The name appears occasionally in the altered form Habor (Gen. xxv. 15, xxxvi. 39), compared with 1 Chr. i. 30, 50).

1. [תַחַד: Χόρδας, Alex. Χόρδας: Hador.] The first of the name was a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15 [HADAD: 1 Chr. i. 30]). His descendents probably occupied the western coast of the Persian Gulf, where the names Altai (Pod. vi. 7, § 15), Attene, and Chatana (Plin. vi. 32) bear affinity to the original name.
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ng to the ordinary interpretation of Zech. xii. 11, a place in the valley of Megiddo, named after two Syrian idols, where a national lamentation was held for the death of king Josiah in the last of the four great battles (see Stanley, S. of P. ix.) which have made the plain of Esdraelon famous in Hebrew history (see 2 K. xxi. 29; 2 Chr. xxxv. 23; Josephus, Ant. x. 3, § i.). The LXX. translate the word "pomegranate;" and the Greek commentators, using that version, see here no reference to Josiah. Jonathan, the Chaldean interpreter, followed by Jarchi, understands it to be the name of the son of king Tabrimon who was opposed to Ahab at Ramoth-Gilead. But it has been taken for the place at which Josiah died by most interpreters since Jerome, who states (Comm. in Zech.) that it was the name of a city which was called in his time Maximanopolis, and was not far from Jereed. Van de Velde (i. 355) thinks that he has identified the very site, and that the more ancient name still lingers on the spot. There is a treatise by Wichmanhausen, De planeta HADAR. in the Nov. Theos. Thol.-phil. i. 101. W. T. B.

HADAR (חדר) [perh. chaluder]: 2 Chronicles 26:4; Hadar or Hadad, a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15); written in 1 Chr. i. 50 Hadad (חדר) 2 Chronicles 26:4; Hadad; but Gesenius supposes the former to be the true reading of the name. It has not been identified, in a satisfactory way, with the appellation of any tribe preceding or on the Syrian frontier: but names identical with, or very closely resembling it, are not uncommon in those parts, and may contain traces of the Ishmaelite tribe sprung from Hadar. The mountain Hadad, belonging to Teyma (תאי, the borders of the Syrian desert, north of E. Medeveh, is perhaps the most likely to be correctly identified with the ancient dwellings of this tribe; it stands among a group of names of the sons of Ishmael, containing Dumah (דמעה, Kedar (كيفאר), and Tema (תמא). E. S. P.

2. (חדר) [perh. ornament, honor], with a different aspirate to from [the preceding]; 2 Chronicles 26:4; 2 Chronicles 26:4, Abda or Bapda, Alex. Abad: Adbar). One of the kings of Edom, successor of Baal-hannan ben-Abchor (1 en. xxxvi. 29), and, if we may so understand the statement of ver. 31, about contemporary with Saul. The name of his city, and the name and genealogy of his wife, are given. In the parallel list in 1 Chr. i. 50 he appears as HADAD. We know from another source (1 K. xi. 14, &c.) that Hadad was one of the names of the royal family of Edom. Indeed, it occurs in this very list (Gen. xxxvi. 35). But perhaps this fact is in favor of the form HADAR being correct in the present case: its isokoria is probably a proof that it is a different name from the others, however similar.

HADAREZER (חדרезר) [chose help is Hadad, Ges.]: 2 Chronicles 26:4; Abara, Aba, and so gen. Ald. Fa. comp. gen. Abadar: Adarse, son of Rehob (2 Sam. vii. 3); the king of the Aramean state of Zobah, who, while on his way to "establish his dominion," at the Euphrates, was overtaken by David, defeated with a great loss both of chariots, horses, and men (1 Chr. xviii. 3, 4), and driven with the remnant of his force to the other side of the river (xix. 16). The golden weapons captured on this occasion (בְּנֵי, A. V. "shields of gold," a thousand in number, was taken by David to Jerusalem (xviii. 7), and dedicated to Jehovah. The foreign arms were preserved in the Temple, and were long known as king David's (2 Chr. xxix. 9; Cant. iv. 4). (Arms; Shelet, p. 102.)

Not daunted by this defeat, Hadarezer seized an early opportunity of attempting to revenge himself: and after the first repulse of the Ammonites and their Syrian allies by Josh, he sent his army to the assistance of his kindred the people of Maachah, Rehob, and Ish-toh (1 Chr. xix. 16; 2 Sam. x. 15, comp. 8). The army was a large one, as is evident from the numbers of the slain; and it was especially strong in horse-soldiers (1 Chr. xix. 18). Under the command of Shophach, or ShobaZ, the captain of the host (םכ) they crossed the Euphrates, joined the other Syrians, and encompassed at a place called Helam. The moment was a critical one, and David himself came from Jerusalem to take the command of the Israelite army. As on the former occasion, the rout was complete: seven hundred chariots were captured, seven thousand charioteers and forty thousand horse-soldiers killed, the petty sovereigns who had before been subject to Hadarezer submitted themselves to David, and the great Syrian confederacy was, for the time, at an end.

But one of Hadarezer's more immediate retainers, Rezon ben-Elizah, made his escape from the army, and gathering round him some fugitives like himself, formed them into one of those marauding ravaging "bands" (תافية) which found a congenial refuge in the thinly peopled districts between the Jordan and the Euphrates (2 K. v. 2; 1 Chr. xix. 19-22). Making their way to Damascus, they possessed themselves of the city. Rezon became king, and at once began to avenge the loss of his kinsmen by the course of "mischief" to Israel which he pursued down to the end of Solomon's reign, and which is summed up in the emphatic words " he was an adversary (a 'Satan') to Israel "... he abhorred Israel (1 K. xi. 23-25).

In the narrative of David's Syrian campaign in 2 Sam. we have this name given as Hadar-ezer, and also in 1 K. xi. 24. But in 2 Sam. only, and in all its other occurrences in the Hebrew text as well as in the LXX. (both MSS.), and in Josephus, the form Hadarezer is maintained.

G. HAD'ASHAH (חֲדָשָׁה) [new, Ges.]: Adar, Alex. Aδας: Hadassxa, one of the towns of Judah, in the Shefelah or maritime low-country, named between Zenan and Mischkel-gad, in the second group (Josh. xv. 37 only). By Eusebius it is spoken of as lying near Taphna, i.e. Gopha. But if by this Eusebius intends the well-known Gophna, there must be some error, as Gopha was several miles north of Jerusalem, near the direct north road to Nobia. No satisfactory reason presents itself why Hadashah should not be the Aδας of the Macreassan history. Hitherto it has eluded discovery in modern times.

G. * HADES. [DEAD, THE; DEEP, THE; HELL.]

HADASSAH (חֲדָסָה) [myrtle]: LXX. omit: Edessa, a name, probably the earlier name, of Esther (Esth. ii. 7). Gesenius (Thes. p. 966) suggests that it is identical with 'Akroaea, the name of the daughter of Cyrus.
HADATHAH (יוֹדָתָה) [new]: LXX. mit: νοτατ. According to the A. V., one of the three names of Judah in the Chronic record—Hazar, Hadathah, and Kerethi, and Hebron,” etc. (Gen. xv. 25); but the Masoret accents of the Hebrew connect the word with that preceding it, as if it were Hazor-chadathath, i.e. New Hazor, in distinction from the place of the same name in ver. 23. This reading is expressly sanctioned by Eusebius and Jerome, who speak: (Onom. “Asor”) of “New Hazor” as lying in their day to the east of and near Ascalon. (See also Jellicoe, p. 708.) But Ascalon, as Robinson has pointed out (ii. 34, note), is in the Shefelah, and not in the South, and therefore, if named in Joshua at all, be included in the second division of the list, beginning at ver. 33, instead of where it is, not far from Kedesh. G.

HADID (יהָדִיד), sharp, possibly from its situation on some craggy eminence, Gen. Thes. 440; ‘אַדִּית (אֹדִית) by comb., with preceding name in Exe. xvi. 24. ‘אַדָּית, cf. A. H., Josh. ii. 8, A. H. , Damascus, in Neh. vii., אַדָּית, Vat. F. A. אַדָּית (in Neh. xii., אַדָּית, A. H., אַדָּית, Vat. A. אַדָּית, in Neh. xi., LXX. mit: Ἡδίθ), a place named, with Loyal (Lydda) and Ono, only in the later books of the history (Ex. ii. 33; Neh. vii. 37, xii. 34), but yet so as to imply its earlier existence. In the time of Eusebius (Onom. “Adhimain”) a town called Aditha, or Adatha, existed to the east of Diospolis (Lydda). This was probably Haditha, the Adaim of the Macarolonic history cannot be the same place, as it is distinctly specified as in the maritime or Philistine plain further south—“Aditha in Sepeha” (1 Macc. xii. 38)—with which agrees the description of Josephus (Ant. xiii. 6, § 5). About three miles east of Lodah stands a village called el-Hadith, marked in Van de Velde’s map. This is described by the old Jewish traveller Flav.Josephus as being on the summit of a round hill, and identified by him, doubt, correctly, with Hadid. See Zuntz, in Ascher’s Λνμ. of Tukda, ii. 430. G.

HADILAI [2 syll.] (יהָדִילֵי [recting or keeping holy]): אָדִיל (Vat.=X נוֹדִיל). A. H., אָדִיל, a man of Ephraim; father of Amasa, who was one of the chief of the tribe in the reign of Pekah (2 Chr. xxvii. 12).

HADROMOTH (יהָדָרֶמֹת) [possibly fire-worshipers: see Frister]: אָדְרָם; [Vat. X. אָדְרָם]. A. H., אָדְרָם, a man of Ephraim; father of Amasa, who was one of the chief of the tribe in the reign of Pekah (2 Chr. xxvii. 12).

HADRACH (יהָדַרָךְ) [see infra]: Στρίτισ. [Alex. Στρίτισ. Abl. with 13 MSS. Στρίτισ] Hadrach, a country of Syria, mentioned once only, by the prophet Zechariah, in the following words: “The burden of the word of Jehovah in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus [shall be] the rest thereof: when the eyes of man, as of all the tribes of Israel, shall be toward Jehovah. And Hamath also shall border thereby; Tyre and Zidon, though it be very wise” (ix. 1, 2). The position of the district, with its borders, is here generally stated, although it does not appear, as is commonly assumed, that it was on the east of Damascus; but the name itself seems to have wholly disappeared; and the ingenuity of critics has been exercised on it without attaining any trustworthy results. It still remains unknown. It is true that R. Jose of Damascus identifies it with the site of an important city east of Damascus; and Joseph Alashi makes mention of a place called Hadrak (אֲדָרָךְ); but, with Gesenius, we may well distrust these writers. The vague statement of Στρίτισ Alex. seems to be founded on no particular facts beyond those contained in the prophecy of Zechariah. Besides these identifications we can point to none that possesses the smallest claim to acceptance. Those of Movers (Phoen.), a, Bleeck, and others are purely

HADRACH

an Arab author who identifies Hadoran with Jur

ham (Am. Lette, Joun. Asiatique, iii. 348, vi. 220); but this is highly improbable; nor is the suggestion of Hadhura, by Caussin (Essai, i. 30) more likely: the latter being one of the aborigines, tribes of Arabia, such as ‘Ad, Thamood, etc. [Αραβια.] E. S. P.

2. (יהָדָרָךְ): הָדוּרְמָו (Vat. Χριστοῦ Α. H. הָדוּרְמָו): Alex. Χριστοῦ; Hadrorm. son of Tou or Tie king of Hamath; his father’s ambassador to congratulate David on his victory over Hadarezer king of Zobah (1 Chr. xvi. 11), and the bearer of valuable presents in the form of articles of antique manufacture (Joseph.), in gold, silver, and brass. In the parallel narrative of 2 Sam. viii. the name is given as Joram; but this being a contraction of Jehoram, which contains the name of Jehovah, is peculiarly an Israite appellation, and we may therefore conclude that Hadoram is the genuine form of the name. By Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, § 4) it is given as Ἁδώρμως.

3. (יהָדָרָךְ): δ’ Ἁδώρμως (Vat. -τείλι): Alex. Χριστοῦ: Hadrorm. The form assumed in Chronicles by the name of the intendant of taxes under David, Solomon, and Rehoboam, who lost his life in the battle of Ziklag (1 Chr. xvi. 11), and the last-named prince (2 Chr. x. 18). He was sent by Rehoboam to appease the tumult, possibly as being one of the old and moderate party; but the choice of the chief officer of the taxes was not a happy one. His interference was ineffectual, and he himself fell a victim: “all Israel stoned him with stones that he died.” In Kings the name is given in the longer form of Hadroram, but in Samuel (2 Sam. vii. 2) as Hadrach. By Josephus, in both the first and last case, he is called Ἀδώρμως.

HADRACH (יהָדַרָךְ) [see infra]: Στρίτισ. [Alex. Στρίτισ. Abl. with 13 MSS. Στρίτισ] Hadrach, a country of Syria, mentioned once only, by the prophet Zechariah, in the following words: “The burden of the word of Jehovah in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus [shall be] the rest thereof: when the eyes of man, as of all the tribes of Israel, shall be toward Jehovah. And Hamath also shall border thereby; Tyre and Zidon, though it be very wise” (ix. 1, 2). The position of the district, with its borders, is here generally stated, although it does not appear, as is commonly assumed, that it was on the east of Damascus; but the name itself seems to have wholly disappeared; and the ingenuity of critics has been exercised on it without attaining any trustworthy results. It still remains unknown. It is true that R. Jose of Damascus identifies it with the site of an important city east of Damascus; and Joseph Alashi makes mention of a place called Hadrak (אֲדָרָךְ); but, with Gesenius, we may well distrust these writers. The vague statement of Στρίτισ Alex. seems to be founded on no particular facts beyond those contained in the prophecy of Zechariah. Besides these identifications we can point to none that possesses the smallest claim to acceptance. Those of Movers (Phoen.), a, Bleeck, and others are purely

Hadrach which borders tieroen, Tyre and Sidon; for it is very wise” (comp. Es. xxviii. 3 f.). H.

b The Movers do not propose any local identification (if that be meant here). In Strabo’s account of Syria, the land of Hadrak (α. Ἄραβια) is mentioned, as is probably supposed by Movers, and may be intended. For Bleeck’s theory, see above. H.
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hypothetical, and the same must be said of the theory of Alphens [Van Alphens], in his monograph De terra Hadrach et Damascus (Traj. Rh. 1723, referred to by Winer, s. c). A solution of the difficulties surrounding the name may perhaps be found by supposing that it is derived from HADRACH.

* Another conjecture may be mentioned, namely, that Hadrach is the name of some Syrian king otherwise unknown. It was not uncommon for heathen kings to bear the names of their gods. Gesenius (Therapeut. i. 449) favors this opinion after Bleek. (See Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1852, p. 268.) Valhinger argues for it, and attempts to show that the king in question may have been the one who reigned between Bembadad III. and Rezin, about the time of Uzziah and Jeroboam II. (See Herz. Realcyc. v. 445). The data are insufficient for so definite a conclusion. Hengstenberg adopts the Jewish symbolic explanation, namely, that Hadrach (derived from חָּדַר and חֲדָּר = strong-weak) denotes the Persian kingdom as destined, according to prophetic announcement, notwithstanding its power, to be utterly overthrown. Winer (Bibl. Relatn. i. 454) speaks of this as not improbably correct. Hengstenberg discusses the question at length under the head of "The Land of Hadrach," in his Christology of the O. T., iii. 371 ff. (trans. Edlinb. 1858).

HAGAB (חֲגָב) [locus]: "Ayál: Hagab.

Bene-Hagab [sons of Hagab] were among the Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel [Ezr. ii. 49]. In the parallel list in Nehemiah, this and the name preceding it are omitted. In the Apocryphal Esdras [v. 30] it is given as AGABA.

HAGABA (חֲגָבָה) [locus]: "Ayálah: [Alex. Ayá-alá: Hagaba].

Bene-Hagaba were among the Nethinim who came back from captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii. 48). The name is slightly different in form from

HAGABAH (חֲגָבָה) [locus]: "Ayálah: Hagabah,

under which it is found in the parallel list of Ezr. iv. 45. In Esdras it is given as GRABAH.

HAGAR (חָגָר) [flight]: "Ayáp: Avar,

an Egyptian woman, the handmaid, or slave, of Sarah (Gen. xvi. 1), whom the latter gave as a concubine to Abraham, after he had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan and had no children by Sarah (xvi. 2 and 3). That she was a bondwoman is stated both in the O. T. and in the N. T. (in the latter as part of her typical character); and the condition of a slave was one essential of her position as a legal concubine. It is recorded that "when she saw that she had conceived, her mistress was despised in her eyes" (4), and Sarah, with the anger, we may suppose, of a free woman, rather than of a wife, reproached Abraham for the results of her own act: "My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived, I was despaired in my eyes: Jehovah judge between me and thee." Abraham's answer seems to have been forced from him by his love for the wife of many years, who besides was his half-sister; and with the apparent want of purpose that he before displayed in Egypt, and afterwards at the court of Abimelech [in contrast to his firm courage and constancy when directed by God], he said, "Behold, thy maid is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee." This permission was necessary in an eastern household, but it is worthy of remark that it is now very rarely given; nor do we think, from the unchangeableness of eastern customs, and the strongly-marked national character of those peoples, that it was usual ancieitly to allow a wife to deal hardly with a slave in Hagar's position. Yet the truth and individuality of the vivid narrative is enforced by this apparent departure from usage: "And when Sarai dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face," turning her steps towards her native land through the great wilderness traversed by the Egyptian road. By the fountain in the way to Shur, the angel of the Lord found her, charged her to return and submit herself under the hands of her mistress, and delivered the remarkable prophecy respecting her unborn child, recorded in ver. 10-12. [ISID.]

"And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God art a God of vision; for she said, Have I then seen [i. e. lived] after vision of God?"

Wherefore the well was called BEER-LAHAI-ROM (13, 14). On her return, Hagar gave birth to Ishmael, and Abraham was then eighty-six years old.

Mention is not again made of Hagar in the history of Abraham until the feast at the weaning of Isaac, when "Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had borne unto Abraham, mocking." and in exact sequence with the first mention of Ishmael, she gave birth to him. [Gen. xxv. 12].

"Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, [even] with Isaac." (xxi. 9, 10). Abraham, in his grief, and unwillingness thus to act, was comforted by God, with the assurance that in Isaac should his seed be called, and that a nation should also be raised of the bondwoman's son. In his trustful obedience, we read; in the pathetic narrative, Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took his camels, and Isaac, and Bethuel's daughter, and a bottle of water, and gave [it] unto Hagar, putting [it] on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away, and she departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went, and sat her down over against [him] a good way off, as it were a bow-shot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against [him], and lifted up her voice and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad, and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he [is]. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand, for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water, and she went and filled the bottle [skin] with water, and gave the lad to drink" (xxi. 14-19).

The verisimilitude, oriental exactness, and simple heroism of this story go into the full expansion attesting its truth apart from all other evidence; and even Winer says (in alluding to the subterfuge of skepticism that Hagar = flight) — would lead to

---

a It seems to be unnecessary to assume (as Kalscheuer, Comment. on Genesis) that we have here another proof of Abraham's faith. This explanation of the
the assumption of its being a myth, "Das Ereignis ist so einfach und der orientalischen Sagen so angemessen, das wir hier gewiss eine rein historische Sage vor uns haben." (Realwörter, s. v.

"Hagar ").

The name of Hagar occurs elsewhere only when she takes a wife to Ishmael (xxi. 21), and in the genealogy (xv. 12). St. Paul refers to her as the type of the old covenant, likening her to Mount Sinai, the Mount of the Law (Gal. iv. 22 ff.).

In Mohammedan tradition Hagar (عائشة) is represented as the wife of Abraham, as might be expected when we remember that Ishmael is the head of the Arab nation, and the reputed ancestor of Mohammed. In the same manner she is said to have dwelt and been buried at Meckah, and the well Zendem in the sacred enclosure of the temple of Meckah is pointed out by the Musulms as the well which was miraculously formed for Ishmael in the wilderness. E. S. P.

* The truthfulness to nature which is so manifest in the incidents related of Hagar and Ishmael (as suggested above), bears strong testimony to the fidelity of the narrative. See especially Gen. xvi. 6; xxi. 10, 11, and 24 ff. Dean Stanley very properly calls attention to this trait of the patriarchal history as illustrated in this instance, as well as others. (Jewish Church, i. 40 ff.) See also, on this characteristic of these early records, Blunt's *Veracity of the Books of Moses*. Hess brings out impressively this feature of the Bible in his *Geschichte der Patriarchen* (2 Bde. Tübingen, 1878). It appears from Gal. iv. 21, where Paul speaks of the dissensions in Abraham's family, that the jealousy between Hagar's son and the heir of promise proceeded much farther than the O. T. relates. Rixetschi has a brief article on "Hagar" in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie* for 1872. Mr. Williams (Holy City, p. 463-468) inserts an extended account of the supposed discovery by Mr. Rowlands of Beer-lahmi-riö, the well in the desert, at which, after her expulsion from the house of Abraham, the angel of the Lord appeared to Hagar (Gen. xvi. 7 f.). It is said to be about 5 hours from Kadesh, on the way from Beer-sheba to Egypt, and is called Mâlidîh (more correctly Mâlidîh, says Rixetschi), the name being regarded as a false syllable, except in the first syllable of the change of Beer, "well," for Mo'ed, "water." Near it also is found an elaborate excavation in the rocks which the Arabs call Beit-Hagar, i. e. "house of Hagar." Keil and Delitzsch (in Gen. xvi. 14) incline to adopt this identification. Knobel (Genesis, p. 147) is less decided. Dr. Robinson's note (Bibl. Riss., 2d ed. i. 189) throws some discredit on the accuracy of this report.

Hagar occurs in Gal. iv. 25 (T. R. & A. V.), not as a personal name (q. "Ayap"); but as a local or local name (q. "Abip") applied to Mount Sinai in Arabia. The Arabic عائشة, pronounced very much like this name, means a "stone," and may have been in use in the neighborhood of Sinai as one of its local designations. (See Meyer on Gal. iv. 25.) There is no testimony that the mount was so called out of this passage; but as Ewald remarks respecting this point (Niedtray in his *Buchbeschreibung des Apostel*., p. 103 th.), Paul is so much the less to be charged with an error here, since moral reminiscence of his own, as he had himself travelled in that part of Arabia, and as an apostle, had remained there a long time." (See Gal. i. 17 f.) Some conjecture that this name was transferred to the mountain from an Aramaic town so called, where, according to one account, Hagar is said to have been buried. But, on the other hand, it is not certain that q. "Ayap" originally belongs to the toponym, though the weight of critical opinion affirms it (see Meyer, in loc.). The questions both as to the origin of the name and the genelessness of the reading are carefully examined in Lightfoot's *Commentary on Galatians* (pp. 178, 189 ff. 2d ed.), though perhaps he underestimates the testimony for q. "Ayap."  

HAGARENES, HAGARITES (لاجرون، لاجريتي)  

"Ayapøuvi, Ayapaou, [etc.] Agapou, Agapou, Agapouou", a people dwelling to the east of Palestine, with whom the tribe of Reuben made war in the time of Saul, and "who fell by their hand, and they dwelt in their tents throughout all the land [i.e. of Gilead]" (1 Chr. v. 10); and again, in ver. 18-20, the sons of Reuben, and the Gadites, and half the tribe of Manasseh, "made war with the Hagrites, with Jether, and Nophish, and Nobah, and they were helped against them, and the Hagrites were delivered into their hand, and all that were with them. The spoil here recorded to have been taken shows the wealth and importance of these tribes; and the conquest, at least of the territory occupied by them, was complete, for the Israelites "dwelt in their tents until the Captivity" (ver. 22). The same people, as confederate against Israel, are mentioned in Ps. lxxxiii.: "The encampments of Edom and the Ishmaelites; of Moab and the Hagrites; of Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; the Philistines with the inhabitants of Tyre; Assur also is joined with them; they have holpen the children of Lot" (ver. 6-8).

Who these people were is a question that cannot readily be decided, though it is generally believed that they were named after Hagar. Their geographical position, as inferred from the above passages, was in the "east country," where dwelt the descendants of Ishmael; the occurrence of the names of two of his sons, Jether and Nophish (1 Chr. v. 19), as before quoted, with that of Nobah, whom Genesis supposes to be another son (though he is not found in the genealogical lists, and must remain doubtful [NODAH]), seems to indicate that these Hagarenes were named after Hagar; but in the passage in Ps. lxxxiii., the Ishmaelites are apparently distinguished from the Hagarenes (cf. Bar. iii. 29). May they have been thus called after a town or district named after Hagar, and not only because they were her descendants? It is needless to follow the suggestion of some writers, that Hagar may have been the mother of other children after her separation from Abraham (as the Bible and tradition are silent on the question), and it is in itself highly improbable.

It is also uncertain whether the important town and district of Heger (the inhabitants of which were probably the same as the Agar of Strabo, xvi. p. 767, Dionys. Perig. 958, Plin. vi. 32, and Ptol. v. 19, 2) represent the ancient name and a dwelling of the Hagarenes; but it is reasonable to suppose that they do. Heger or Herjera (جاجير) is indecipherable, according to Yakoot, *Musulirak, s. v.

Hager also, according to Airmes, as Gesenius
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and Winter write it, is the capital town, and also a subdivision of the province of northeastern Arabia called El-Behery, or, as some writers say, the name of the province itself (Muškharak and Muraviev, s. v.), on the borders of the Persian Gulf. It is a low and fertile country, frequented for its abundant water and pastureage by the wandering tribes of the neighboring deserts and of the high land of Neby. For the Agrie, see the Dictionary of Geography. There is another Hejer, a place near El-Medemench.

The district of Hejer (Joseph, ii. 22), on the borders of Desert Arabia, north of El-Medemench, has been thought to possess a trace, in its name, of the Hagarites. It is, at least, less likely than Hejer to do so, both from situation and etymology. The tract, however, is curious from the caves that it is reported to contain, in which, say the Arabs, dwelt the old tribe of Thamood.

Two Hagarites are mentioned in the O. T.: see Mihiyar and Jaziz.

E. S. P.

HAGGARITE

THE (ןגהראית: אַ'אָנוֹרַיְת; [Vat. sap. יִנְעַרְיִת; Aygarea;]. Jaziz the Hagarite, i. e. the descendant of Hagar, had the charge of David's sheep (I ن, א. V. "flocks"); 1 Chr. xxvii. 31). The word appears in the other forms of Hagarites and Hagarines.

HAGGAI [2 syll.] (גָּגָי [yntvi].) "The Prophet." [Sin. אַגָּיָי İgays, in Hag., except inscription, and so Alex. in the inscr. of Ps. cxlv.-cxliv..] Aygarea, the tenth in order of the minor prophets, and first of those who prophesied after the Captivity. With regard to his tribe and parentage both history and tradition are alike silent. Some, indeed, taking in his literal sense the expression הַגָּיָי הַנִּנְעַרְיִת (males y'be'eich) in i. 13, have imagined that he was an angel in human shape (Jerome, Comm. in loc.). In the absence of any direct evidence on the point, it is more than probable that he was one of the exiles who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua; and Ewald (Die Prophet. d. Alt. B.) is even tempted to infer from ii. 2 that he may have been one of the few survivors who had seen the first temple in its splendor. The rebuilding of the temple, which was commenced in the reign of Cyrus (n. c. 535), was suspended during the reigns of his successors, Cambyses and Pseudo-Smerdis, in consequence of the determined hostility of the Samaritans. On the accession of Darius Hystaspis (n. c. 521), the prophets Haggai and Zechariah urged the renewal of the undertaking, and obtained the permission and assistance of the king (Ezr. v. 1, vi. 14; Joseph. Ant. xi. 4). Aninated by the high courage (magni spiritus, Jerome) of these devoted men, the people prosecuted the work with vigor, and the temple was completed and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius (n. c. 516). According to tradition, Haggai was born in Babylon, was a young man when he came to Jerusalem, and was buried with honor near the sepulchres of the priests (Isidore. Hispal. c. 49; Pseudo-Dorotheus, in Chron. Pasch. 51 d.). It has hence been conjectured that he was of priestly rank. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, according to the Jewish writers, were the men who were with Daniel when he saw the vision related in Dan. x. 7; and were after the Captivity members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 130 elders (Civit., ill. 65). The Sefer Ovam Zada places their death in the 53rd year of the Medes and Persians; while the extravagance of another tradition makes Haggai survive till the entry of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem, and even till the time of our Saviour (Carpzov, Introd.). In the Roman Martyrology Hosea and Haggai are joined in the catalogue of saints (Acta Sanctor. 4 July). The question of Haggai's probable connection with the authorship of the book of Ezra will be fully discussed in the article under that head, pp. 805, 806.

The names of Haggai and Zechariah are associated in the LXX. in the titles of Ps. 137, 145-148; in the Vulgate in those of Ps. 111, 145; and in the Posito Syriac in those of Ps. 125, 126, 145, 146, 147, 148. It may be that tradition assigned to these prophets the arrangement of the above-mentioned psalms for use in the temple service, just as Ps. lxiv. is in the Vulgate attributed to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the name of the former is inscribed at the head of Ps. cxxxvi. in the LXX. According to Pseudo Epiphanius (de Vita Proph.), Haggai was the first who chanted the Hallelujah in the second temple: "wherefore," he adds, "we say 'Hallelujah, which is the hymn of Haggai and Zechariah.'" Haggai is mentioned in the Apocalypse as Agorys, in 1 Esdr. vi. i, vi. 3; 2 Esdr. i. 40; and is included in the Exclus. xix. 11 (cf. Hag. ii. 21) and Heb. xii. 26 (Haggai, v. 6).

The style of his writing is generally tame and prosaic, though at times it rises to the dignity of severe invective, when the prophet rebukes his countrymen for their selfish indolence and neglect of God's house. But the brevity of the prophecies is so great, and the poverty of expression which characterizes them so striking, as to give rise to a conjecture, not without reason, that in their present form they are but the outline or summary of the original discourses. They were delivered in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (n. c. 520), at intervals from the 1st day of the 6th month to the 24th day of the 9th month in the same year.

In his first message to the people the prophet denounced the listlessness of the Jews, who dwelt in their "panelled houses," while the temple of the Lord was roofless and desolate. The displeasure of God was manifest in the failure of their efforts for their own gratification. The heavens were "stayed from dew," and the earth was "stayed from her fruit." They had neglected that which should have been their first care, and reap the due wages of their selfishness (i. 4-11). The words of the prophet sank deep into the hearts of the people and their leaders. They acknowledged the voice of God speaking by his servant, and obeyed the command. Their obedience was rewarded with the assurance of God's presence (i. 13), and twenty-four days after the building was resumed. A month had scarcely elapsed when the work seems to have slackened, and the enthusiasm of the people abated. The prophet, ever ready to rekindle their zeal, encouraged the flagging spirits of the chiefs with the renewed assurance of God's presence, and the fresh promise that, stately and magnificently, the temple is to be the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former (ii. 3-9). Yet the people were still inactive, and two months afterwards we find him again censuring their sluggishness, which rendered worthless all their ceremonial observances. But the rebuke was accompanied by a repetition of the promise (ii. 10-19). On the same day, the
four-and-twentieth of the ninth month, the prophet declared his last prophecy, addressed to Zerubbabel, prince of Judah, the representative of the royal family of David, and as such the lineal ancestor of the Messiah. This closing prediction foreshadows the establishment of the Messianic kingdom upon the overthrow of the thrones of the nations (ii. 20-23).

W. A. W.

* For the later exegetical works on the prophets which include Haggai, see under Habakkuk.

Keil gives a list of the older commentators or monographs in his Lehr- und krit. Einl. in d. J. T. p. 308 (2nd Ed.). Oehler treats of the prophet's personal history in Herzog's Real-Encyc. v. 471 ff. Bleek (Einl. in d. A. Test. p. 549) agrees with those (Ewald, Haevernick, Keil) who think that Haggai lived long enough to see both the first and the second temples. On the Messianic passage of this prophet (ii. 9-9), the reader may consult, in addition to the commentators, Heeschenberg, Christology of the O. T. T. iii. 243-271 (Keith's trans.); Hasse, Geschichte des Alten Bundes, p. 203 ff.; Smith, J. P., Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, i. 283 ff. (5th ed. London 1859); and Holwick, Die Propheten u. ihre Weisungen (2nd Abdruck), p. 156, a few words only.

H.

HAG'GERI (יוֹבָר), i. e. Hagri, a Hagarite: 'Ayyapi; [Vat. FA.-p.ζα] Alex. ΑγγατΟς: Ajyppa]. "Mihirak son of Haggeri" was one of the mighty men of David's guard, according to the catalogue of 1 Chr. xii. 38. The parallel passage—2 Sam. xxii. 36—has "Ban the Gadite" (יוֹבָר). This Kennicott decides to have been the original, from which Haggeri has been corrupted (Dissert. p. 214). The Targum has Bar Gedh (יוֹבָר). HAGG'GII (יוֹבָר) [festive]: 'Ayyapi, Alex. ΑγγατΟς: [In Num.], 'Ayyapi, Vat. -p.ζα Haggii, Ajyppa], second son of Gad (Gen. xxvi. 16; Num. xxvi. 15), founder of the Haggites (יוֹבָר). It will be observed that the name, though given as that of an individual, is really a patronymic, precisely the same as the family.

HAGG'FIJAH (יוֹבָר חֹבָד), the festal name of Haggai, a Levite, one of the descendants of Merari (1 Chr. vi. 30).

HAG'GITES, THE (יוֹבָר תְּרָא), four 'Ayyapi: [Vat. -p.ζα] Ajyppa], the family sprung from Haggai, second son of Gad (Num. xxvi. 15).

HAGGI'TH (יוֹבָר), a dancer: 'Ayyapi; Alex. ΑγγατΟς, Ajyppa; [Vat. ΑγγατΟς, ΑγγατΟς] Joseph. 'Ayyapi (Haggith, Ajyppa), one of David's wives, of whom nothing is told us except that she was the mother of Abdoniah, who is commonly designated as "the son of Haggith" (2 Sam. iii. 4: 1 K. i. 5, 11, ii. 13; 1 Chr. iii. 2). He was, like Absalom, renowned for his handsome presence. In the first and last of the above passages Haggith is fourth in order of mention among the wives, Abdoniah being also fourth among the sons. His birth happened at Hebron (2 Sam. iii. 2, 5) shortly after that of Absalom (1 K. i. 6; where it will be observed that the words "his mother" are inserted by the translators).

HAG'GIA (יוֹבָר), Bas. Holms & Parsons: Ajyppa]. 1 Esdr. v. 34. (HAYTH.)

HA'I (יוֹבָר [the stone-heap, or ruin]): 'Ayyapi: [Vat. FA.-p.ζα] Alex. ΑγγατΟς: Ajyppa]. The form in which the well-known place At appears in the A. V. on its first introduction (Gen. xii. 8; xiii. ii.). It arises from the translators having in these places, and these only, recognized the definite article with which At is invariably and emphatically accompanied in the Hebrew. (More probably it comes from the Vulgate.—A. T.) In the Samaritan Version of the above two passages, the name is given in the first Aivah, and in the second Cephrath, as if Cephrath.

G.

HAIL (סָפָר, "The Ten; Snow")

HAIR. The Hebrews were fully alive to the importance of the hair as an element of personal beauty, whether as seen in the "curled locks, black as a raven," of youth (Cant. v. 11), or in the "crown of glory" that encircled the head of old age (Prov. xvi. 31). The customs of ancient nations in regard to the hair varied considerably: the Egyptians allowed the women to wear it long, but kept the heads of men closely shaved from early childhood (Her. ii. 30, iii. 12; Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, ii. 327, 328). The Greeks admired long hair, whether in men or women, as is evidence in the expression καρποφόρα ταῖς 'Αραμίταις, and in the representations of their divinities, especially Bacchus and Apollo, whose long locks were a symbol of perpetual youth. The Assyrians also wore it long (Her. i. 195), the flowing curls being gathered together in a heavy cluster on the back, as represented in the sculptures of Nineveh. The Hebrews, on the other hand, while they encouraged the growth of hair, observed the natural distinction between the sexes by allowing the women to wear it long (Luke vii. 38; John xi. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 6 ff.), while the men restrained theirs by frequent clippings to a moderate length. This difference between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, especially the Egyptians, arose no doubt partly from natural taste, but partly also from legal enactments. Clipping the hair in a certain manner and offering the locks, was in early times connected with religious worship. Many of the Arabsians practiced a peculiar tonsure in honor of their God OONTAL (Her. iii. 8, 5ηαυατάν πετρόγαλα, πορίζομαι, κόσμον τών κρατάοντος), and hence the Hebrews were forbidden to "round the corners (יוֹבָר) the extremity of their heads" (Lev. xvi. 27), meaning the locks along the forehead and temples, and behind the ears. This tonsure is described in the LXX. by a peculiar expression κασάθες (= the classical κασάθος), probably derived from the Hebrew קָסָר (comp. Bohart, Com. i. 6, p. 379).

That the practice of the Arabsians was well known to the Hebrews, appears from the expression קָסָר יְבָר, rounded as to the locks, by which
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They are described (Jer. ix. 26; xvi. 23; xliii. 32: we marginal translation of the A. V.). The prohibition against cutting off the hair on the death of a relative (Deut. xiv. 1) was probably grounded on a similar reason. In addition to these regulations, the Hebrews dreaded baldness, as it was frequently the result of leprous (Lev. xvi. 40 fin.), and hence formed one of the disqualifications for the priesthood (Lev. xxii. 6, LXX.). [Baldness.] The rule imposed upon the priests, and probably followed by the rest of the community, was that the hair should be polled (ผม, Ez. xlv. 20), neither being shaved, nor allowed to grow too long (Lev. xvi. 5; Ez. i. c.). What was the precise length usually worn, we have no means of ascertaining; but, from various expressions, as


The usual and favorite color of the hair was black (Cant. v. 11), as is indicated in the comparisons to a "lock of goats" and the "kents of Kedar" (Cant. iv. 1, i. 5); a similar hue is probably intended by the purple of Cant. vii. 5, the term being broadly used (as the Greek πορφύρας in a similar application μᾶλις, Anacr. 28). A fictitious hue was occasionally obtained by sprinkling gold-dust on the hair (Joseph. Ant. viii. 7, § 3). It does not appear that dyes were ordinarily used; the "Carmel" of Cant. vii. 5 has been understood as χιλιαξ (A. V. "crimson," margin) without good reason, though the similarity of the words may have suggested the subsequent reference to purple. Herod is said to have dyed his gray hair for the purpose of concealing his age (Ant. xvi. 8, § 1); but the practice may have been borrowed from the Greeks or Romans, among whom it was common (Aristoph. Eum. 736; Martial, Ep. iii. 43; Propert. ii. 18, 24, 29; from Matt. v. 36, we may infer that it was not usual among the Hebrews. The approach of age was marked by a sprinkling (ןָּלֶק, Hos. vii. 9; comp. a similar use of spargere, Propert. iii. 4, 24) of gray hairs, which soon overspread the whole head (Gen. xliii. 28, xvii. 29; 1 K. ii. 6, 9; Prov. xxxi. 13, xx. 29). The reference to the almond in Eccl. x. 5, has been explained of the white blossoms of that tree, as emblematic of old age: it may be observed, however, that the color of the flower is pink rather than white, and that the verb in that passage, according to high authorities (Giesen, and Hitzig), does not bear the sense of blossoming at all. Pure white hair was deemed characteristic of the Divine Majesty (Dan. vii. 9; Rev. i. 14).

The chief beauty of the hair consisted in curls, whether of a natural or artificial character. The Hebrew terms are highly expressive: to omit the word יִשְׁפָּר—rendered "locks" in Cant. iv. 1, 3, vi. 7, and Is. xlv. 2, but more probably meaning a veil,—we have יִשְׁפָּר (Cant. v. 11), properly pendulous flexible boughs (according to
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be LXX, ἐλατραί the shoots of the palm-tree, which supplied an image of the coma pendula; ἄνθισμα (Is. vi. 3), a similar image borrowed from the curve of a blossom: ὑφή (Cant. iv. 9), a lock falling over the shoulders like a chain of ear-pendants (in uno erineae colli tuae, Vulg., which is better than the A.V., "with one chain of thy neck"); ἀπιπρασία (Cant. vii. 5, A.V. "galeries"), properly the channels by which water was brought to the flocks, which supplied an image either of the coma flaus, or of the regularity in which the locks were arranged; θέρας (Cant. vii. 5), again an expression for coma pendula, borrowed from the threads hanging down from an unfinished wool; lastly κεραυνὸν (Is. iii. 24, A.V. "well set hair"), properly "plaited work," i.e. gracefully curved locks. With regard to the mode of dressing the hair, we have no very precise information: the terms used are of a general character, as of Jezreel (2 K. ix. 30), βρακία, i.e. she adorned her head; of Judith (x. 5), διήρατος, i.e. arranged (the A.V. has "braided," and the Vulg. decirumcurvatu), here used in a technical sense in the reference to the discirumcallinum or hair-pin); of Herod (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 9, § 4), κεκραυγμένοι τῇ συνθέτει τῆς κοινῆς, and of those who adopted feminine fashions (B. J. iv. 9, § 10), κόμας συνθέτουσιν. The terms used in the N. T. (πλαγιασθείς, 1 Tim. ii. 9; ἑκατοστίς τρικύκλος, 1 Pet. iii. 3) are also of a general character; Schlesner (Lex. s. v.) understands them of curling rather than plaiting. The arrangement of Samson’s hair into seven locks, or more properly braid (ἃριστους ἑάντροις, from ἐάντροις, to inter-

EGYPTIAN WIGS. (Wilkinson.)

HAKKATAN (Ἑκάκαταν) [the small or young]: Ἀκκαδαν [Vat. Akoan] I Faery. Johann, son of Hakkatan, was the chief of the Bene-Azaza [sons of A.], who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr. vii. 12). The name is probably Katan, with the definite article prefixed. In the Apocrypha Esdras it is ACATAN.
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familiar to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, ii. 335) and Greeks (Hom. H. xiv. 176). The locks were probably worn in their place by a fillet, as in Egypt (Wilkinson, i. e.).

Ornaments were worked into the hair, as practiced by the modern Egyptians, who "add to each braid three black silk cords with little ornaments of gold" (Lane, i. 71): the LXX. understands the term ἄνθισμα (Is. iii. 18, A.V. "cauls"), as applying to such ornaments (ἐπαλάσων). Schroeder (de Vitr. Mat. Heb. cap. 2) approves of this, and conjectures that they were sun-dried, i.e. circular, as distinct from the "round tires like the moon," i.e. the crescent-shaped ornaments used for necklaces. The Arabian women attach small bells to the tresses of their hair (Niebuhr, Vegera, i. 133). Other terms, sometimes understood as applying to the hair, are of doubtful signification, e.g. χέλη (Is. iii. 22; nasus: "crisping-pins"), more probably porus, as in 2 K. v. 23; καρποί (Is. iii. 20, "head-lands"), birchit gyrdles, according to Schroeder and other authorities; διαφανής (Is. iii. 29), discirumcallinum, Vulg. i.e. pins used for keeping the hair parted; cf. Jerome in Euseb. iii. cap. ult., more probably tabucous. Combs and hair-pins are mentioned in the Talmud; the Egyptian combs were made of wood and double, one side having large, and the other small teeth (Wilkinson, ii. 343): from the ornamental devices worked on them we may infer that they were worn in the hair.

With regard to other ornaments worn about the head, see HAKKATAN. The Hebrews, like other nations of antiquity, adorned the hair profusely with orniments, which were generally compounded of various aromatic ingredients (Latham iii. 2; 2 Sam. xiv. 2; Ps. xxii. 5, 116, xcsii. 10; Exod. iv. 8; Is. iii. 24): more especially on occasion of festivities or hospitality (Matt. vii. 17, xxvi. 7; Luke vii. 46; cf. Joseph. Ant. xiv. 4, § 1, χρυσαμένου μιρροῦ τὸν κεφαλὴν, ἦ λεις κομοσιαῖς). It is perhaps in reference to the glossy appearance imparted to it that the hair is described as purple (Cant. vii. 5).

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

Hair was employed by the Hebrews as an image of what was loved valuable in man's person (1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; 1 K. i. 52; Matt. v. 36; Luke xii. 7, 18; Acts xxviii. 31); as well as of what was innumerable (Ps. xi. 12, bxx. 4); or particularly fine (Judg. xx. 16). In Is. vii. 20, it represents the various productions of the field, trees, crops, etc.; like ἀρός κομματιον σαρόν of Gallin Dom. 41, or the κομματιον κομματιον of Stat. Theb. v. 56. Hair is as the hair of women? (Rev. ix. 8), means long and unshaved hair, which in later times was regarded as an image of barbaric rudeness (Hengstenberg, Comm. in loc.).

W. L. B.
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HAKKATAN (Ἑκάκαταν) [the small or young]: ΑΝΚΑΔΑΤΑ [Vat. ΑΚΑΤΑΝ] I Faery. Johann, son of Hakkatan, was the chief of the Bene-Azaza [sons of A.], who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr. vii. 12). The name is probably Katan, with the definite article prefixed. In the Apocrypha Esdras it is ACATAN.
HAHKKOZ (חאַּקַּקז [the thorn]): δ Κάσινον  
'Comp. [Alex.] Ἀκάκας: Accoss, a priest, the chief of the seventh of the course in the service of the sanctuary, as appointed by David (1 Chr. xxvii. 10). In Ezr. ii. 61 the name occurs again as that of a family of priests; though here the prefix is taken by our translators — and no doubt correctly — as the definite article, and the name appears as Koz. The same thing also occurs in Neh. iii. 24, 21. In Edras Accoss.

HAKUPHA (חאַק'פָּח [bent, crooked]): Gen.; inclement, Fürst: 'Ακουφή, 'Ακουφία; [Vat. Αφήφα, Αφήφα: F.A. in Neh., Αφήφα:] Ακουφη. Bene-Chakupha [sons of C.] were among the names of Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 51, Neh. vii. 53). In Edras (1 Edr. v. 31) the name is given as ACIFPA.

HALLAH (חאַלָּה [a cloud, σωματί]: Αλάθ, Αλάτ; [Alex.] Αλάθ, Αλάτ, Χαλά]: Ηλία, [Lohdes] is probably a different place from the Calah of Gen. x. 11. [See CALAH.] It may with some confidence be identified with the Chalætis (Χαλαλήτης) of Ptolemy (v. 18), which he places between Anthemusia (cf. Strab. xvi. 1, § 27) and Gauzantis. The name is thought to remain in the modern Gla, a large mound on the upper Khobur, above its junction with the Jeruger (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 512, note 2, K. [vii. 6], viii. 11; I Chr. v. 26). G. K.

HALAK, THE MOUNT (with the article, חאַלַּק): The smooth mountain: πᾶς τῶν Χαλακῶν. *HALAK [Vat. in Josh. xi., Alex. Αλάθ, or Αλάτ: ποικιλόν], a mountain, twice and twice only, named as the southern limit of Joshua's conquests — the Mount Halak which goeth up to Seir" (Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7), but which has not yet been identified — has not apparently been sought for by travellers. Keil suggests the line of chalk cliffs which cross the valley of the Ghor at about six miles south of the Dead Sea, and form at once the southern limit of the Ghor and the northern limit of the Arabah. [Arabah, p. 133 a.] And this suggestion would be plausible enough, if there were any example of the word har, "a mountain," being applied to such a vertical cliff as this, which rather answers to what we suppose was intended by the term Selā. The word which is at the root of the name (supposing it to be Hebrew), and which has the force of smoothness or baldness, has ramified into other terms, as Helkah, an even plot of ground, like those of Jacob (Gen. xxxvii. 19) or Naboth (2 K. ix. 25), or that which gave its name to Helkath-hat-tuerim, "the field of the strong" (Stanley, App. § 20). G.

* HALE (Luke xii. 58; Acts viii. 3) is the original form of "haul," sometimes still used in formal discourse. In both the above passages it means to drag men by force before magistrates. That is the import also of the Greek term κατασφυγή κατάφωσις. H.

HAL/HUL (חאַלַּה [full of hollows, νησί]: Ἀλάκον; [Vat. Αλάκον] Alex. Αλάκον: Ἁλάκον, a town of Judah in the mountain district, one of the group containing Beth-zur and Gedor (Josh. xv. 58). Jerome, in the Quaestiones comment (under Elul), reports the existence of a hamlet (ῥιλμός) named "Alula," near Hebron. The name still remains unaltered, attached to a conspicuous hill a mile to the left of the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, between 3 and 4 miles from the latter. Opposite it, on the other side of the road, is Beltsur, the modern representative of Bethzur, and a little further to the north is Jedur, the ancient Gedor. [Bethzur:] The site is marked by the ruins of walls and foundations, amongst which stands a dilapidated mosque bearing the name of Nebi Yumrus — the prophet Jonah (Lob. i. 210). In a Jewish tradition quoted by Hotten (Cypřk Hebrewici, p. 52) it is said to be the burial-place of Gad, David's seer. See also the citations of Zunz in Asher's Benj. of Tudeka (ii. 437, note). G.

HALI (חאֶלִי [nekklace]): Αλάθιον: Alex. Αλαθίον. Chaladi, a town on the boundary of Asher, named between Helkath and Beten (Josh. xix. 25). Nothing is known of its situation. Schwarz (p. 191) compares the name with Che lethon, the equivalent in the Latin of Cymeon in the Greek of Jud. viii. 3.

HALICARNAS/SUS (חאַלכארונסוס): Χαλκαιούσσας) in Caïdia, a city of great renown, as being the birthplace of Herodotus and of the later historian Dionysius, and as embellished by the Mausoleum erected by Artemisia, but of no Biblical interest except as the residence of a Jewish population in the periods between the Old and New Testament histories. In 1 Mac. xxv. 23, this city is specified as containing such a population. The decree in Joseph. Ant. xiv. 10, § 23, where the Romans direct that the Jews of Halicarnassus shall be allowed τὰς προσευματί τινας ἐναρκτείς τής θάλασσας κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἑσοῦ, is interesting when compared with Acts xvi. 13. This city was celebrated for its harbor and for the strength of its fortifications; but it never recovered the damage which it suffered after Alexander's siege. A plan of the site is given in Ross, Relien auf den Griech. Inseln. (See vol. iv. p. 30.) The sculptures of the Mausoleum are the subject of a paper by Mr. Newton in the Classical Museum, and many of them are now in the British Museum. The modern name of the place is Pudrum. J. S. H.

* See particularly on Halicarnass the important work of Mr. Newton, History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Caidas, and Branchikos, 2 vols. text and I vol. plates, London, 1862-63. A.

HALLELU'JAH (חאַלָלַעַח): Αλαλύα): used of the court of the high-priest's house (Luke xxii. 55). Αλαλύα is in A. V. Matt. xxvi. 69, Mark xiv. 66, John xviii. 15, "palace;" Vulg. atrium: πραόσυλον, Mark xiv. 66, "porch;" Vulg. atrum atrium. In Matt. xxvii. 27 and Mark xvi. 15, Αλαλύα is syn. with πραόσυλον, which in John xvi. 28 is in A. V., "judgment-hall." Αλαλύα is the equivalent for כַּפַּר הַנִּלְגָּא, an inclosed or fortified space (Gen. p. 512), in many places in O. T. where Vulg. and A. V. have respectively vilis or viculus, "a village," or atrium, "a chief of the enclosure or temple. The hall or court of a house or palace would probably be an inclosed but uncovered space, impluvium.

It is not unworthy of notice that, though so far from Jerusalem, Jerome speaks of it as "in the district of Elia."
the language of Ham" in the Bible (Ps. 105:31, 32, 23), and this, though it does not prove that the name of the Egyptian name with that of the patriarch, certain debuggers it, and establishes the historical fact that Egypt, settled by the descendants of Ham, was peculiarly his territory. The name Mizraim we believe to confirm this. The restriction of Ham to Egypt, unlike the case, if we may reason inferentially, of his brethren, may be accounted for by the very early civilization of this part of the Hamite territory, while much of the rest was comparatively barbarous. Egypt may also have been the first settlement of the Hamites whose colonies went forth, as we know to have been the case with the Philistines. [CAMPBELL.]

The settlements of the descendants of Cush have occasioned the greatest difficulties to critics. The main question upon which everything turns is whether there was an eastern and a western Cush, like the eastern and western Ethiopians of the Greeks. This has been usually decided on the Biblical evidence as to the land of Cush and the Cushites, without reference to that as to the several names designating in Gen. x. his progeny, or, except in Nimrod's case, the territories held by it, or both. By a more inducive method we have been led to the conclusion that settlements of Cush extended from Babylonia along the shores of the Indian Ocean to Ethiopia above Egypt, and to the supposition that there was an eastern as well as a western Cush; historically the latter inference must be correct; geographically it may be less certain of the postdiluvian world. The ancient Egyptians applied the name Keset, or Kesh, which is obviously the same as Cush, to Ethiopia above Egypt. The sons of Cush are stated to have been Selu, Havilah, Sabath, Raamah, and Subtechah: it is added that the sons of Raamah were Sheba and Dedan, and that Cush beget Nimrod. Certain of these names recur in the lists of the descendants of Joktan and of Abraham by Keturah, a circumstance which must be explained, in most cases, as historical evidence tends to show, by the settlement of Cushites, Joktanites, and Abrahamites in the same regions. [ARABIA.] Selu is generally identified with Sheba, and there seems to be little doubt that at the time of Solomon the chief kingdom of Ethiopia was that of Selu. [SHEBA.] The postdiluvian Havilah seems to recur in the references to Arabia. [HAWILAH.] Sabath and Subtechah are probably Arabian names: this is certainly the case with Raamah, Sheba, and Dedan, which are recognized on the Persian Gulf. [SARAH; SARTECHO; RAAMAH; SHEBA; DEDAN.] Nimrod is a descendant of Cush, but it is not certain that he is a son, and his is the only name which is positively personal and not territorial in the list of the descendants of Cush. The account of his first kingdom in Babylonia, and of the extension of his rule into Assyria, and the foundation of Nineveh — for this we take the meaning of Gen. x. 11, 12 — indicates a spread of Hamitic colonies along the Euphrates and Tigris northwards. [CUSH.]

If, as we suppose, Mizraim in the lists of Gen. x. and 4 Chr. i. stand for Mizrir, we should take the singular Mazor to be the name of the progenitor of the Egyptian tribes. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be identical in signification with Ham, so that it may be but another name of the patriarch. [EGYPT.] In this case the mention of Mizraim or Mizrir would be geographical, and not indicative of a Mazor, son of Ham.
The Mizraimites, like the descendants of Ham, occupied a territory wider than that bearing the name of Mizraim. We may, however, suppose that Mizraim included all the first settlements, and that in remote times other tribes besides the Philistines migrated, or extended their territories. This we may infer to have been the case with the Lehabim (Ludim) or Libyans, for Manetho speaks of them as in the remotest period of Egyptian history subject to the Pharaohs. He tells us that under the first king of the Third Dynasty, of Memphis, Nechores, or Necorechis, "the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but, on account of a wonderful increase of the moon, submitted through fear" (Cory's Anec. Frag. 21d ed. pp. 100, 101). It is unlikely that at this very early time the Memphite kingdom ruled far, if at all, beyond the western boundary of Egypt.

The Ludim appear to have been beyond Egypt to the west, so probably the Ananim, and certainly the Lehabim. [Ludim; Ananim; Lehabim.] The Naphtuhim seem to have been just beyond the western border. [Naphtuhim.] The Pathrusim and Caphtorim were in Egypt, and probably the Casdulhim also. [Pathros; Cuttor; Casdulhim.] The Phlitim are the only Mizraite tribe that we know to have passed into Asia: their first establishment was in Egypt, for they came out of Caphtor into Egypt, as Genesis tells us.

Phut has been always placed in Africa. In the Bible, Phut occurs as an ally or supporter of Egyptian Thebes, mentioned with Cush and Ludim (Nah. iii. 9), with Cush and Ludim (the Mizrane Ludim?), as supplying part of the army of Pharaoh-Necho (Jer. xvi. 9), as involved in the calamities of Egypt together with Cush, Lud, and Chub [Chuço] (Ez. xxx. 5), as furnishing, with Persia, Lud, and other lands or tribes, mercenaries for the service of Tyre (xxvii. 10), and with Persia and Cush as supplying part of the army of Gog (xxxviii. 5). There can therefore be little doubt that Phut is to be placed in Africa, where we find, in the Egyptian inscriptions, a great number of people corresponding to it. [Phut.]

Respecting the geographical position of the Canaanites there is no dispute, although all the names are not identified. The Hamathites alone of those identified were settled in early times wholly beyond the land of Canaan. Perhaps there was a primeval extension of the Canaanite tribes after their first establishment in the land called after their ancestor, for before the specification of its limits as those of their settlements it is stated "afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad" (Gen. x. 18, 19). One of their most important extensions was to the northeast, where was a great branch of the Hittite nation in the valley of the Orontes, constantly mentioned in the wars of the Pharaohs [Egypt], and in those of the kings of Assyria. Two passages which have occasioned much controversy may be here noticed. In the account of Abraham's entrance into Palestine it is said, "And the Canaanite [was] then in the land" (xii. 6); and as to a somewhat later time, that of the separation of Abraham and Lot, as repeated by Genesis, "the Canaanites and the Perizzites dwelt then in the land" (xiii. 7). These passages have been supposed either to be late glosses, or to indicate that the Pentateuch was written at a late period. A comparison of all the passages referring to the primitive history of Palestine and Idumea shows that there was an earlier population expelled by the Hamite and Abrahamic settlers. This population was important in the time of the war of Chedorlaomer; but at the Exodus, more than four hundred years afterwards, there was but a remnant of it. It is most natural therefore to infer that the two passages under consideration mean that the Canaanite settlers were already in the land, not that they were still there.

Philologers are not agreed as to a Hamitic class of languages. Recently Bunsen has applied the term "Hamitism," or as he writes it Chanutism, to the Egyptian language, or rather family. He places it at the head of the "Semitic stock," to which he considers it as but partially belonging, and thus describes it:—"Chanutism, or ante-historicai Semitism: the Chanut deposit in Egypt; its daughter, the Demotic Egyptian; and its end the Coptic." (Outline, vol. i. p. 183.) Sir H. Rawlinson has applied the term Cushite to the primitive language of Babylonia, and the same term has been used for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. This terminology depends, in every instance, upon the race of the nation speaking the language, and not upon any theory of a Hamitic class. There is evidence which, at the first view, would incline us to consider that the term Semitic, as applied to the Syro-Arabic class, should be changed to Hamitic; but on a more careful examination it becomes evident that any absolute classification of languages into groups corresponding to the three great Noachian families is not tenable. The Biblical evidence seems, at first sight, in favor of Hebrew being classed as a Hamitite rather than a Semitic form of speech. It is called in the Bible "the language of Canaan," ḫaṭṭāḇ hēb`ēṯ (Is. xix. 18), although those speaking it are elsewhere said to speak ḫaṭṭāḇ hūḏāth (2 K. xvii. 26, 28; Is. xxxvi. 11, 13; Neh. xii. 24). But the one term, as Gesenius remarks (Gram. Intro., i.), indicates the country where the language was spoken, the other as evidently indicates a people by whom it was spoken; thus the question of its being a Hamite or Semitic language is not touched; for the circumstance that it was the language of Canaan is agreeable with its being either indigenous (and therefore either Canaanite or Rephite), or adopted (and therefore perhaps Semitic). The names of Canaanite persons and places, as Gesenius has observed (l. c.), conclusively show that the Canaanites spoke what we call Hebrew. Elsewhere we might find evidence of the use of a so-called Semitic language by nations either partly or wholly of Hamite origin. This evidence would favor the theory that Hebrew was Hamitic; but on the other hand we should be unable to dissociate Semitic languages from Semitic peoples. The Egyptian language would also offer great difficulties, unless it was held to be partly of Hamitic origin, since it is mainly of an entirely different class to [from] the Semitic. It is mainly Nigritional, but it also contains Semitic elements. We are of opinion that the groundwork is Nigritional, and that the Semitic part is a layer added to a complete Nigritional lin,
zusage. The two elements are mixed, but not fused. This opinion those Semitic scholars who have studied the subject share with us. Some Iranian scholars hold that the two elements are mixed, and that the ancient Egyptian represents the transition from Turanian to Semitic. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be, that what we call Semitic is early Noachian.

An inquiry into the history of the Hamite nations presents considerable difficulties, since it cannot be determined in the cases of the most important of those commonly held to be Hamite that they were purely of that stock. It is certain that the three most illustrious Hamite nations—the Cushites, the Phenicians, and the Egyptians—were greatly mixed with foreign peoples. In Babylonia the Hamite element seems to have been absorbed by the Semites, but not in the earliest times. There are some common characteristics, however, which appear to connect the different branches of the Hamite family, and to distinguish them from the children of Japheth and Shem. Their architecture has a solid grandeur that we look for in vain elsewhere. Egypt, Babylonia, and Southern Arabia alike afford proofs of this, and the few remaining monuments of the Phenicians are of the same class. What is very important is that what is very important is indicating the purely Hamite character of the monuments to which we refer is that the earliest in Egypt are the most characteristic, while the earlier in Babylonia do not yield in this respect to the later. The national mind seems in all these cases to have been [represented in?] these material forms. The early history of each of the chief Hamite nations shows great power of organizing an extensive kingdom, of acquiring material greatness, and of checking the incursions of neighboring nominal peoples. The Philistines afford a remarkable instance of these qualities. In every case, however, the more energetic sons of Shem or Japheth have at last fallen upon the rich Hamite territories and despoiled them. Egypt, favored by a position fenced round with nearly impassable barriers—on the north almost a havenless coast, on the east and west sterile deserts, held its freedom far longer than the rest; yet even in the reign of Shishak the throne was filled by foreigners, who, if Hamites, were Semite enough in their belief to revolutionize the religion of the country. In Babylonia the Medes had already captured Ninus's city more than 2000 years before the Christian era. The Habites of Southern Arabia were so early overthrown by the Joktanites that the scanty remains of their history are alone known to us through tradition. Yet the story of the migration of the ancient kings of Yemen is so perfectly in accordance with all we know of the Habites that it is almost enough of itself to prove what other evidence has so well established. The history of the Canaanites is similar; and if that of the Phenicians be an exception, it must be reected that they became a merchant class, as Ezekiel's famous description of Tyre shows (chap. xxvii). In speaking of Hamite characteristics, we do not intend it to be inferred that they were necessarily altogether of Hamite origin, and not at least partly borrowed.

R. S. P.

2. (םַע) [multitude, people, Friär], Gen. xiv. 5:

Sam. (שֵׁם), (ווח) According to the Masoretic text, Chedorlaomer and his allies vowed the Zuzim to a place called Ham. If, as seems likely, the Zuzim be the same as the Zammuzumm, Ham must be placed in what was afterwards the Ammonite territory. Hence it has been conjectured by Tuch, that Ham is but another form of the name of the chief stronghold of the children of Ammon, Rabbah, now Rumein. The LXX. and Vulg., however, throw some doubt upon the Masoretic reading: the former has, as the rendering of מַעְשֵׂה (תּוֹאֹר) and the latter, et Zuzim cum eis, which shows that they read מַעְשֵׂה; but the Mas. rendering seems the more likely, as each clause mentions a nation, and its capital or stronghold; although it must be allowed that if the Zuzim had gone to the assistance of the Egyptian, a deviation would have been necessary. The Samaritan Version has רַמְיָה, Lishoth, perhaps intending the Laish of Gen. x. 19, which by some is identified with Callirhoë on the N. E. quarter of the Dead Sea. The Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan have מַעְשֵׂה, Hebr. Schwarz (217) suggests Hammeimoth (in Van de Veldc's map Hammeilet), one mile above Lebbaca, the ancient Ar-Moab, on the Roman road. [Zeterns.]

3. In the account of a migration of the Semeites to the valley of Gedor, and their destroying the pastoral inhabitants, the latter, or possibly their predecessors, are said to have been "of Ham" מַעְשֵׂה (מַעְשֶׂה) —הוֹאֹר רִיוֹנָה (דָּשִׁי יִשָּׁמ). This may indicate that a Hamite tribe was settled here, or, more precisely, that there was an Egyptian settlement. The connection of Egypt with this part of Palestine will be noticed under Zerah. Ham may, however, here be in no way connected with the patriarch or with Egypt.

HAMAN (הַמָּן [celebrated, Pers.], or = Mercury (Sans.), Friär): Amanu (Aman), the chief minister or vizier of king Ahaseurus (Esth. iii. 1). After the failure of his attempt to cut off all the Jews in the Persian empire, he was hanged on the gallows which he had erected for Mordecai. Most likely he is the same Aman who is mentioned as the oppressor of Achaæarans (Tob. xiv. 10). The Targum and Josephus (Ant. xi. 6, § 5) interpret the description of him—the Agaæus—as signifying that he was of Amalekite descent; but he is called a Macedonian by the LXX. in Esth. iv. 24 (cf. iii. 1), and a Persian by Sulpicius Severus. Prideaux (Conocion, anno 451) unites the sum which he offered to pay into the royal treasury at more than £2,000,000 sterling. Modern Jews are said to be in the habit of designating any Christian enemy by his name (Eisengenger, Ent. jud. i. 721). [See addition under Esther, Book of.] W. T. B.

HAMATH (הַמָּת [fortress, citadel]): Haddath, Haddath, Hadad Khamath, appears to have been the principal city of Upper Syria from the time of the Exodus to that of the prophet Amos. It was situated in the valley of the Orontes, about half-way between its source near Bazaalk and the bend which it makes at Jisr-hadid. It thus naturally commanded the whole of the Orontes valley, from the low screen of hills which forms the watershed between the Orontes and the Likey—a "entrance to Hamath," as it is called in Scripture (Num xxxiv. 8; Josh. xiii. 5, &c.) — to the defile
...It east the G. Horment, seems ond quarters Orontes, describes from the importance (Am. l) eing "that math rental, as presently) was the known that Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and on the defeat of the latter by David, sent his son to congratulate the Jewish monarch (2 Sam. viii. 10), and (apparently) to put Hamath under his protection. Hamath seems clearly to have been included in the dominions of Solomon (1 K. iv. 21-4); and its king was no doubt one of those many princes whom that monarch ruled, who "brought presents and served Solomon all the days of his life." The store-cities," which Solomon "built in Hamath " (2 Chr. viii. 4), were perhaps staples for trade, the importance of the Orontes valley as a line of traffic being always great. On the death of Solomon and the separation of the two kingdoms, Hamath seems to have regained its independence. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Ahab (c. 900) it appears as a separate power, in alliance with the Syrians of Damascus, the Hittites, and the Phoenicians. About three-quarters of a century later Jeroboam the second "recovers Hamath " (2 K. xiv. 28); he seems to have dismantled the place, whereas the prophet Amos, who wrote in his reign (Am. i. 1), couples "Hamath the great " with Gath, as an instance of desolation (ib. vi. 2). Soon afterwards the Assyrians took it (2 K. xviii. 34, xix. 13, &c.), and from this time it ceased to be a place of much importance. Antiocchus Epiphanes appears to have changed its name to Epiphanion, an appellation under which it was known to the Greeks and Romans from his time to that of St. Jerome (Comment. in Ezek. xvii. 16), and possibly later. The natives, however, called it Hamath, even in St. Jerome's time; and its present name, Hamah, is but very slightly altered from the ancient form.

Burckhardt visited Hamah in 1812. He describes it as situated on both sides of the Orontes, partly on the declivity of a hill, partly in the plain, and as divided into four quarters — Hubler, El Djas, El Magh, and El Medine, the last being the quarter of the Christians. The population, according to him, was at that time 30,000. The town possessed few antiquities, and was chiefly remarkable for its huge water-wheels, whereby the gardens and the houses in the upper town were supplied from the Orontes. The neighboring territory he calls "the granary of Northern Syria." (Travels in Syria, pp. 146-147. See also Poirecko, Travels in the East, vol. i.; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 314; and Stanley, S. of P. pp. 406, 407."

* The "entrance of Hamath" is not as stated, at the water-sided of the Litâny and the Orontes, which would place it too far south, for the following reasons: (1) The northern boundary of the Israelites was certainly north of Riblah, for the border descends from Hazar-enan to Shepham, and from Shepham to Riblah. Riblah is still known by its ancient name, and is found south of Hums Lake about six or eight hours. The "entrance" must therefore lie north of this town. (2) It must lie east of Mount Hor. Now, if Mount Hor be, as it probably is, the range of Lebanon, the question is readily solved by a reference to the physical geography of the region. The ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon terminate opposite Hums Lake by bold and decided declivities. There is then a rolling country for a distance of about ten miles north of the Lebanon chain, after which rises the lower range of the Nusairiyeh mountains. A wider space of plain intervenes between Anti-Lebanon and the low hills which lie eastward of Hamath. The city of Hums lies at the intersection of the arms of the cross thus formed, and toward each of the cardinal points of the compass there is an "entering in" between the hills. Thus northward the pass leads to Hamath; westward to Kabit el-Husn and the Mediterranean; eastward to the great plain of the Syrian desert; and southward toward Baal-gad in Cœle-Syria. This will appear at a glance from the accompanying plan of the country, in which it will be seen

The Hamathites were a Hamitic race, and are included among the descendants of Canaan (Gen. x. 18). There is no reason to suppose with Mr. Kenrick (Phoenicia, p. 60), that they were ever in any sense Phoenicians. We must regard them as closely akin to the Hittites on whom they bordered, and with whom they were generally in alliance. Nothing appears of the power of Hamath, beyond the geographical notices which show it to be a well-known place (Num. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 8; Josh. xiii. 5; &c.), until the time of David, when we hear that Toi, king of Hamath, had "had wars" with Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and on the defeat of the latter by David, sent his son to congratulate the Jewish monarch (2 Sam. viii. 10), and (apparently) to put Hamath under his protection. Hamath seems clearly to have been included in the dominions of Solomon (1 K. iv. 21-4); and its king was no doubt one of those many princes whom that monarch ruled, who "brought presents and served Solomon all the days of his life." The "store-cities," which Solomon "built in Hamath" (2 Chr. viii. 4), were perhaps staples for trade, the importance of the Orontes valley as a line of traffic being always great. On the death of Solomon and the separation of the two kingdoms, Hamath seems to have regained its independence. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Ahab (c. 900) it appears as a separate power, in alliance with the Syrians of Damascus, the Hittites, and the Phoenicians. About three-quarters of a century later Jeroboam the second "recovered Hamath" (2 K. xiv. 28); he seems to have dismantled the place, whereas the prophet Amos, who wrote in his reign (Am. i. 1), couples "Hamath the great" with Gath, as an instance of desolation (ib. vi. 2). Soon afterwards the Assyrians took it (2 K. xviii. 34, xix. 13, &c.), and from this time it ceased to be a place of much importance. Antiocchus Epiphanes appears to have changed its name to Epiphanion, an appellation under which it was known to the Greeks and Romans from his time to that of St. Jerome (Comment. in Ezek. xvii. 16), and possibly later. The natives, however, called it Hamath, even in St. Jerome's time; and its present name, Hamah, is but very slightly altered from the ancient form.

Burckhardt visited Hamah in 1812. He describes it as situated on both sides of the Orontes, partly on the declivity of a hill, partly in the plain, and as divided into four quarters — Hubler, El Djas, El Magh, and El Medine, the last being the quarter of the Christians. The population, according to him, was at that time 30,000. The town possessed few antiquities, and was chiefly remarkable for its huge water-wheels, whereby the gardens and the houses in the upper town were supplied from the Orontes. The neighboring territory he calls "the granary of Northern Syria." (Travels in Syria, pp. 146-147. See also Poirecko, Travels in the East, vol. i.; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 314; and Stanley, S. of P. pp. 406, 407."

The "entrance of Hamath" is not as stated, at the water-sided of the Litâny and the Orontes, which would place it too far south, for the
journeying along the coast from Tripoli to La-
\[a\]nch. Lebanon and the Nusairiyeh range are seen in profile, with the gap between them. A similar view is presented from the remaining cardinal points G. E. P.

**HAMATHITE, THE**

HA'MATHITE-ZO'BAH (חָמָת-זֹבָה): Haswski: [Alex. Ámáth Žóbat] Kewthas-Šubat) is said to have been attacked and conquered by Sol-
onon (2 Chr. viii. 3). It has been conjectured to be the same as Hamath, here regarded as included in Aram-Zobah — a geographical expression which has usually a narrower meaning. But the name Hamath-Zobah would seem rather suited to another Hamath which was distinguished from the "Great Hamath," by the suffix "Zobah." Compare Hamoth-Gilead, which is thus distinguished from Ramah in Benjamin.

*HAMITAL, 2 K. xxiii. 31, is the reading of the A.V. ed. 1611 for HAMITAL.

Hammath (חָמָת [warm spring]): Guamad-
dadáke — the last two syllables a corruption of the name following; [Alex. Ámáth; Abl. Ámáhta] Ámáth, one of the fortified cities in the territory allotted to Naphtali (Josh. xix. 35). It is not possible from this list to determine its position, but the notices of the Talmudists, collected by Lightfoot in his Chorographical Century, and Chor. Deod, leave no doubt that it was near Tiberias, one mile distant — in fact that it had its name, Channath, "hot baths," because it contained those of Tiberias. In accordance with this are the slight notices of Jospehus, who mentions it under the name of Namaan as a "village not far from Tiberias, . . . one of the baths" of Tiberias" (Ant. xviii. 2, § 3), and as where Vespasian had en-
camped "before" (πρὸς) Tiberias" (I. J. iv. 1, § 3).

Remains of the wall of this encampment were rec-
ognized by Irbê and Mangles (p. 89 b). In both cases Josephus names the hot springs or baths, add-
ing in the latter, that such is the interpretation of the name 'Amsgáns, and that the waters are med-
dical. The Hamath, at present three in number, still send up their hot and sulphureous waters, at a spot rather more than a mile south of the modern town, at the extremity of the ruins of the ancient city (Rob. ii. 383, 384; Van de Velde, ii. 399).

It is difficult, however, to reconcile with this position other observations of the Talmudists quoted on the same place, by Lightfoot, to the effect that Chamath was called also the "wells of Gadara," from its proximity to that place, and also that half the town was on the east side of the Jordan and half on the west, with a bridge between them — the fact being that the ancient Tiberias

was at least 4 miles, and the Hamman 2, from the present embouchure of the Jordan. The same difficulty besets the account of Parchi (in Zunz's App. to Benjamin of Tudela, ii. 403). He places the wells entirely on the coast of Jordan.

In the list of Levitical cities given out of Naph-
tali (Josh. xxi. 32), the name of this place seems to be HAMMOTH-DOR, and in 1 Chr. vi. 76 it is further altered to HAMMON.

G.

**HAMMEDATHA** (חָמָדָת-הוֹ): "Amasarth: [Alex. Ámamáthos, Ámamáthos:] Amosathus), father of the infamous Hannan, and commonly design-
ated as "the Agagite" (Esth. iii. 1, 10; viii. 5; ix. 24), though also without that title (ix. 10).

By Gesenius (Lex. 1855, p. 539) the name is taken to be Medatha, preceded by the definite article. For other explanations, see First, Hommel. [Zend. = given by Hoom]; and Simonis, ONomacron, p. 589. The latter derives it from a Per-
isan word meaning "double." For the termination compare ABDATHA.

**HAMMELECH** (חָמָלעך [the king]): τοῦ Basiileos: Amelech), rendered in the A.V. as a proper name (Jer. xxxvi. 26; xxxvii. 6); but there is no apparent reason for supposing it to be anything but the ordinary Hebrew word for "the king," i.e. in the first case Jehoiakim, and in the latter Zedekiah. If this is so, it enables us to connect with the royal family of Judah two persons, Jerachmeel and Malech, who do not appear in the A.V. as members thereof.

G.

**HAMMER.** The Hebrew language has several names for this indispensable tool. (1.) Pattish (חָמָת, connected etymologically with נדָשָׁה, to strike), which was used by the gold-beater (Is. xlii. 7, A. V. "carpenter") to overlay with silver and "smooth" the surface of the image; as well as by the quarry-man (Jer. xxiii. 29). (2.) Mok-
kibáh (מֹכֶּב [and מֹכֶּב תִּכְּנָה]), properly a tool for rising, hence a stone-cutter's mallet (1 K. vi. 7), and generally any workman's hammer (Judg. xv. 21; Is. xlv. 12; Jer. x. 4). (3.) Halmáth (חלמה), used only in Judg. v. 26, and then with the addition of the word "workmen's" by way of explanation. (4.) A kind of hammer, named moppélz (מֹפְּלָצ), Jer. lii. 20 (A. V. "battle-
axe"), or môfítica (מֹפִית), Prov. xxv. 18 (A. V.

...and three others a few paces further south (see a's Rob. Euseb. Res. iii. 259).

**HAMMER, THE**

HA'MATHITE, THE (חָמָת-הו':) ʾAmar-
ə;: Amathaus, Hamathaus), one of the families descended from Canaan, named last in the list (Gen. xiii. 18; 1 Chr. i. 16). The place of their set-

tlement was doubtless HAMATH.
HAMMOLKETH

“maul”, was used as a weapon of war. “Hammer” is used figuratively for any overwhelming power, whether worldly (Jer. i. 23), or spiritual (Jer. xxiii. 21 [comp. Heb. iv. 12]). W. L. B.

* From יָהָּן comes Maccaabaeus or Maccabee [MACCABEES, THE]. The hammer used by Jael (Judg. v. 25) was not of iron, but a wooden maul, such as the Arabs, use now for driving down their tent-pins. (See Thosson’s Land and Book, ii. 149.) In the Hebrew, it is spoken of as “the hammer,” as being the one kept for that purpose. The nail driven through Sisera’s temples was also one of the wooden tent-pins. This particularity points to a scene drawn from actual life. It is said in 1 K. vi. 7 that no sound of hammer, or axe, or any iron tool, was heard in building the Temple, because it “was built of stone made ready” at the quarry. The immense cavern under Jerusalem, where undoubtedly most of the building material of the ancient city was obtained, furnishes incidental confirmation of this statement. The heaps of chippings which lie about show that the stone was dressed on the spot. . . . There are no other quarries of any great size near the city, and in the reign of Solomon this quantity of stone, in its whole extent, was without the limits of the city.” (Barclay’s City of the Great King, p. 486, 1st ed. (1865)). See also the account of this subterranean gallery in the Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem, pp. 63, 64. H.

HAMMOLEKETH (ךונלדז), with the article = the Queen: ֹםאֹלֶךְ (Malacoth: Regine), a woman introduced in the genealogies of Manasseh, as daughter of Machir and sister of Gilead (1 Chr. vii. 17, 18), and as having among her children Abi-Ezer, from whose family sprang the great judge Gideon. The Targum translates the name by יָּוָּן = who reigned. The Jewish tradition, as preserved by Kimchi in his commentary on the passage, is that “she used to reign over a portion of the land which belonged to Gilead,” and that for that reason her lineage has been preserved.

HAMMON (ךונלדז) [hot or sunny]: [Ezek. xxvi:]: Alex. Hamun: Honoon. 1. A city in Asher (Josh. xix. 28), apparently not far from Zidon-rabbah, or “Great Zidon.” Dr. Schults suggested its identification with the modern village of Hamul, near the coast, about 10 miles below Tyre (Rob. iii. 66), but this is doubtful both in etymology and position.

2. [Xaoue: Alex. Xaoue.] A city allotted out of the tribe of Naphtali to the Levites (1 Chr. vi. 76), and answering to the somewhat similar names Hammath and Hammam-Dor in Joshua. G.

HAMMOTH-DOR (ךונלדז) [warm springs, abode]: Neemad: Alex. Eamothop: Ammoth Dor, a city of Naphtali, allotted with its suburbs to the Gershonite Levites, and for a city of refuge (Josh. xxi. 62). Unless there were two places of the same name, but a wooden maul, this city is identical with Hammath. Why the suffix Dor is added is hard to tell, unless the word refers in some way to the situation of the place on the coast, in which fact only had it (as we know) any resemblance to Dor, on the shore of the Mediterranean. In 1 Chr. vi. 76 the name is connected with Hammam. G.

HAMONAH (ךונלדז) [tumult, noise of a multitude]: Polamah: Ammon, the name of a city mentioned in a highly obscure passage of Ezekiel (xxix. 16); apparently that of the place in or near which the multitudes of Gog should be buried after their great slaughter by God, and which is to derive its name — “multitude” — from that circumstance. G.

HAMON-GOG, THE VALLEY OF (ךונלדז) = ravine of Gog’s multitude: ֶָּוָּזָזָז.
HAMUTAL, the family (חָמוּתַל) of the preceding (Num. xxvi. 21).

HAMUTAL (חָמוּתַל) = perh. kin to the

HAN[...](םתָר) [Vat. [א]מסת, [א]ס[א]ת[א]: Alex. [א]מסת, [א]ס[א]ת[א][א]] in Jer. "אמסת [א]ס[א]ת[א][א]: אמסת[א]ת[א]", daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah: one of the wives of king Josiah, and mother of the unfortunate princes Jehohaz (2 K. xxiii. 31), and Mattaniah or Zedekiah (2 K. xxiv. 18; Jer. lii. 1). In the two last passages the name is given in the original text as חָמוּתַל. Chamiel, a reading which the LXX. follow throughout.

* Curiously enough, in the first passage, but in neither of the last, the A. V. ed. 1611 reads Hamutal.

A.

HANAMEEL [properly Hanameel, in 3

SYL.] (חָנָמֵיא [properly חָנָמֵיא whose God has
given, Gesen.]: 'אַנָמֵיא ה[א][א]: Hanameel), son of Shallum, and cousin of Jeremiah. When Judah was occupied by the Chaldeans, Jerusalem be
laguered, and Jeremiah in prison, the prophet

found a field of Hanameel in token of his assur-
ance that a time was to come when land should be
once more, a secure possession (Jer. xxxii. 7, 8, 9, 12; and comp 44). The suburban fields

belonging to the tribe of Levi could not be sold (Lev. xxv. 34); but possibly Hanameel may have inherited property from his mother. Compare the case of Haranah, who also was a Levite; and the note of Groton on Acts iv. 37. Henderson (on Jer. xxxii. 7) supposes that a portion of the Levitical

estates might be sold within the tribe.

W. T. B.

HANAN (חָנָן [gracious, merciful]: 'אָנָן: Hanon). 1. One of the chief people of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chr. viii. 23).

2. The last of the six sons of Azel, a descend-

ant of Saul (1 Chr. viii. 35; ix. 44).

3. [FA. אפרוא, "Son of Manahah,' i.e. possibly a Syrain of Aram-Ma'aziah, one of the heroes of David's guard, according to the extended list of 1 Chr. iv. 43.

4. [FA. אפרוא, "Bene-Chanan [sons of C.] were among the Nehemiah who returned from Bab-
ylon with Zerubbabel (Ex. ii. 46; Neh. vii. 49). In the parallel list, 1 Esdr. v. 30, the name is given as ANAN.

5. (LXX. omits [Rom. and Alex. in Neh. x. 10 read אפרא, but Vat. and FA. omit]). One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in his public exposition of the law (Neh. viii. 7). The same person is probably mentioned in x. 10 as sealing the con-

tract, since several of the same names occur in both passages.

6. [Vat. omits.]. One of the 9 heads "of the people," that is of the haimen, who also sealed the covenant (x. 22).

7. (אפרא: [F.A. אפרא.]) Another of the chief

haimen on the same occasion (x. 26).

8. [FA. אפרא, "Son of Zazar, son of Mat-
tanias, whom Nehemiah made one of the store-

keepers of the provisions collected as tithes (Neh. xiii. 13). He was probably a haiman, in which case the four storekeepers represented the four chief classes of the people — priests, scribes, Levites, and

haimen.

9. Son of Igddalah "the man of God" (Jer. xxiv. 4). The sons of Hanan had a chamber in

the Temple. The Vat. LXX. gives the name [חָנָן יִזְיֹד אֲבָנָיו [F.A. אפרא ינוו אֲבָנָיו].

HANAN-EEL [properly Hanan, in 3 sy

L] (חָנָן-אֵל [properly חָנָן-אֵל who God has
given, Gesen.]: 'אָנָן אֵל: Hanan). 1. Of the

sons of Hanan, David's Seer, who were separated for song in the house of the Lord, and head of the 18th course of the service (1 Chr. xxv. 4, 25).

2. [FA. וּט, once וּט: Alex. 1 K. xvi. 7, 24]. A Seer who rebelled (n. c. 941) Asa, king of Judah, for his want of faith in God, which he had showed by laying off the hostility of Benhadad 1, king of Syria (2 Chr. xvi. 7). For this he was imprisoned by Asa 10). He (or another Hanan) was the father of Jehiel the Seer, who testi-

fied against Basha (1 K. xvi. 1, 7), and Jehosh-

aphat (2 Chr. xix. 2, xx. 34).

3. [FA. וּט: Alex. וּט: Alex. APRA]. One of the priests who in the cime of Ezra were con

nected with strange wives (Est. x. 20). In Edras the

name is ANANIAS.

4. [FA. APRA, FA. in i. 2, APRA]. A brother of Nehemiah, who returned n. c. 446 from Jerusalem to Susa (Neh. ii. 2); and was afterwards made governor of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (vii. 2).

5. [FA. וּט: Alex. וּט: Alex. APRA]. A priest

mentioned in Neh. xii. 36.

W. T. B.

HANANIAH (חָנָנִיאָה and חָנָנִיאָה) [yeho-

nah has given]: "Aphania; "Aphanias": Aphan-


Aphanias: "Aphanias".

1. Of the 14 sons of Heman the singer, and chief of the sixteenth out of the 24 courses or wards into which the 288 musicians of the Levites were divided by king David. The sons of Heman were especially employed to blow the horns (1 Chr. xv. 28).

2. One of the chief captains of the army of king

Uziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 11).

3. Father of Zakkiah, one of the princes in the reign of Jehoshaphat king of Judah (Jer. xxxv. 12).

4. Son of Azur, a Benjamite of Gilgal and a false prophet in the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah in the 4th year of his reign, u. c. 605, Hananiah.
Eliakim, perhaps Jeremiah saith Babylonian Chadrnazzar, in combination no doubt with the projected movements of Pharaoh-Hophra. Hananiah corroborated his prophecy by taking from off the neck of Jeremiah the yoke which he wore by Divine command (Jer. xxvii., in token of the seduction of Judaea and the neighboring countries to the Babylonian empire), and breaking it, adding, "Thus saith Jehovah, Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years." But Jeremiah was bid to go and tell Hananiah that for the wooden yokes which he had broken he should make yokes of iron, so firm was the dominion of Babylon destined to be for seventy years. The prophet Jeremiah added this rebuke and prediction of Hananiah's death, the fulfillment of which closes the history of this false prophet. "Hear now, Hananiah; Jehovah hath not sent thee; but thou makest this people to trust in a lie. Therefore thus saith Jehovah, Behold I will cast thee from off the face of the earth: this year thou shalt die, because thou hast taught rebellion against Jehovah. So Hananiah the prophet died the same year, in the seventh month" (Jer. xxviii.). The above history of Hananiah is of great interest, as throwing much light upon the Jewish politics of that eventful time, divided as parties were into the partizans of Babylon on one hand, and Egypt on the other. It also exhibits the machine of false prophecies, by which the irreligious party sought to promote their own policy, in a very distinct form. At the same time too that it explains in general the sort of political calculation on which such false prophecies were hazarded, it supplies an important clew in particular by which to judge of the date of Pharaoh-Hophra's (or Apries') accession to the Egyptian throne, and the commencement of his ineffectual effort to restore the power of Egypt (which had been prostrate since Necho's overthrow, Jer. xlv. 2) upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire. The leaning to Egypt, indicated by Hananiah's prophecy as having begun in the fourth of Zedekiah, had in the sixth of his reign issued in open defection from Nebuchadnezzar, and in the guilt of perjury, which cost Zedekiah his crown and his life, as we learn from Ez. xvii. 12-20; the date being fixed by a comparison of Ez. viii. 1 with xx. 1. The temporary success of the intrigue which is described in Jer. xxxvii. was speedily followed by the return of the Chaldeans and the destruction of the city, according to the prediction of Jeremiah. This history of Hananiah also illustrates the manner in which the false prophets hindered the mission, and obstructed the beneficent effects of the ministry, of the true prophets, and affords a remarkable example of the way in which they prophesied smooth things, and said peace when there was no peace (comp. 1 K. xxii. 11, 24, 25).

5. Grandfather of Irijah, the captain of the ward at the gate of Benjamin who arrested Jeremiah on a charge of deserting to the Chaldeans (Jer. xxxvii. 13).

6. Head of a Benjaminite house (1 Chr. vii. 24).

7. The Hebrew name of Shadrach. [SHAD-RACH.] He was of the house of David, according to Jewish tradition (Dan. i. 3, 6, 7, 11, 19; ii. 17). [ASANIAN.]

8. Son of Zerubbabel, 1 Chr. iii. 19, from whom Christ derived his descent. He is the same person who is by St. Luke called Iacovs, Joanna, and who, when Elias is discarded, appears there also as Zerubbabel's son [GENEOLOGY OF CHRIST.] The identity of the two names Hananiah and Joanna is apparent immediately we compare them in Hebrew. יהושע (Hananiah) is compounded of וגן and the Divine name, which always takes the form יג, or יג, at the end of compounded names (as in Jeremiah, Shephtiah, Nehem-iah, Azar-iah, etc.). It meant gratiosis dedit Domini. Joanna (יווה) is compounded of the Divine name, which at the beginning of compound names takes the form יג, or יג (as in Jeho-shuna, Jeho-shaphat, Jo-zadak, etc.), and the same word, יג, and means Dominus gratiosis dedit. Examples of a similar transposition of the elements of a compound name in speaking of the same individual, are יג יג, Jeconiah, and יג יג, Jeho-jachan, of the same king of Judah: Ahaz-iah and Jeho-ahaz of the same son of Jehoram; Eli-am, and Ammi-el, of the father of Bath-sheba; and Eli-asah for Asah- el, and Ishma- el, for Eli-shama, in some MSS. of Ezr. x. 15 and 2 K. xxv. 25. This identification is of great importance, as bringing St. Luke's genealogy into harmony with the Old Testament. Nothing more is known of Hananiah.

9. The two names Hananiah and Jehohanan stand side by side, Ezr. x. 28, as sons of Bela, who returned with Ezra from Babylon.

10. A priest, one of the "apostheacies" (which see) or makers of the sacred ointments and incense (Ex. xxx. 22-28, 1 Chr. ix. 30), who built a portion of the wall of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 8). He may be the same as is mentioned in ver. 30 as having repaired another portion. If so, he was son of Shelemiah; perhaps the same as is mentioned xii. 41.

11. Head of the priestly course of Jeremiah in the days of Jotakim the high-priest, Neh. xii. 12.

12. Ruler of the palace (יהויאב ילא ייחו) at Jerusalem under Nehemiah. He is described as "a faithful man, and one who feared God above many." His office seems to have been one of authority and trust, and perhaps the same as that of Eliakim, who was "over the house" in the reign of Hezekiah. [ELIAKIM.] The arrangements for guarding the gates of Jerusalem were intrusted to him with Hanani, the Tirshathah's brother. Prideaux thinks that the appointment of Hanani and Hanannah are fixed by that of the conquest of Egypt by "ram byres."
indicates that at this time Nehemiah returned to Persia, but without sufficient ground. Nehemiah seems to have been continuously at Jerusalem for some time after the completion of the wall (viii. 5, 65, viii. 9, x. 1). If, too, the term ἀναξία means, as Gesenius supposes, and as the use of it in Neh. ii. 8 makes not improbable, not the palace, but the fortress of the Temple, called by Josephus Ἄφωρις—there is still less reason to imagine Nehemiah's absence. In this case Hananiah would be a priest, perhaps of the same family as the preceding. The rendering moreover of Neh. vii. 3, 3, should probably be, "And I rejoined (or gave orders to) Hanani...and Hananiah the captains of the fortress...concerning Jerusalem, and said, Let not the gates," etc. There is no authority for rendering ἀναξία by "over"—"He gave such an one charge over Jerusalem." The passages quoted by Gesenius are not one of them to the point.

13. An Israelite, Neh. x. 23 (Hebr. 24). [AN-AXIAE.]

14. Other Hananians will be found under ANAXIAE, the Greek form of the name. A. C. H.

HANDICRAFT (τέχνη, ἀποθεώσις: are, artificium, Acts xviii. 3, xix. 25; Rev. xviii. 12). Although the extent cannot be ascertained to which those arts were carried on whose invention is ascribed to Tuba-Cain, it is probable that this was proportionate to the nomadic or settled habits of the antediluvian races. Among nomad races, as the Bedouin Arabs, or the tribes of Northern and Central Asia and of America, the wants of life, as well as the arts which supply them, are few; and it is only among the city-dwellers that both of them are multiplied and made progress. This subject cannot, of course, be followed out here; in the present article brief notices can only be given of such handicraft trades as are mentioned in Scripture.

1. The preparation of iron for use either in war, in agriculture, or for domestic purposes, was doubtless one of the earliest applications of labor: and, together with iron, working in brass, or rather copper alloyed with tin, bronze (Ἀργυρόκοντος, xρυσίατης: argentarius, aurifex) must have found employment both among the Hebrews and the neighboring nations in very early times, as appears from the oraments sent by Abraham to Hezekiah (Gen. xxv. 22, 54, xxxiv. 4, xxxviii. 18; Deut. vii. 25). But whatever skill the Hebrews possessed, it is quite clear that they must have learned much from Egypt and its "iron furnaces," both in metal work and in the arts of setting and polishing precious stones; arts which were turned to account both in the construction of the Tabernacle and the making of the priests' ornaments, and also in the casting of the golden calf as well as its destruction by Moses, probably, as suggested by Gognet, by a method which he had learnt in Egypt (Gen. xii. 42; Ex. iii. 22, xvi. 35, xxxiv. 4, 5, xxxvi. 2, 4, 29, 24, xxxvii. 17, 24, xxxviii. 4, 8, 24, 25, xxxix. 6, 39; Neh. iii. 8; Is. xiv. 12). Various processes of the goldsmiths' work (No. 1) are illustrated by Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. ii. 130, 152, 162).

After the conquest frequent notices are found both of moulded and wrought metal, including soldering, which last had long been known in Egypt; but the Phoenicians appear to have possessed greater skill than the Jews in these arts, at least in Solomon's time (Judg. viii. 21, 27, xvii. 4; I K. vii. 13, 46, 46; Is. xii. 7; Wisd. xv. 4).

Egyptian Blow-pipe, and small fire-place with checks to confine and reflect the heat. (Wilkinson.)

Ezech. xxxvii. 28; Isa. vi. 50, 55, 57 [or Espan. of Jer. vi. 50, 55, 57?]; Wilkinson, ii. 162. [ZAKRAPHI.] Even in the desert, mention is made of heating gold into plates, cutting it into wire and...
HANDICRAFT

Among the tools of the smith are mentioned —
tongs (αλάτλας, forceps, Ges. p. 761),
hammer (σφυράς, malleus, Ges. p. 1101),
avvil (μαλλη, Ges. p. 1118),
bellow (φοσφηρός, sufflatorium, Ges. p. 866; Is.

In N. T. Alexander "the coppersmith" (6 καλαντές) of Ephesus is mentioned, where also was carried on that trade in "silver shrines" (καπάλια), which was represented by Demetrius the silversmith (ἀργυροποιός) as being in danger from the spread of Christianity (Acts xix. 24, 28; 2 Tim. iv. 14). [See also Smith.]

2. The work of the carpenter (δέκτος, τέκτων, artifex lignarius) is often mentioned in
HANDICRAFT

Scripture (e. g. Gen. vi. 14; Ex. xxxvii.; Is. xli. 13). In the palace built by David for himself the workmen employed were chiefly Phoenicians sent by Hiram (2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Chr. xiv. 1), as most of the rebuilding under Zerubbabel, no mention is made of foreign workmen, though in the latter case the timber is expressly said to have been brought by sea to Joppa by Zedekiah (2 K. xii. 11; 2 Chr. xxiv. 12; Ezra iii. 7). That the Jewish carpenters must have been able to carve with some skill is evident from Is. xli. 7, xlv. 13, in which last passage some of the implements used in the trade are mentioned: the ruler (ῥυτήρ, μέτρον, norma, possibly a chalk pencil, Ges. p. 1337), measuring-line (μέτρον, Ges. p. 1201), compass (ῥυτήριον, παραγγαφίς, circinum, Ges. p. 450), plane, or smoothing instrument (ῥυτήριον· κάλα, rasumis, Ges. pp. 1228, 1338), axe (ῥυτήριον, Ges. p. 302, or βραχήν, Ges. p. 1236, διχων, securis).

The process of the work, and the tools used by Egyptian carpenters, and also cooperers and wheelwrights, are displayed in Egyptian monuments and reliefs: the former, including dovetailing, veneering, drilling, gluing, varnishing, and inlaying, may be seen in Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. ii. 111-119. Of the latter many specimens, including saws, hatchets, knives, awls, nails, a hone, and a drill, also turned objects in bone, exist in the British Museum, 1st Egyptian room, case 42-43, Nos. 6046-6188. See also Wilkinson, ii. p. 113, fig. 385.

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

Tools of an Egyptian Carpenter. (Wilkinson.)

Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4. Chisels and drills. Fig. 9. Horn of oil.
5. Part of drill. 10. Shovel.

probably were those, or at least the principal of those who were employed by Solomon in his works (1 K. v. 6). But in the repairs of the Temple, executed under Joash king of Judah, and also in

Veneering and the use of glue. (Wilkinson.)

a, a piece of dark wood applied to one of ordinary quality; b, a, a ruler; c, a box, similar to those used by our carpenters; d, a bone; e, a piece of glue. Fig. 2 is grinding something.

3. The masons (הַבְלָה), wall-lauhlers, Ges. p. 299, employed by David and Solomon, at least the chief of them, were Phoenicians, as is implied also in the word בְּלֵה, men of Gebal, Jebail, Ryb. (Ges. p. 258; 1 K. v. 18; Ez. xxvii. 9; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 179). Among their imple-
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Handicraft

1. Masons. (Wilkinson.)

Part 1. levelling, and Part 2 squaring a stone.

2. Carpenters. (Wilkinson.)

r, drills a hole in the seat of a chair. s, t, r, legs of chair. u, u, adzes. v, a square. w, man planing or polishing the leg of a chair.

Handicraft

pered mortar " of Ezekiel (xliv. 10) was perhaps a sort of cold-wall of mud or clay without lime (בָּנָי, Ges. p. 1516) which would give way under heavy rain. The use of white-wash on tombs is remarked by our Lord (Matt. xxiii. 27. See also Mishna Monas Sheni, v. 1). Houses infected with leprosy were required by the Law to be re-plastered (Lev. xiv. 40-45).

4. Akin to the craft of the carpenter is that of ship and boat-building, which must have been exercised to some extent for the fishing-vessels on the lake of Gennesaret (Matt. viii. 23, ix. 1; John xxi. 3, 8). Solomon built, at Ezion-Geber, ships for his foreign trade, which were manned by Phoenician crews, an experiment which Je-hoshaphat endeavored in vain to renew (1 K. ix. 26, 27, xxi. 18; 2 Chr. xx. 36, 37).

5. The perfumes used in the religious services, and in later times in the funeral rites of monarchs, imply knowledge and practice in the art of the " apothecaries " (μυροφόροι, pigmentarii), who appear to have formed a guild or association (Ex. xxx. 25; Neh. iii. 8; 2 Chr. xvi. 14; Eccles. vii. 1, x. 1; Ecclus xxxvi. 8).

6. The arts of spinning and weaving both wool and linen were carried on in early times, as they are still usually among the Bedouins, by women. The women spun and wove goat's hair and flax for the Tabernacle, as in later times their skill was employed in like manner for idolatrous purposes. One of the excellences attributed to the good house-wife is her skill and industry in these arts (Ex. xxxv. 25, 26; Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 11; 2 K. xxiii. 7; Ex. xvi. 16; Prov. xxxi. 13, 24; Burschardt, Notes on Ezek. i. 65; comp. Hom. ii. 123; Or. i. 356, ii. 104). The loom, with its beam (υλήμα, μισάντιον, licentiorum, 1 Sam. xvii. 7; Ges. p. 883), pin (γυρος, πάσαλας, clavus, Judg. xvi. 14; Ges. p. 643), and shuttle (Σφεν, δηνεῦτα, Joh. vii. 6; Ges. p. 146) was, perhaps, introduced later, but as early as David's time (1 Sam. xvii. 7), and worked by men, as was the case in Egypt, contrary to the practice of other nations. This trade also appears to have been
HANDKERCHIEF

practiced hereditarily (1 Chr. iv. 21; Herod. ii. 35; Soph. [Ed. Cod. 339]).

Together with weaving we read also of embroidery, in which gold and silver threads were interwoven with the body of the stuff, sometimes in figure patterns, or with precious stones set in the needlework (Ex. xxxvi. 1, xxviii. 4, xxxix. 6-13).

7. Besides these arts, those of dyeing and of dressing cloth were practiced in Palestine, and those also of tanning and dressing leather (Josh. ii. 15-18; 2 K. i. 8; Matt. iii. 4; Acts ix. 43; Mish. Megill. iii. 2). Shoe-makers, barbers, and tailors are mentioned in the Mishnah (Pesach. iv. 6): the barber (כַּאוֹרָא, Ges. p. 283), or his occupation, by Ezekiel (v. 1; Lev. xxxv. 8; Num. vii. 5); Josephus, Ant. xvi. 17, § 5; B. J. i. 27, § 5; Mish. Shabb. i. 2), and the tailor (l. 3), plasterers, glaziers, and glass vessels, painters, and goldworkers are mentioned in Mishnah. (Chel. viii. xxxix. 3, 4, xxx. 1).

Tent-makers (ץבַּוַּנְיוּא) are noticed in the Acts (xviii. 3), and frequent allusion is made to the trade of the potters.

8. Bakers (כִּבָּשָה, Ges. p. 138) are noticed in Scripture as carrying on their trade (Jer. xxxvii. 21; Hos. vii. 4; Mish. Chel. xvii. 2); and the well-known valley Tyropoion probably derived its name from the commerce in its inhabitants (Joseph. B. J. v. 4, 1). Butchers, not Jewish, are spoken of in I Cor. x. 25.

Trade in all its branches was much developed after the Captivity; and for a father to teach his son a trade was reckoned not only honorable but indispensable (Pirke Pirkei Ab. ii. 2; Kebuthah. iv. 14). Some trades, however, were regarded as less honorable (Jahn, Bibl. Art. § 84). Some, if not all trades, had special localities, as was the case formerly in Europe, and is now in Eastern cities (Jer. xxviii. 31; 1 Cor. x. 25; Joseph. B. J. v. 4, § 1, and 8, § 1; Mish. Beor. v. 1; Russell, Aleppo, i. 20; Chardin, Voyages, vii. 274, 394; Lane, Mod. Egypt. ii. 115).

One feature, distinguishing Jewish from other workmen, deserves peculiar notice, namely, that they were not slaves, nor were their trades necessarily hereditary, as was and is so often the case among other, especially heathen nations (Jahn, Bibl. Ant. c. v. § 81-84; Saalschütz, Hebr. Arch. 14. c. v; Winer, s. v. Handkercke). [MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS; POTTERY; GLASS; LEATHER.]

H. W. P. HANDEKERCHIEF, NAPKIN, APRON.

The two former of these terms, as used in the A. V. = σουδάρων, the latter = συμφίλοι: they are classed together, inasmuch as they refer to objects of a very similar character. Both words are of Latin origin: σουδάρων = sudarium from subdāre = to wear; "the Lutherian translation preserves the reference to its etymology in its rendering, schweisschut; συμφίλοι = semicinctum, i. e. "a half girdle." Neither is much used by classical writers; the sudarium is referred to as used for wiping the face ("candido frontem sudario tergeter," Quintil. vi. 3), or hands ("sudario manus tergens, "and in collo habeant," Petron. in fraga. Tragyr. c. 57); and also as worn over, the face for the purpose of concealment (Stenton. in Neros, c. 48): the word was introduced by the Romans into Palestine, where it was adopted by the Jews, in the form סְדָרָה as = סָדָרָה, in Ruth iii. 15. The sudarium is noticed in the N. T. as a wrapper to fold up money (Luke xix. 20) — as a cloth bound about the head of a corpse (John xi. 44, xx. 7), being probably brought from the crown of the head under the chin — and lastly as an article of dress that could be easily removed (Acts xix. 12), probably a handkerchief worn on the head like the kuffiyeh of the Bedouins.

The semicinctum is noticed by Martial xiv. Epigr. 153, and by Petron. in Satyr. c. 94. The distinction between the cinctus and the semicinctum consisted in its width (Isidor. Orig. xix. 33): with regard to the character of the συμφίλοι, the only inference from the passage in which it occurs (Acts xix. 12) is that it was easily removed from the person, and probably was worn next to the skin. According to Suidas the distinction between the sudarium and the semicinctum was very small, for he explains the latter by the former, συμφίλοι τάσσατον ἵνα συμφίλοι, the φασίδιον being a species of head-dress: Hesychius likewise explains συμφίλοι by φασίδιον. According to the scholiast in (Cod. Steph.), as quoted by Scheusner (Lex. s. v. σουδάρων), the distinction between the two terms is that the sudarium was worn on the head, and the semicinctum used as a handkerchief. The difference was probably not in the shape, but in the use of the article; we may conceive them to have been bands of linen of greater or less size, which might be adapted to many purposes, like the article now called lungi among the Arabs, which is applied sometimes as a girdle, at other times as a turban (Wellsted, Travels, i. 321).

*HAND-MAID. [CONCUBINE; SLAVE.]*

*HAND-MILL. [MILL.*

*HAND-STAVE. [STAFF.]*

HANES (חָנֵן): Hanes, a place in Egypt only mentioned in Is. xxx. 4: "For his princes were at Zoan, and his messengers came to Hanes." The LXX. has "Ὅτι ἐπὶ γῆν τὰς ἄρχουσας ἀνθρώπων, evidently following an entirely different reading. Hanes has been supposed by Vitringa, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and Gesenius, to be the same as Heracleopolis Magna in the Heptanis, Cop. [ΕΚΘ΢ΕΚ, ΙΟΣΕΪ, ΣΙΝΗ.]

This identification depends wholly upon the similarity of the two names: a consideration of the sense of the passage in which Hanes occurs shows its great improbability. The prophecy is a reproof of the Jews for trusting in Egypt: and according to the Masoretic text, mention is made of an embassy, perhaps from Hoshea, or else from Ahaz, or possibly Hezekiah, to a Pharaoh. As the king whose assistance is asked is called Pharaoh, he is probably not an Ethiopian of the XXVIIth dynasty, for the kings of that line are mentioned by name — So, Tirhakah — but a sovereign of the XXIId dynasty, which, according to Manetho, was of Tanite kings. It is supposed that the last king of the latter dynasty, Manetho’s Zet, is the Sethos of Herodotus, the king in whose time Semachib’s army perished, and who appears to have been mentioned under the title of Pharaoh by Rabshakeh (Is. xxxvi. 6; 2 K. xviii. 21), though it is just possible that Tirhakah may have been intended if the reference be to an embassy to Zet, Zoan was probably his capital, and in any case then the most important city of the eastern part of Lower Egypt; Hanes was most probably in its neighborhood; and
HANGING

we are disposed to think that the Chald. Paraphr.
right in identifying it with בִּיתָן, or בְּיתָן, once written, if the Kethibh be cor-
rect, in the form בִּיתָן. Daphane, a fortified
town on the eastern frontier. [TEMPLES.]

Gesenius remarks, as a kind of apology for the
identification of Hanes with Heracleopolis Magna,
that it was latterly suggested, on strong grounds, by
Sir Gardner Wilkinson, that this is a mistake in
the case of the IXth dynasty for Hermontiades
(Heroed. ed. Rawlinson, vol. ii. p. 348). If this
supposition be correct as to the IXth dynasty, it
must also be so as to the Xth; but the circum-
stance whether Heracleopolis was a royal city or
not, a thousand years before Isaiah's time, is obvi-
osely of no consequence here.

B. S. P.

* HANGING. [PUNISHMENT.]

HANGING: HANGINGS. These terms
represent both different words in the original, and
different articles in the furniture of the Temple.

1. The "hanging" ָּוַי תֹּנְיוֹת: תֹּנְיוֹת (torium) was a curtain or "covering," (as the
word radially means) to close an entrance; one was placed
before the door of the Tabernacle (Ex. xxvi. 36,
37, xxxix. 28); it was made of variegated stuff
wrought with needlework, and was hung on five
pillars of acacia wood; another was placed before the
entrance of the court (Ex. xxvii. 16, xxxviii.
18; Num. iv. 26); the term is also applied to the
vail that concealed the Holy of Holies, in the full
expression "vail of the covering" (Ex. xxvii. 12,
xxxix. 34, xl. 21; Num. iv. 5). [CURTAINS.
2. The "hangings" ([ֵבָּיִת תֹּנְיוֹת: תֹּנְיוֹת] were used for covering the walls of the court of
the Tabernacle, just as tapestry was in modern times
(Ex. xxvii. 9, xxviii. 17, xxxviii. 9; Num. iii. 26, iv.
26). The rendering in the LXX. implies that they
were made of the same substance as the sails of a
ship, i.e. (as explained by Rash.) "meshy, not
woven." This opinion is, however, incorrect, as the
material of which they were constructed was "five
twined linen." The hangings were carried only
five cubits high, or half the height of the walls of
the court (Ex. xxvii. 18; comp. xxvi. 16). [TA-
BERNACLE.

In 2 K. xxiii. 7, the term בְּיִתָן, מִיִּתָן, strictly "houses," A. V. "hangings," is probably
intended to describe tents used as portable sanctu-
aries.

W. L. B.

HANIEL (חניאֵל, i. e. Channiel [grace of
God]: הָנָּיָּל [Vat. מְרֵי]: Hannah), one of the
sons of Ulia, a chief prince, and a choice hero in
the tribe of Asher (1 Chr. vii. 39). [HANIEL.

HANNAH (חנָּה, grace, or prayer: "Appa:
Anna"), one of the wives of Elkanah, and mother
of Samuel (1 Sam. i. ii.): a prophetess of con-
ciderable repute, though her claim to that title is based
upon one production only, namely, the hymn of
hanksgiving for the birth of her son. This hymn
is in the highest order of prophetic poetry; its re-
semblance to that of the Virgin Mary (comp. 1
Sam. ii. 1-10 with Luke i. 66-80; see also Ps.
42: 11), has been noticed by the commentators; and
it is specially remarkable as containing the first
designation of the Messiah under that name. In
the Targum it has been subjected to a process of
magnificuous dilution, for which it would be dif-
ficult to find a parallel even in the pompous vagaries
of that paraphrase (Eichhorn, Einl. ii. p. 68).

[SAMUEL.] T. E. B.

HANNAH (חנָּה, grace, or gra-

dially disposed) to: אמא: bare: Hannah:
athon), one of the cities of Zebulun, a point ap-
parently on the northern boundary (Josh. xiv. 19).
It has not yet been identified.

HANIEL (חניאֵל, "Appa: Hannah," son of Phed; as prince (Nasi) of Manasses he
assisted in the division of the Promised Land
(Num. xxxvii. 23). The name is the same as
HANIEL.

HANOCH (חנוכ, [see on ENOCH]: "Heph:
Hanoch). 1. The third in the children of Midian,
and therefore descended from Abraham
by Keturah (Gen. xxv. 4). In the parallel list of
1 Chr. i. 33, the name is given in the A. V. as
HANOCH.

2. [Hanoch]: "Heph: Hanoch," eldest son
of Reuben (Gen. xvi. 9; Ex. vi. 14; Num. xxxvi.
5; 1 Chr. v. 3), and founder of the family of
HANOCHITES, THE (חנוכית, [see on
HANOCH]: "Heph: Hanochites")
families Hanochitan), Num. xxxvi.
3. The Hebrew of Hanoch is the same as that of
Enoch, and belongs to two other persons [ENOCH].

There is no good reason for this tautological

HANUN (חנוע, [gracious]: אמא, [Avi-
, etc.: Haamon]). 1. Son of Nahash (2 Sam. x. 1,
2; 1 Chr. xix. 1, 2), king of Amnon about n. c.
1057, who dishonored the ambassadors of David
(2 Sam. x. 4), and involved the Ammonites in
a disastrous war (2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chr. x. 6).

W. T. B.

2. [Aviwh: Haamon.]: A man who, with
the people of Zemah, repaired the ravine-gate in
the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 13).

3. [Aviwh: ָּיָּב: Haamon]: A man specified as the "6th son of
Zedak," who also assisted in the repair of the
wall, apparently on the east side (Neh. iii. 50).

HAPHARAIM, so A. V. ed. 1611, and
other early editions, also the Bishops' Bible; in
many later editions, less correctly,

HAPHRAM (ח_district of
הָפְרָה, i. e. Chapharaim:
"Pharach:" [Vat. אייר:]: Alex. אפרים: Hapha-
rain), a city of Issachar, mentioned next to Shunem
(Josh. xix. 19). The name possibly signifies "two
pits." In the Onomasticon ("Aphrach") it is spoken as still known under the name of Afirca
(Ena: אפריך), and as standing six miles north of
Legias. About that distance northeast of Legias,
and two miles west of Sedom (the ancient Shunem),
stands the village of el-Åfuleh (אלף), which
may be the representative of Chapharaim, the gnat-
arch Ath having taken the place of the Hebrew
Cheth.

HAYA (חָיָה [mountain-lion, Gen.]: "Ara"
which appears only in 1 Chr. v. 26, and even there
and
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Carrhar, which we know from Strabo and Ptolemy to have been the appellation by which Haran was known to the Greeks. We may assume then the author of Chronicles to mean, that a portion of the Israelites carried off by Pyl and Tiglath-Pilser were settled in Harron on the Belik, while the greater number were conveyed to the Chaldean.

(Compare 1 Chr. v. 29 with 2 K. xii. 11 and xix. 12; and see articles on "Haran and Haran.")

G. R.

HARADAH (ḥārādāḥ), with the article [the trembling]: Xapādāḥ: Arama'i, a desert station of the Israelites, Num. xxxiii. 24, 25; its position is uncertain.

H. H.

HARAN. 1. (ḥārān) [a strong one, First: prob. montanus, mountainer, Gesen.]: Apārā: Jos. [Apārā: Aram]. The third son of Terah, and therefore youngest brother of Abram (Gen. xi. 31). Three children were born to Lot (27, 31), and two daughters, namely, Milcah, who married her uncle Nahor (29), and Iscah (29), of whom we merely possess her name, though in some (e. g. Josephus) she is held to be identical with Sarah. Haran was born in Ur of the Chaldees, and he died there while his father was still living (29). His sepulchre was still shown there when Josephus wrote his history (Ant. i. 6, § 5). The ancient Jewish tradition is that Haran was buried in the furnace of Nimrod for his waves' conduct during the fiery trial of Abraham. (See the Targum Ps. Jonathon; Jerome's Quest. in Genesis, and the notes thereto in the edit. of Migne.)

This tradition seems to have originated in a translation of the word Ur, which in Hebrew signifies "fire." It will be observed that although this name and that of the country appear the same in the A. V., there is in the original a certain difference between them: the latter commencing with the harsh guttural Cheth.

2. (Avāx: Alex. Apār: Arama') A Gershonite Levite in the time of David, one of the family of Shimel (1 Chr. xxiii. 9).

G.

HARAN (ḥārān), i. e. Charran: Apādā: [Vat.] Alex. Apār: Harron, a son of the great Caleb by his concubine Ephaal (1 Chr. ii. 40). He himself had a son named Gazez.

HARAN (ḥārān) [scorned, abrid, Gesen.; a noble, freeman, First: Xapārā: Strab., Ptol. Kaqārā: Harron], is the name of the place whither Abraham migrated with his family from Ur of the Chaldees, and where the descendants of his brother Nahor established themselves. Haran is therefore called "the city of Nahor" (comp. Gen. xxxiv. 10 with xxvii. 43). It is said to be in Mesopotamia (Gen. xxiv. 10), or more definitely, in Padan-Aram (xxv. 20), which is the "cultivated district at the foot of the hills" (Stanley's S. F. P., p. 129 note), a name well applying to the beautiful stretch of country which lies below Mount Masina between the Khbouar and the Euphrates. [PADAN-ARAM.] Here, about midway in this district, is a town still called Harrain, which really seems never to have changed its appellation, and beyond any reasonable doubt is the Haran or Charran of Scripture (Bochart's Phileg., i. 14; Ewald's Geschichte, i. 384). It is remarkable that the people of Harrain retained to a late time the Chaldean language and the worship of Chaldean deities (Assenam. Bild. Or. i. 327; Chwolson's Studier und der Theismus, ii. 39). Harrain lies upon the Belik (ancient Blackicks), a small affluent of the Euphrates, which falls into it nearly in long. 39°. It was famous among the Romans for being near the scene of the defeat of Crassus (Plin. H. N. v. 24). Also in the time of the Christian era it appears to have been included in the kingdom of Edessa (Mos. Chor. ii. 32), which was ruled by Agbars. Afterwards it passed with that kingdom under the dominion of the Romans, and appears as a Roman city in the wars of Caracalla (Mos. Chor. ii. 72) and Julian (Jo. Malal. p. 329). It is now a small village inhabited by a few families of Arabs.

In the A. V. of the New Test. the name follows the Greek form, and is given as Charran (Acts vii. 2, 4).

G. R.

* A controversy has recently sprung up respecting the situation of the patriarchal Haran which requires notice here. Within a few years a little village known as Harrin-el-J تنو is been discovered, about four hours east of Damascus, on the borders of the lake into which the Barada (Alans) flows. Dr. Beke (Origines Biblic., Lond. 1834) had thrown out the idea that the Scripture Haran was not, as generally supposed, in Mesopotamia, but must have been near Damascus. He now maintains that this Harrin, so unexpectedly brought to light between "Alana and Pharpars, rivers of Damascus," must be the identical Haran (or Charran) of the Bible in Aram-naharam, i.e. Aram of the two rivers. In 1801 Dr. Beke made a journey to Palestine, with special reference to this question. The argument on which he mainly relies is the fact that Laban, in his pursuit of Jacob, appears to have travelled from Haran to Gilead on the east of the Jordan in 7 days (Gen. xxxi. 23), whereas the actual distance of Haran from Gilead is about 300 geographical miles, and would make in that country an ordinary journey of 15 or 20 days. An Arab tribe on its ordinary migrations moves from 12 to 15 miles a day, and a caravan from 20 to 23 miles a day. On the other hand, it is not a little remarkable that Dr. Beke himself went over the ground, step by step, between Harrin-el-J تنو and Gilead, and found the time to be five days, hence very nearly the time that Laban was on the way before he overtook Jacob in Gilead.

It must be owned that this rapidity of Laban's pursuit of Jacob from Haran is not a slight difficulty. For its removal we can only resort to certain suppositions in the case, which of course we are at liberty to make if the Scripture text does not exclude them, and if they are justified by the known customs of the country and the age.

First, we may assume that Laban, taking with him only some of his sons or other near kinsmen ("his brothers," see Gen. xxxi. 23), was uninumbered with baggage or women and children, and hence moved with all the despatch of which eastern travelling admits. One party was fleeing and the other pursuing. The chase was a close one, as is the language used. Jacob complains that Laban had "followed hotly" after him. The swift dromedaries would be brought into requisition if the ordinary camels were not swift enough. The speed of these animals is such, says
Sir Henry Rawlinson (who has seen so much of the East), that they "consume but 8 days in crossing the desert from Damascus to Bagdad, a distance of nearly 500 miles." He thinks it unquestionable that Laban could have "traversed the entire distance from Haran to Gil'eal in 7 days" (Athen. Soc., April 19, 1862). For examples of the capacity of such canals for making long and rapid journeys, see the Penny Cyclopaedia, vi. 191.

Secondly, the expression (which is entirely correct for the Hebrew) that Laban's journey before coming up with Jacob was a "seven days' journey," is indefinite, and may include 8 or 9 days as well as 7. "Seven," as Gesenius states, "is a round number, and stands in the Hebrew for any number less than 10." A week's time, in this wider sense, would bring the distance still more easily within an expeditious traveller's reach.

But whatever may be thought of the possibility of Laban's making such a journey in such time, the difficulty in the case of Jacob would seem to be still greater; since, accompanied as he was with flocks and herds and women and children, he must have travelled much more slowly. To this it may be replied that the narrative does not restrict us to the three days which passed before Laban became aware of Jacob's departure added to the seven days which passed before he overtook Jacob in Gil'eal. It is very possible that Laban, on hearing so suddenly that Jacob had fled, was not in a situation to follow at once, but had preparations to make which would consume three or four days more; so as in reality to give Jacob the advantage of five or six days before he finally started in pursuit. It is altogether probable too that the wary Jacob adopted measures before setting out which would greatly accelerate his flight. (See Gen. xxxvi. 20.) Mr. Porter, who is so familiar with Eastern life, has drawn out this suggestion in a form that appears not unreasonable. Jacob could quietly move his flocks down to the banks of the Euphrates and send them across the river, without exciting suspicion; since then, as now, the flocks of the great proprietors roamed over a wide region (Gen. xxxvi. 1-3). In like manner before starting himself he could have sent his wives and children across the river, and hurried them forward with all the despatch which at this day characterizes an Arab tribe fleeing before an enemy (vers. 17, 18). All this might take place before Laban was aware of Jacob's purpose; and they were then at least 3 days' distance from each other (vers. 19-22). The intervening distance between the Euphrates and Gil'eal, a distance of 250 miles, is a vast plain, with only one ridge of hills: and thus Jacob "could march forward straight as an arrow." If, as supposed, his route lay entirely to the north, he already could travel for the first two or three days at a very rapid pace. "Now, I maintain" (says this writer), "that any of the tribes of the desert would at this moment, under similar circumstances, accomplish the distance in 10 days, which is the shortest period we can, according to the Scripture account, assign to the journey (vers. 22, 23). We must not judge of the capabilities of Arabia at present, and according to our Western ideas and experience." (See Athen. Soc., May 24, 1862.)

Dr. Beke's other incidental confirmations of his theory are less important. It is urged that unless Abraham was living near Damascus, he could not have had a servant in his household who was called "Eliezer of Damascus" (Gen. xv. 2). The answer to this is that the servant himself may possibly have been born there and have wandered to the further East before Abraham's migration; or more probably, may have sprung from a family that belonged originally to Damascus. Mr. Porter says "I knew well in Damascus two men, one called Ibrahim el-Halify, 'Abraham of Aleppo'; and the other Elias el-Akkawy, 'Elias of Akka,' neither of whom had ever been in the town whose name he bore. Their ancestors had come from those towns: and that is all such expressions usually signify in the East" (Athen. Soc., December 7, 1861.)

The coincidence of the name proves nothing as to the identification in question. The name (if it be Arabic) means 'erald,' 'sclorch,' and refers no doubt to the Syrian Havis as being on the immediate confines of the desert. The affix Aro'naed, "columns," comes from five Ionic pillars, forty feet high, which appear among the mud-houses of the village. (See Porter's Biblical, of Syria, and Pal., ii. 457.)

Again, the inference from Acts vii. 2, that Stephen opposes Charan to Mesopotamia in such a way as to imply that Charan lay outside the latter, is unnecessary, to say the least; for he may mean equally as well that Abraham was called twice in Mesopotamia, i.e. not only in the part of that province where Charan was known to be, but still earlier in the more northern part of it known as the land of the Chaldees, the original home and seat of the Abrahamian race. Not only so, but the latter must be Stephen's meaning, unless he differed from the Jews of his time, since both Philo (de Abl. ii. pp. 11, 14, ed. Mang.) and Josephus (Ant. i. 7, § 1) relate that Abraham was called thus twice in the land of his nativity and kindness, and in this view they follow the manifest implication of the O. T., as we see from Gen. xv. 7 and Neh. ix. 7 (comp. Gen. xii. 1-4).

Dr. Beke found "flocks of sheep, and maidens drawing water," at Havis-el-Aro'naed, and felt that he saw the Scripture scene of Jacob's arrival, and of the presence of Rachel with "her father's sheep which she kept," reenacted before his eyes. But that is an occurrence so common in eastern villages at the present day, especially along the skirts of the desert, that it can hardly be said to distinguish one place from another.

But the reasons for the traditional opinion entirely outweigh those against it. (1.) The city of Nahor or Haran (Gen. xxiv. 10) is certainly in Aram-naharaim, i.e. "Syria of the two rivers" (in the A. V. "Mesopotamia"). This expression occurs also in Dent. xxii. 4 and Judg. iii. 8, and implies a historic notoriety which answers perfectly to the character of the Euphrates and Tigris, but not to rivers of such limited local importance as the Alanna and Charpur, streams of Damascus. (2.) Aram-Damascus (the "Syria Damascus" of Pliny) is the appellation of Southern Syria (see 2 Sam. vii. 6 and Is. vii. 8), and is a different region from Aram-naharaim where Haran was. (3.) Jacob in going to Haran went to "the land of the people of the East," not to "hills of Aram-damascus," but to a region that is as different from Damascus, as one almost north of Palestine, but is so to that beyond the Euphrates. In accordance with this, Balaam, who came from Aram-naharaim, speaks of himself as having been brought "out of the mountains of the East" (Dent. xxiii. 5; Num. xxiii. 7). (4.) The river which Jacob crossed in his flight from
HARE (HA'RARITE, perhaps = the mountainer, Ges. Thes. p. 392: de Arvii, or Orori, Arorites), the designation of three men connected with David's guard.

1. ( הלֵל גֶּשֶׁם, [de Arvii]: "Agee, a Hararite" (there is no artile here in the Hebrew), father of Shammah, the third of the three chiefs of the heroes (2 Sam. xxiii. 11). In the parallel passage, 1 Chr. xi., the name of this warrior is entirely omitted.

2. (הֲשָׂמַמָּה הַרָּאָרֵית, [Vat. Alex. e'hi: de Orori]): "Shammam the Hararite" is named as one of the thirty in 2 Sam. xxii. 33. In 1 Chr. xi. 34 [Araupi; Vat. 1. Araphe, 2. m. Arapi: Arorites] the name is altered to Shaze. Kennicott's conclusion, from a minute investigation, is that the passage is a mere repetition of the same in the Hebrew, as the word "Shammam" should stand in both, "Jonathan son of Shammah the Hararite," whereas Shammam being identical with Shimea, David's brother.

3. (חָזָבּרָפִּים), [Vat. - e're, - rei: Arorites, Arorites.] "Shakar (2 Sam. xxiii. 33) or Sacar (1 Chr. xi. 35) the Hararite" was the father of Abiam, another member of the correct name. Kennicott inclines to take Sacar as the correct name.

HARBO'NA (שָׂרָבָא) [prob. Pers. asdriver, Ges.]: [Arap. Alex. Oaproywa]: [Comp. Xapbawit: Harbavwz], the third of the seven chamberlains, or eunuchs, who served king Ahasuerus (Esth. i. 10), and who suggested Haman's being hung on his own gallows (vii. 9). In the latter passage the name is "HARBO'NAH (שָׂרָבָא) [see above]:

Bouraybâ: [FA. Bouraya: Comp. Xapbawit: Harbavwz]. [Written thus in Esth. vii. 9, but the same name as the foregoing. — H.]

HARE (חָזַר, arnebeth = Sârânuw: lepus) occurs only in Lev. vi. 6 and Deut. xiv. 7, amongst the animals disallowed as food by the Mosaic law. There is no doubt at all that arnebeth denotes a "hare," and in all probability the species Lepus Sârânuw, which Ehrenberg and Hemprich (Symb Phys.) mention as occurring in the valleys of Arabia Petraea and Mount Sinai, and L. Sârânuw, which the same authors state is found in the Lebanon, are those which were best known to the ancient Hebrews; though there are other kinds of Leporidae, as the L. Egyptianus and the L. Aethiopicus, if a distinct species from L. Sârânuw, which are found in the Bide lands. The hare is at this day called arneb (בַּר) by the Arabs in Palestine and Syria (see Russell's Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, ii. 104, 105); and the Sârânuw, i. e. "rough foot," is identical with λαγός, and is the term which Aristotle generally applies to the hare: indeed, he only uses the latter word once in his History of Animals (viii. 27, § 4). We are of opinion, as we have elsewhere stated (Con ey), that the rabbit (L. conicus) was unknown to the ancient Hebrews, at any rate in its wild state; nor does it appear to be at present known in Syria or Palestine as a native. It is doubtful whether Aristotle was acquainted with the rabbit, as he never alludes to any burrowing λαγός or δασινώς; but, on the other hand, see the passage in vi. 28, § 3, where the young of the δασινώς are said to be "horn blind," which will apply to the rabbit alone. Pliny (N. H. viii. 53), expressly notices rabbits (cuniculi), which occur in such numbers in the Balearic Islands as to destroy the harvests. He also notes the
practice of ferreting these animals, and thus driving them out of their burrows. In confirmation of Pliny's remarks, we may observe that there is a small island of the Balearic group called Cenceira, i.e., in Spanish a "rabitat-waren," which at this day is abundantly stocked with these animals. The hare was erroneously thought by the ancient Jews to have chewed the cud, who were no doubt misled, as in the case of the shaphim (Hyrax), by the habit these animals have of moving the jaw about.

"Hares are so plentiful in the environs of Aleppo," says Dr. Russell (p. 158), "that it was no uncommon thing to see the gentlemen who went out a sporting twice a week return with four or five brace hung in triumph at the girths of the servants' horses." The Turks and the natives, he adds, do not eat the hare; but the Arabs, who have a peculiar mode of dressing it, are fond of its flesh. Hares are hunted in Syria with greyhound and falcon.

W. H.

HAREL (with the def. art. מַעֲרֵה: τὸ ἁρέλ: Αρέλ). In the margin of Ez. xiii. 15, the word rendered "altar" in the text is given "Harel, i.e. the mountain of God." The LXX., Vulg., and Arab. evidently regarded it as the same with "Ariel" in the same verse. Our translators followed the Targum of Jonathan in translating it "altar." Junius explains it of the Ἱσσράης or hearth of the altar of burnt offering, covered by the network on which the sacrifices were placed over the burning wood. This explanation Gesenius adopts, and brings forward as a parallel the Arab. مَيَا, "a hearth or fireplace," akin to the Heb. יִמָּא, "a light, flame." First (Homer, s. v.) derives it from an unused root מִמַּא, מַר, "to glow, burn," with the termination -r; but the only authority for the root is its presumed existence in the word ἠραλ, Edward (Die Propheten des A. B. ii. 373) identifies Harel and Ariel, and refers them both to a root מְמַא, מָרָה, akin to the Heb. יִמָּא, יָם.

W. A. W.

HAREPHA (§§. §). [Sheep off].: "Apria: [Vat. Apechiv]: Alex. Απρίφα: [Comp. Απρίφα]: Hariph, a name occurring in the genealogies of Judah, as a son of Caleb, and as a "father of Beth-gader." (1 Chr. ii. 51, only.) In the lists of Ezr. ii. and Neh. vii. the similar name Hariph is found, but nothing appears to establish a connection between the two.

HARETH, THE FOREST OF (§§. §; §). מַמָּה, in both MSS. — reading מַמָּה for מַמָּה— שָׁם, [Vat. שָׁם]: Alex. Αρέφα: [Comp. Αρέφα]: is sulmam Haret], in which David took refuge, after, at the intercession of the prophet God, he had quitted the "hold" or fastness of the cave of Adullam — if indeed it was Adullam and not Mizpeh of Moab, which is not quite clear (1 Sam. xxxi. 5). Nothing appears in the narrative by which this position of the forest, which has long since disappeared, can be ascertained, except the very general remark that it was in the "land of Judah." c. e., according to Josephus, the inheritance proper of that tribe, τῷ καλοχριστῷ τῷ φασάθι, as opposed to the "desert," ἤν ἵπποιαρα, in which he had before been lurking (Ant. vi. 12, § 4). We might take it to be the "wood" in the "wilderness of Ziph," in which he was subsequently hidden (xiii. 15, 19), but that the Hebrew term is different (chorakh instead of yarāh). In the Onomasticon, "Arith" is said to have then existed west of Jerusalem.

HARHIAH (3 syl.) מַמָּה [Jehovah is angry]: "Apaxias: [Vat. Alex. FA. omit: Arriv]: Uziel son of Charanah, of the goldsmiths, assisted in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 8). [Some MSS. read מַמָּה is a protection, First.]

HARHAS (§§. §).: "Apas: [Vat. Apeas]: Aronas, an ancestor of Shalumm the husband of Habbah, the prophetess in the time of Josiah (2 K. xxii. 14). In the parallel passage in Chronicles the name is given as Haseah.

HARHUR (§§. §) [root רֻר]: to burn, shine: hence distinction, First: but Ges., inflation: "Apas: [Vat. Alex. FA. Apeas]: Harhor: Bene-harchur were among the Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 51; Neh. vii. 53). In the Apocryphal Esdras the name has become Assur, Pharamon.

HARM [§§. § (moluccan)]. 1. (Arapi: [Comp.] Alex. Αράμι: Harum): a priest who had charge of the third division in the house of God (1 Chr. xxiv. 8).

2. [Harp: in Neh. x. 5, 16, Vat. Epapou]: Alex. Αραμί: Harum, Haruem, Arem]): Bene-Harim, probably descendants of the above, to the number of 1017, came up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 39; Neh. vii. 42). [Carm.]: The name, probably as representing the family, is mentioned amongst those who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 5); and amongst the priests who had put away their foreign wives were five of the sons of Harim (Ezr. x. 21). In the parallel to this latter passage in Esdras the name is given Annas.

3. (Arapi: [Vat. Alex. FA omit: Harum]): It further occurs in a list of the families of priests "who went up with Zerubbabel and Jeshua," and of those who were their descendants in the next generation — in the days of Joakim the son of Josha (Neh. xii. 15). In the former list (xii. 3) the name is changed to Rehum (וֹרְמָה to יְרָמָה) by a not unfrequent transposition of letters. [Hebux.]

4. [Harp: ex. Ezr. ii. 32. Rom. "Haraz: Neh. x. 27, Abd. Alex. Peonua: Harim, Heron, Heruen, Heruron.]: Another family of Bene-Harim [sons of H], three hundred and twenty in number, came from the Captivity in the same caravan (Ezr. ii. 32; Neh. vii. 55). These were harime, and seem to have taken their name from a place, at least the contiguous names in the list are certainly those of places. These also appear among those who had married foreign wives (Ezr. x. 31), as well as those who sealed the covenant (Neh. x. 27). [Eanes].

HARIPH (§§. §) [outlandish rain, Ges.]: but First, "early-born, strong": "Apai: [Vat. Apea]: alone in which the reading of Josephus departs from the Hebrew text, and agrees with the LXX.
HARLOT

Alex. Areph. [Alex.: FA. Areph. Areph:] Hariph

hundred and twelve of the Bene-Chariph [sons of C.] returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii. 24). The name occurs again among the "heads of the people" that sealed the covenant (x. 19 [20 in Hebr.]). In the lists of Ezra and Esdras, Hariph appears as Jorah [Jorah] and Azemphthi respectively. An almost identical name, Haraph [חַרָפ], a plucking off, appears in the lists of Judah [1 Chr. ii. 51] as the father of Bethgader [comp. Haraphthi].

HARLOT (הִרְוֹת, often with הָרְזִרות הָרְזִרות הָרְזִרות), That this condition of persons existed in the earliest states of society is clear from Gen. xxxviii. 15. So Rahab [Josh. ii. 1], who is said by the Chaldean paraph. (ad loc.), to have been an innkeeper, but if there were such persons, considering what we know of Canaanitish morals (Lev. xviii. 27), we may conclude that they would, if women, have been of this class. The law forbids (xix. 29) the father's compelling his daughter to sin, but does not mention it as a voluntary mode of life on her part without his complicity. It could indeed hardly be so. The isolated act which is the subject of Deut. xxiii. 28, 29, is not to the purpose. Male relatives were probably allowed a practically unlimited discretion in punishing family dishonor incurred by their women's unchastity (Gen. xxxviii. 24). The provision of Lev. xxi. 9, regarding the priest's daughter, may have arisen from the fact of his home being less guarantied owing to his absence when ministering, as well as from the scandal to sanctity so involved. Perhaps such abominations might, if not thus severely marked, lead the way to the excesses of Gentile ritualistic fornication, to which indeed, when so near the sanctuary, they might be viewed as approximating (Michaelis, Lores f. Mosae, art. 268). Yet it seems to be assumed that the harlot class would exist, and the prohibition of Deut. xxiii. 18, forbidding offerings from the wages of such sin, is perhaps due to the contagion of heathen example, in whose worship practices abounded which the Israelites were taught to abhor. The term הָרְזָר [meaning properly "consecrated"] points to one description of persons, and הָרְזֵר ["strange woman"] to another, of which this class mostly consisted. The first term refers to the impure worship of the Syrian d Astarte (Num. xxv. 1; comp. Herod. i. 199; Justin, xvi. 5; Strabo, viii. p. 378, xii. p. 559; Val. Max. ii. 15; August. de Civ. Dei, iv. 4), whose votaries, as bolgry progressed, would be recruited from the daughters of Israel; hence the common mention of both these sins in the Prophets, the one indeed being a metaphor of the other (Is. i. 18; Jer. ii. 20; comp. Ex. xxiv. 15, 16; Jer. iii. 1, 2; Ecclus. xii. 6; Ez. xxi. 3); Hos. i. 2, ii. 4, 5, iv. 11, 13, 14, 15, v. 3). The latter class would grow up with the growth of great cities and of foreign intercourse.

HAROD, THE WELL OF 1008

and hardly could enter into the view of the Mosaic institutes. As regards the fashions involved in the practice, similar outward marks seem to have attended its earliest forms to those which we trace in the classical writers, e. g. a distinctive dress and a seat by the way-side (Gen. xxxviii. 14; comp. Ez. xvi. 16, 25; Bar. vi. 43 [or Epist. of Jer. 43]; Petron. Arb. Sat. xvi.; Juv. vi. 118 foll.; Doutouz Amulet. Sacro. Exc. xxiv.). Public singing in the streets occurs also (Is. xxii. 16; Eccles. ix. 4). Those who thus published their infamy were of the worst repute, others had houses of resort, and both classes seem to have been known among the Jews (Prov. vii. 8-12, xxiii. 25; Eccles. ix. 7, 8); the two women, 1 K. iii. 16, lived as Greek hetarces sometimes did, in a house together (Dict. Gr. and Rom. Ant. s. v. Hetero). The baneful fascination ascribed to them in Prov. vii. 21-25 may be compared with what Chardin says of similar effects among the young nobility of Persia (Voyages en Perse, i. 163, ed. 1711), as also may Luke xv. 30, for the sums lavished on them (l. b. 162). In earlier times the price of a kid is mentioned (Gen. xxxviii.), and great wealth doubtless sometimes accrued to them (Ex. xvi. 3, 39, xxiii. 20). But lust, as distinct from gain, appears as the inducement in Prov. vii. 14, 15 (see Doutouz. Amulet. Sacro. ad loc.), where the victim is further allured by a promised sacrificial banquet (comp. Ter. Eun. iii. 3). The "harlots" are classed with "publicans," as those who lay under the ban of society in the N. T. (Matt. xxii. 32). No doubt they multiplied with the increase of polygamy, and consequently lowered the estimate of marriage. The corrupt practices imported by Gentile converts into the Church occasion most of the other passages in which allusions to the subject there occur, 1 Cor. v. 1, 9, 11; 2 Cor. xii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 10. The decree, Acts xv. 29, has occasioned doubts as to the meaning of πορνεία there, chiefly from its context, which may be seen discussed at length in Deyling's Obscr. Sacr. ii. 470, foll.; Schoettgen, Hor. Hebr. i. 488; Spencer and Hammond, ad loc. The simplest sense however seems the most probable. The children of such persons were held in contempt, and could not exercise privileges nor inherit (John viii. 41; Deut. xiii. 1; Judg. i. 1, 2). On the general subject Michaelis, Lores f. Mosae, bk. v. art. 268; Selden, de Us. Heb. i. 16, iii. 12, and de Jur. Natur. v. 4, together with Schoettgen, and the authorities there quoted, may be consulted.

The words הַרְזָר הַרְזָר הַרְזָר א. V. "and they washed his armor" (1 K. xii. 38) should be "and the harlots washed," which is not only the natural rendering, but in accordance with the LXX. and Josephus.

HARNEPHER (הַרְנֵפֶר [etym. uncertain]: Ἀράνεφης [Vat. corrupt: Ἰμμοφερ], one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chr. vii. 36).

HATROD, THE WELL OF (accur. the

stoning; but this is, by Selden (de Us. Heb. iii. 18), shown to be unfounded.

So at Corinth were 1000 leporolai dedicated to Aphrodité and the gross sins of her worship, and simultaneously, Harly at Comana, in Armenia (Strabo, ii. c). Α' Λύδιαν α' γυναίκαν εν την εδώρ τούς παρασκεύασαν (Theophr. Char. xxviii.). So Catullus (Carm. xxxvii. 16) speaks conversely of semiluaris maritari.
HARODITE, THE

spring of Charod [i. e. of trembling], ḫârâd, [Hârâd, Alex. ἄραδ, Ax. ἄραδα], a spring by (חָרַד) which Gideon and his great army encamped on the morning of the day which ended in the rout of the Midianites (Judg. xil. 1), and where the trial of the people by their mode of drinking apparently took place. The word, slightly altered, recurs in the proclamation to the host: “Whosoever is fearful and trembling (חָרַד), charred) let him return” (ver. 3): it is impossible to decide whether the name Charod was, as Prof. Stanley proposes, bestowed on account of the trembling, or whether the mention of the trembling was suggested by the previously existing name of the fountain: either would suit the paronomastic vein in which these ancient records so delight. The word charred (A. V. “was afraid”) recurs in the description of another event which took place in this neighborhood, possibly at this very site—Samuel’s last encounter with the Philistines—when he was afraid, and his heart trembled greatly,” at the sight of their fierce hosts (1 Sam. xxviii. 5). The ‘Ain Jalâl, with which Prof. Stanley would identify Harod (S. q. P.), is very suitable to the circumstances, as being at present the largest spring in the neighborhood, and as forming a pool of considerable size at which great numbers might drink (Rob. ii. 324). But if at that time so copious, would it not have been seized by the Midianites before Gideon’s arrival? However, if the ‘Ain Jalâl be not this spring, we are very much in the dark, since the “hill of Moreh,” the only landmark afforded us (vii. 1), has not been recognized. The only hill of Moreh of which we have any certain knowledge was by Shechem, 25 miles to the south. If ‘Ain Jalâl be Harod, then Jael’s duty must be Moreh.

It is quite possible that the name Jalâl is a corruption of Harod. In that case it is a good example of the manner in which local names acquire a new meaning in passing from one language to another. Harod itself probably underwent a similar process after the arrival of the Hebrews in Canaan, and the paronomastic turn given to Gideon’s speech, as above, may be an indication of the change.

G.

HARODITE, THE (חָרַד, [patronym. see below]): δ Ψωδαίους: Alex. o Ψωδαίους, Π[Ἀρωδιόν]: de Harodii, the designation of two of the thirty-seven warriors of David’s guard, SHAMMAH and ELKA (2 Sam. xxviii. 29), doubtless derived from a place named Harod, which just spoken of or some other. In the parallel passage of Chronicles by a change of letter the name appears as HAMORITE.

HAROFEH (חָרֹף, i. e. ha-Roch = the see: ‘Aroq [Vat. corrig.], a name occurring in the genealogical lists of Judah as one of the sons of “Shelah, father of Kirjath-jearim” (1 Chr. ii. 52). The Vulg. translates this and the following words, ‘qui violent dimidium requiptionem.’ A somewhat similar name—REAIM— is given in v. 2 as the son of Shelah, but there is nothing to establish the identity of the two.

HARORITE, THE (חָרֹר), [see Harodite]: δ Ψωδαίππι: [Vat. FA. Ψαδαίοι}: Alex. J̄: the title given to SHAMMUTI, Ε: of the warriors of David’s guard (1 Chr. xi. 27).

We have here an example of the minute discrepancies which exist between these two parallel lists. In this case it appears to have arisen from an exchange of Ψ, D, for Ψ, R, and that at a very early date, since the LXX. is in agreement with the present Hebrew text. But there are other differences, for which see SHAMMAH.

HAROSETH (חָרֹס, Charasheth [working in wood, stone, etc., Ge.; or city of crafts, of artificial wood, First]: ‘Aroseti; [Vat. Aroseth; Alex. Arosethi, in ver. 10, Aroseth]: Haroseth, or rather “Harosheth of the Gentiles,” as it was called (probably for the same reason that Gideon was afterwards, from the mixed races that inhabited it, a city in the north of the land of Canaan, supposed to have stood on the west coast of the lake Merom (cf. Hâlûkî), from which the Jordan issues forth in one unbroken stream, and in the portion of the tribe of Naphtali. It was the residence of Sisa, captain of Judah, king of Canaan (Judg. iv. 2), whose capital, Hazor, one of the fenced cities assigned to the children of Naphtali (Josh. xix. 36), lay to the northwest of it; and it was the point to which the victorious Israelites under Barak pursued the discomfited host and chariots of the second potentate of that name (Judg. iv. 14). Herein the paronomastic usage with which the conquered Canaanites, the name of Sisa, became afterwards a family name (Ezr. ii. 53). Neither is it irrelevant to allude to this coincidence in connection with the moral effects of this decisive victory; for Hazor, once “the head of all those kingdoms” (Josh. xii. 16), had been taken and burnt by Joshua; its king, Jabin 1, put to the sword; and the whole conflagration of the Canaanites of the north broken and slaughtered in the celebrated battle of the waters of Merom (Josh. xi. 5–14)—the first time that “chariots and horses” appear in array against the invading host, and are so summarily disposed of, according to Divine command, under Joshua; but which subsequently the children of Joseph feared to face in the valley of Jezreel (Josh. xvi. 16–18); and which Judah actually failed before the Philistine plain (Judg. i. 19). Herein was the great difficulty of subduing plains, similar to that of the Jordan, beside which Harosheth stood. It was not till the Israelites had asked for and obtained a king, that they began “to multiply chariots and horses” to themselves, contrary to the express words of the law (Deut. xviii. 16), as it were to fight the enemy with his own weapons. (The first instance occurs 2 Sam. viii. 4, comp. 1 Chr. xv. 4; next in the history of Abinadab, 2 Sam. xxv. 1, and of Adoni- jah, 1 K. i. 5; while the climax was reached under Solomon, 1 K. iv. 26.) And then it was that their decadence set in! They were strong in faith when they immured the horses and burned the chariots with fire of the kings of Hazor, of Madon, of Shimron, and of Aschashaf (Josh. xii. 1). And yet so rapidly did they decline when their pillars were burnt, what more, that the city of Hazor had risen from its ruins; and in contrast to the kings of Mesopotamia and of Moab (Judg. iii.), who were both of them foreign potentates, another Jabin, the territory of whose ancestors had been assigned to the tribe of Naphtali, claimed the disposition of being the first to revolt against and shake off the dominion of Israel in his newly acquired inheritance. But the victory won by
HARP

Deborah and Barak was well worthy of the song of triumph which it inspired (Judg. v.), and of the proverbial celebrity which ever afterwards attached to it (Ps. lxxxii. 9, 10). The whole territory was gradually won back, to be held permanently, as it would seem (Judg. iv. 24); at all events we hear nothing more of Hazor, Harosheth, or the Canaanites of the north, in the succeeding wars.

The site of Harosheth does not appear to have been identified by any modern traveller.

E. S. F.

* Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 143) supposes Harosheth to be the high Tell called Harottieh, near the base of Carmel, where the Kishon flows along toward the sea. "I have no doubt," he says, "of this identification." A castle there would guard the pass along the Kishon into the plain of Esdraelon, and the ruins still found on this "enormous double mound" show that a strong fortress must have stood here in former times. A village of the same name occurs higher up on the other side of the river, and hence somewhat nearer the scene of the Deborah-Barak battle. This writer says that Harottieh is the Arabic form of the Hebrew Harosheth, and (according to his view of the direction of the flight) lies directly in the way of the retreat of Sisera's forces. It is about eight miles from Megiddo, and in the neighborhood of Acecho (Akko), and hence exactly in the region where the Gentile "nations," to which Harosheth belonged, still dwelt and were powerful; for we learn from Judg. i. 37 that the Hebrews had been unable to drive them out from that part of the country.

En-dor is mentioned (Ps. lxxxii. 10) as a place of slaughter on this occasion. Hence, Stanley, in his graphic sketch (Jewish Church, i. 350), represents the Canaanites as escaping in the opposite direction, through the eastern branch of the plain, and thence onward to Harosheth, supposed by him to be among the northern hills of Galilee. En-dor was not far from Tabor (the modern village is distinctly visible from its top), and in that passage of the Psalms it may be named as a vague designation of the battle-field, while possibly those who "perished at En-dor" were some of the fugitives driven in that direction, about whose destruction there was something remarkable, as known by some tradition not otherwise preserved.

HARP (חֵינָוֶר, Kinnor), in Greek κινύρα or κινύρα, from the Hebrew word, the sound of which corresponds with the thing signified, like the German kwerran, "to produce a shrill tone" (Liddell and Scott). Lassen inclines to the opinion that חֵינָוֶר is derived from קְנָו, "an unusual onomatopoeic root, which means to give forth a tumultuous and strident sound, like that of a string when touched." The Kinnor was the national instrument of the Hebrews, and was well known throughout Asia. There can be little doubt that it was the earliest instrument with which man was acquainted, as the writer of the Pentateuch assigns its invention, together with that of theorgan, to the antediluvian period (Gen. iv. 21). Dr. Kalisch (Hist. and Crit. Com. on the Old Test. considers Kinnor to stand for the whole class of stringed instruments (Nepholoth), as עָנָב, says he, "is the type of all wind instruments." Writers who connect the κινύρα with κινύρα (vailing), conjecture that this instru-

ment was only employed by the Greeks on occasions of sorrow and distress. If this were the case with the Greeks it was far different with the Hebrews, amongst whom the kinnor served as an accompaniment to songs of cheerfulness and mirth as well as of praise and thanksgiving to the Supreme Being (Gen. xxxi. 27; I Sam. xvi. 23; 2 Chr xx. 28; Ps lxxxiii. 2), and was very rarely used, if ever, in times of private or national affliction. The Jewish bard finds no employment for the kinnor during the Babylonian Captivity, but describes it as put aside or suspended on the willows (Ps. cxxxvii. 2); and in like manner Job's harp "is changed into mourning" (xxx. 31), whilst the hand of grief pressed heavily upon him. The passage "my bowels shall sound like a harp for

Moab" (Is. xvi. 11) has impressed some Biblical critics with the idea that the kinnor had a lugubrious sound; but this is an error, since יָנָמ refers to the vibration of the chords and not to the sound of the instrument (Gesen. and Hitzig, in Comment.).

Touching the shape of the kinnor a great difference of opinion prevails. The author of Shilte Haggielborin describes it as resembling the modern harp; Pfeiffer gives it the form of a guitar; and St. Jerome declares it to have resembled in shape
the Greek letter delta; and this last view is supported by Hieronymus, quoted by Joel Bell in the preface to Mendelssohn's Psalms. Josephus records (Antiq. vii. 12, § 3) that the kinnor had ten strings, and that it was played on with the plectrum; others assign to it twenty-four, and in the Shilte Haggibborim it is said to have had forty-seven. Josephus's statement, however, ought not to be received as conclusive, as it is in open contradiction to what is set forth in the 1st book of Samuel (xvi. 23, xviii. 10), that David played on the kinnor with his hand. As it is reasonable to suppose that there was a smaller and a larger kinnor, inasmuch as it was sometimes played by the Israelites whilst walking (1 Sam. x. 5), the opinion of Munk — "on jouint peut-être des deux manières, suivant les dimensions de l'instrument" — is well entitled to consideration. The Talmud (Moss. Bereith) has preserved a curious tradition to the effect that over the bed of David, facing the north, a kinnor was suspended, and that when at midnight the north wind touched the cords they vibrated and produced musical sounds.

The שמעון "harp on the Sheminith" (1 Chr. xv. 21) — was so called from its eight strings. Many learned writers, including the author of Shilte Haggibborim, identify the word "Sheminith" with the octave; but it would indeed be rash to conclude that the ancient Hebrews understood the octave in the sense in which it is employed in modern times. "[Sheminith]. The skill of the Jews on the kinnor appears to have reached its highest point of perfection in the age of David, the effect of whose performances, as well as of those by the members of the "Schools of the Prophets," are described as truly marvellous (comp. 1 Sam. x. 5, xvi. 23, and xix. 20)."

HARROW. The word so rendered 2 Sam. xiii. 1, 1 Chr. xx. 3 (ךִּבָּקוּנַי) is probably a threshing-machine, the verb rendered "to harrow" (ךִּבָּקוּנַי), is xxviii. 24; Job xxix. 10; Hos. x. 11, expresses apparently the breaking of the clods, and is so far analogous to our harrowing, but whether done by any such machine as we call "a harrow," is very doubtful. In modern Palestine, oxen are sometimes turned in to trample the clods, and in some parts of Asia a lash of thorns is dragged over the surface, but all these processes, if used, occur (not after, but) before the seed is committed to the soil. [See Agriculture.] 1 H. H.

HAR'SHA (שָׁרָשָׁה) [deaf]. Ges. 6th Aufl.; see Fürst]: 'Apsadi (אָפָסָדִי in Ezr., Vat. Apoc.: Apsadi) [Harsel]. Bene-colosha [sons of C.] were among the families of Nethinim who came back from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 52; Neh. vii. 54). In the parallel list in Esdras the name is Charesa.

HART (שָׁרְשָׁה: אָפָסָדִי: כִּבָּקָשׁ). The hart is reckoned among the clean animals (Deut. xii. 15, xiv. 5, xv. 22), and seems, from the passages quoted as well as from 1 K. iv. 24, to have been commonly killed for food. Its activity furnishes an apt comparison in Is. xxxv. 6, though in this respect the hind was more commonly selected by the sacred writers. In Ps. xiii. 1 the feminine termination of the verb renders an exclamation necessary: we must therefore substitute the hind; and again in Lam. i. 6 the true reading is נָאָשְׁה, "a ram" (as given in the LXX. and Vulg.). The proper name Ajabon is derived from agyal, and implies that harts were numerous in the neighborhood.

W. L. B.

The Heb. masc. noun agyal (גַּל), which is always rendered אָפָסָדִי by the LXX., denotes, there can be no doubt, some species of Cervus (deer tribe), either the Dama vulgaris, fallow-deer, or the Cervus Barbatus, the Barbary deer, the southern representative of the European stag (C. elaphus), which occurs in Tunis and the coast of Barbary. We have, however, no evidence to show that the Barbary deer ever inhabited Palestine, though there is no reason why it may not have done so in primitive times. Hasselquist (Trav.

Barbary deer.
HARUM 

file: but it is still seen in the vicinity of the Na-

tron lakes, as about Tunis, though not in the des-
t between the river and the Red Sea." This is
doubtless the Cereus Barbarus.

Most of the deer tribe are careful to conceal their

calves after birth for a time. May there not be

some allusion to this circumstance in Job xxxix. 1,

"Canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?" etc.

Perhaps, as the LXX. uniformly renders οὐγάλαυ by

ἀγγυθαλ, we may incline to the belief that the Cere-

sum Barbarus is the deer denoted. The feminine

noun οὐγυθαλ, ogythah, occurs frequently in the

O. T. For the Scriptural allusions see under

HIND.

W. H.

* The word άγγυθαλ in Arabic is not confined to

any particular species, but is as general as our word
deer. It in fact applies as well to the mountain
gaz άγγυθαλ.

"G. E. P.

HARUM (אַרּוֹם [elevated, lofty]: Ἀπρίος; [Vat.] Alex. Ἀ βροῦ: Arum). A name occurring in one of the three obscure portions of the gene-

alogies of Judah, in which Cox is said to have begot-
ten "the families of Aharal son of Harum" (1 Chr. iv. 8).

HARUMAPH (אַרְוָמַפִּי [aiti-nosed, Gen.]: ᾨρομάφ; [Vat. Ἀρομάφ] Heromaph), father or

ancestor of Jehudaiah, who assisted in the repair of

the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 10).

HARUPHITE, THE (גָּרְעֵפָה [patron-

ymn., see Harche]: καὶ Ἡρωμῆφ: [Vat. FA.]

ἡρωμῆφ: Λεβ.: Alex. Ἀρομᾶφ: Ἱλαρίμφιτος),

the designation of Shephathiah, one of the Korhites

who repaired to David at Ziklag when he was in
distress (1 Chr. xii. 5). The Masorets read the

word Hariphite, and point it accordingly, הָרָעפֵה.

HARUZ (גָּרְעֵז [zelous, active]: Αἵρους; [Vat. Harouu:]

Haranu), a man of Jotbah, father of Meshullemuth,

queen of Manasseh, and mother of Amón king of

Judah (2 K. xx. 19).

HARVEST. [Agriculture.]

HASADIAH (הָסָדְיָה [whom Jehovah

loves]: Ἀσαδία: Ησόδια, one of a group of five

persons among the descendants of the royal line of

Judah (1 Chr. iii. 20), apparently sons of Zerub-
babel, the leader of the return from Babylon.

It has been conjectured that this latter half of the

family was born after the restoration, since some

of the names, and amongst them this one — "be-

loved of Jehovah," appear to embody the hopeful

feeling of that time. [ASADIAH.]

HASENU'AH (הָסָנַע, i. e. has-Sennah

the hated]): Ἐσσάου; [Vat. Ααρα] Alex. Ἐσσα-

ουα: Assam; Assam), a Benjamite, of one of the chief

families in the tribe (1 Chr. ix. 7). The name is

really Sennah, with the definite article prefixed.

HASHB'AH (חָסְבָּה, and with final ע,

חָסְבָּה; Ἀσβᾶς, Ἀσβᾶς, Ἀσβᾶ), etc.] Hasibías, [Hasibions, Hasibians.]

* This is one of the instances in which the word

ser (beyond) is used for the west side of Jordan. To

Hasb'ah's), a name signifying "regarded of Jene-

vah," much in request among the Levites, espe-

cially at the date of the return from Babylon.

1. A Merarite Levite, son of Amaziah, in the line of Ethan the singer (1 Chr. vi. 45; Heb. 80)

2. Another Merarite Levite (1 Chr. ix. 14).

3. CHASHABIAH: another Levite, the fourth of the sixth of Judah (the sixth is omitted

here, but is supplied in ver. 17), who played the harp in the service of the house of God under

David's order (1 Chr. xxv. 3), and had charge of

the twelfth course (19).

4. CHASHABIAH: one of the Hebronites, i. e.

descendants of Hebron the son of Kohath, one of

the chief families of the Levites (1 Chr. xxvi. 90)

He and the 1,700 men of his kindred had super-

intendence for King David over business both

sacred and secular on the west of Jordan. Per-

haps this is the same person as

5. The son of Kemuel, who was "prince"

(הָסָבַי) of the tribe of Levi in the time of David

(1 Chr. xxvii. 17).

6. CHASHABIAH: another Levite, one of the

"chiefs" (חָסְבָּי), of his tribe, who officiated for

King Josiah at his great passover-feast (2 Chr.

xxv. 9). In the parallel account of 1 Esdras the

name appears as Assanias.

7. A Merarite Levite who accompanied Ezra

from Babylon (Ezr. viii. 19). In 1 Esdras the

name is Asseriah.

8. One of the chiefs of the priests (and there

fore of the family of Kohath) who formed part of

the same caravan (Ezr. viii. 24). In 1 Esdras the

name is Assanias.

9. "Ruler" (חָסְבָּי) of half the circuit or envi-

rons (חָסְבָּי) of Keilah; he repaired a portion of

the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh. iii.

17).

10. One of the Levites who sealed the covenant of reformation after the return from the Captivity

(Neb. x. 11). Probably this is the person named

as one of the "chiefs" (חָסְבָּי) of the Levites in the

times immediately subsequent to the return from

Babylon (xii. 24; comp. 26).

11. Another Levite, son of Banni (Neh. x. 15).

Notwithstanding the remarkable correspondence

between the lists in this chapter and those in 1

Ch. ix. — and in none more than in this verse

compared with 1 Chr. ix. 14 — it does not appear

that they can be identical, insomuch as this relates

to the times after the Captivity, while that in Chron-

icles refers to the original establishment of the ark

at Jerusalem by David, and of the tabernacle (comp.

19, 21, and the mention of Gibeon, where

the tabernacle was at this time, in ver. 35). But see

NEHEMIAH.

12. Another Levite in the same list of attend-

ants on the Temple; son of Mattaniah (Neh. x.

22).

13. A priest of the family of Hilkiah in the

days of Josiah son of Jeshua, that is in the gen-

eration after the return from the Captivity (Neh.

xxii. 21; comp. 1, 10, 29).

HASHB'NAH (חָסְבָּנָה) [see supra]

[Ἐσσαβάδα: Alex. Ἐσσαβά, and so Vat. FA.,

remove the anomaly, our translators have rendered it

"on this side."
ex. the wrong division of words:] Haschman, one of the chief ("heads") of the people (i. e. the laymen) who sealed the covenant at the same time with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 25).

HASHABNI'AH (חַשָּמְנִי) [whom Jehovah regarde]: [Aramaica: [Vat. Aa'ShBanev].] Alex. Aa'ShBanev; [FA. Aa'ShBanev]; Haschmon (1. Father of Hattush, who repaired part of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 10). 2. [Haschmon]. A Levite who was among those who olicited at the great fast under Ezra and Nehemiah when the covenant was sealed (Neh. ix. 5). This and several other names are omitted in both MSS. of the LXX.

HASHBAD'AN (חַשֶּבָּן) [intelligence in judging, Gesen.]: [Aramaica: [Tat. FA.] omit; Alex. Aa'ShBanev; Haschmona], one of the men (probably Levites) who stood on Ezra's left hand while he read the law to the people in Jerusalem (Neh. viii. 4).

HAS'HEM (חַשֶּם) [perh. fuel, rich, Gesen.]: [Aramaica: [Vat. FA. corrupt: Assen]]. The sons of Hashem the Gizeonite are named amongst the members of David's guard in the catalogue of 1 Chr. (xi. 34). In the parallel list of 2 Sam. xxiii. we find "of the sons of Jashen, Jonathan." After a lengthened examination, Kennicott decides that the text of both passages originally stood "of the sons of Hashem, Guni" (Dissertation, pp. 198-203).

HASHMANIM (חַשֶּמְנִים) [πρόβατα, ζωο]: This word occurs only in the Hebrew of Ps. lxxviii. 31: "Hashmanim (A. V. "prince") shall come out of Egypt, Cush shall make her hands to hasten to God." In order to render this word "princes," or the like, modern Hebrewists have recourse to extremely improbable derivations from the Arabic. The old derivation from the civil name of Hermopolis Magna in the Heptanesia, preserved in the modern Arabic as ٌ،،،. "the two Ashmoons," seems to us more reasonable. The ancient Egyptian name is Ha-shmen or Ha-shmoon, the abode of eight: the sound of the signs for eight, however, we take alone from the Coptic, and Druschet reads them Sesiem (Geogr. Antiqu. i. pp. 219, 220), but not, as we think, on conclusive grounds. The Coptic form is سيم, "the two Shmoons," like the Arabic. If we suppose that Hashmanim is a proper name and signifies Hermopolis, the notion might be explained by the circumstance that Hermopolis Magna was the great city of the Egyptian Hermes, Thoth, the god of wisdom; and the meaning might therefore be that even the wisest Egyptians should come to the temple, as well as the distant Cushites. R. S. P.

HASHMON'AH (חַשֶּמְנָה) [fruitfulness]: Σαλαμώνα; Alex. Aa'Salma: Hermoana), a station of the Israelites, mentioned Num. xxxiii. 23, as next before Moereth, which, from xx. 28 and Deut. x. 5, was near Mount Hor; this tends to indicate the reality of Hashmonah.

HATACH (חַטַּכ) i. e. Chashub [associate, friend, or intelligent]: "Aisoab: Asub]. The re-duplication of the Sh has been overlooked in the A. V., and the name is identical with that elsewhere correctly given as Hasshur.

1. A son of Pahath-Moab who assisted in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 23). 2. Another man who assisted in the same work, but at another part of the wall (Neh. iii. 11). 3. [Vat. FA. Aaseob]. The name is mentioned again among the heads of the "people" (that is the laymen) who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 25). It may belong to either of the foregoing names.

4. [Kem. omits; Vat. FA. Aa'Seob] A Merarite Levite (Neh. xii. 15). In 1 Chr. ix. 14, he appears again as Hasshur.

HAS'U'BANAH (חַשָּבָנָה) [uncovered, or asso- ciated]: [Aaseob; Alex. Aa'Seob: Hassoba], the first of a group of five men, apparently the latter half of the family of Zerubbabel (1 Chr. iii. 20). For a suggestion concerning these persons, see Hasadiah.

HAS'UM (חַשָּם) [rich, distinguished]: [Aa'Sum, Aa'Saum [etc.: Hassum, Hassom, Hassum]). 1. Bene-Chashum, two hundred and twenty-three in number, came back from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 19; Neh. vii. 22). Seven men of them had married foreign wives from whom they had to separate (Ezr. x. 33). The chief man of the family was among those who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 18). In 1 Esd. ix. 29, the man's name is Asum. 2. (Aa'Saum: [Vat. FA. omit: Asum]). The name occurs amongst the priests or Levites who stood on Ezra's left hand while he read the law to the congregation (Neh. viii. 4). In 1 Esd. ix. 44 the name is given corruptly as Lothisheus.

HAS'UPHA (חַשֶּפָה) [uncovered]: [AasepH: Alex. FA. AasefH: HasspH]). One of the families of Nethinim who returned from captivity in the first caravan (Neh. vii. 46). The name is accurately HasspH, as in Ezr. ii. 43. [AasmineH.]

HAS'RAH (חַשָּרָה) [perh. splendor, First]: [AapH: Alex. XeLaPhH: AesepH: Hotse]. The form in which the name Hassrah is given in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22 (comp. 2 K. xxi. 14).

HAS'SENA'AH (חַשֶּסְנָה) [the thorn-hedge, First]: [Aa'saH: Alex. AaseH: FA. AaseaH: AssaH]. The Bene-hassenaah [sons of Hassenaah] rebuilt the fish-gate in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 5). The name is doubtless that of the place mentioned in Ezr. ii. 35, and Neh. vii. 38 — NasaH, with the addition of the definite article. Perhaps it has some connection with the rock or cliff Nessah (1 Num. iv. 4).

HAS'SHUB (חַשֶּב) [intelligent, knowing, Gesen.]: [Aa'sob: Hassub], a Merarite Levite (1 Chr. ix. 14). He appears to be mentioned again in Neh. xi. 15, in what may be a repetition of the same genealogy; but here the A. V. have given the name as Hasshur.

HAS'UPHA (חַשֶּפָה) [uncovered, naked]: [AasofH: Alex. FA. AasepH: HasspH]. Bene Chashapha [sons of (s)] were among the Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 43). In Nehemiah the name is inaccurately given in the A. V. as in the Genevan version]

HASSUPHA: in Ezdras it is AasmineH.

HATACH (חַטַּכ) [Pers. cunnah, Gesen.]: [Aa'spH.]. Alex. [ver. 5]: Aa'spH-5 [ver. 9].
HATHATH

with FA.1, Αχαράδζιος; Comp. 'Ab'Ah'iz] Ahathach), one of the eunuchs (A. V., "chamberlains") in the court of Ahaseurus, in immediate attendance on Esther (Esth. iv. 5, 6, 9, 10). The LXX. alter ver. 5 to τῶν εὐνοῦχων αὐτῆς.

HATHATH (Ἁθαθ) [fearful]: 'Ab'di: Ha-
thath, a man in the genealogy of Judah; one of the sons of Othniel the Kenazite, the well-known judge of Israel (1 Chr. iv. 13).

HATTIPHA (Ἡττίφα) [seized, captive]: 'Ατουφά, 'Ατιφά: [in Exzr. Alex. 'Ατουφα: Hatiopa], Bene-Chatitha [sons of C.] were among the Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 54; Neh. xii. 36). [Ἀτίφα.]

HATTITA (Ἡττίτα) [diggings, exploring]: 'Ατίτα: [in Exzr. Aptippa: in Neh., Vat. FA. ˂Ατιτα: Hattito], Bene-Chatitha [sons of C.] were among the "porters" or "children of the porters" (ὕποπόστατοι, i.e. the gate-keepers), a division of the Levites who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 42; Neh. vii. 45). In Edras the name is abbreviated to ΤΕΤΑ.

HATTIL (Ἡττίλ) [woining, or deceiving]: 'Ατίλ, 'Ετίπα: Alex. 'Ατιλα, ['Ετίπα: in Exzr., Vat. Ατιβα: Hattil], Bene-Chatitha [sons of C.] were among the "children of Solomon's slaves" who came back from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr. ii. 57; Neh. vii. 50). [HAGIA.]

HATTUSH (Ḵattûš) [prob. assembled, Ges.: contendor, Fürst]: Χαττουσ, Χαττους, [etc.]: Hattus: 1. A descendant of the kings of Hittah, apparently one of the "sons of Shechemah" (1 Chr. iii. 22), in the fourth or fifth generation from Zerubbabel. A person of the same name, expressly specified as one of the "sons of David of the sons of Shechemah," accompanied Ezra on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr. viii. 2), while Zerubbabel himself had also come only seventy or eighty years before (Ezr. ii. 1, 2). Indeed, in another statement Hattush is said to have actually returned with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii. 2). At any rate he took part in the sealing of the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. xiv. 2). To obviate the discrepancy between these last-mentioned statements and the interval between Hattush and Zerubbabel in 1 Chr. iii., Lord A. Hervey proposes to read the genealogy in that chapter as if he were the nephew of Zerubbabel, Shemnah in ver. 22 being taken as identical with Shinem in ver. 19. For these proposals the reader is referred to Lord Hervey's Genealogies, pp. 103, 307, 322, &c. [LETTUS: Shinem, Vat. II., ii. 2. (Christōn) [Vat. FA. Χριτόμει: Alex. Χριτός: Comp. Χριτόν.] Son of Hashalhah: one of those who assisted Nehemiah in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 10).

HAU'RUN (Ḫawrûn) [see infra]: Al'wānīs:

Auran: Arab. خوران, a province of Palestine twice mentioned by Ezekiel in defining the north-eastern border of the Promised Land (xlvi. 16, 18). Had we no other data for determining its situation we should conclude from his words that it lay north of Damascus. There can be little doubt, however, that it is identical with the well-known Greek prov-

HAVILAH

name is probably derived from the word "חֵוָל, Hār, "a hole or cave;" the region still abounds in caves which the old inhabitants excavated partly to serve as cisterns for the collection of water, and partly for granaries in which to secure their grain from plunderers. Josephus frequently mentions Aram-

its in connection with Trachonitis, Batanea, and Gaulanitis, which with it constituted the ancient kingdom of Bashan (R. J. i. 20, § 1; ii. 17, § 4). It formed part of that Ῥαχανίτων ἄφοι referred to by Luke (iii. 1) as subject to Philip the tetrarch (comp. Joseph Ant. xvii. 11, § 4). It is bounded on the west by Gaulanitis, on the north by the wild and rocky district of Trachonitis, on the east by the mountainous region of Batanea, and on the south by the great plain of Moab (Jer. xlviii. 21). The surface is perfectly flat and the soil is among the richest in Syria. Not a stone is to be seen save on the few low volcanic tells that rise up here and there, like islands in a sea. It contains upwards of a hundred towns and villages, most of them now deserted, though not ruined. The buildings in many of these are remarkable, the walls are of great thickness, and the roofs and doors are of stone, evidently of remote antiquity (see Porter's Five Years in Damascus, vol. ii. [also his Giant Cities of Bashan, together with his Description of the Trachons and the Trachonites, (London, 1861)]. Some Arab geographers have described the Ḥawran as much more extensive than here stated (Bohard. Taf. Sal., ed. Schult. p. 70; Abulfed. Taf. Syl. s. v.); and at the present day the name is applied by those at a distance to the whole country east of Judah; but the inhabitants themselves define it as above.

J. L. P.

* HAVENS, FAIR. [FAIR HAVENS.]

HAVILAH (Ḫavīlāh) [circle, district, Fürst]: Eōlād, Eōlād: Havelah. 1. A son of Cush (Gen x. 7); and —

2. A son of Joktan (x. 29). Various theories have been advanced respecting these obscure peoples. It appears to be most probable that both stocks settled in the same country, and there intermarried; thus receiving one name, and forming one race, with a common descent. It is immaterial to the argument to decide whether in such instances the name of the new immigrants took the name of the older settlers. In the case of Havilah, it seems that the Cushite people of this name formed the westernmost colony of Cush along the south of Arabia, and that the Joktanites were an earlier colonization. It is commonly thought that the district of Ḥāwīlān (خواران), in the Yemen, preserves the trace of this ancient people; and the similarity of name (being interchangeable with Ḥ, and the termination being redundant), and the group of Joktanite names in the Yemen, render the identification probable. Niebuhr states that there are two Khāwīlāns (Descr. 270, 280), and it has hence been argued by some that we have thus the Cushite and the Joktanite Havilah. The second Khāwīlān, however, is a town, and not a large and well-known district like the first, or more northern one; and the hypothesis based on Niebuhr's assertion is unnecessary, if the theory of a double settlement be
Havilah and Toioi in or ever and our eastern preservation both between Kalkan and Kalkan may be neglected, both being descendants of the first Joktanite settler, and the whole of these early traditions pointing to a Joktanite settlement, without perhaps a distinct preservation of Joktan's name, and certainly none of a correct genealogy from him downwards.

Kalkan is a fertile territory, embracing a large part of myrrhiferous Ararita: mountainous: with plenty of water: and supporting a large population. It is a tract of Arabia better known to both Arabs and moderns than the rest of the Yemen, and the eastern and central provinces. It adjoins Nejran (the district and town of that name), mentioned in the account of the expedition of Elijah Gallos, and the scene of great persecutions of the Christians by Dina-Nuweis, the last of the Tubalians before the Abyssinian conquest of Arabia, in the year 523 of our era (Bossuin, Essai, i. 121 22). For the Chaunatius, see the Dictionary of Geography.

An argument against the identity of Kalkan and Havilah has been found in the mentions of a Havilah on the border of the Ishmaelites, as "than goest to Assyria" (Gen. xxviii, 18), and also on that of the Amelekites (1 Sam. xv. 7). It is not however necessary that these passages should refer to 1 or 2: the place named may be a town or country called after them; or it may have some reference to the Havilah named in the description of the rivers of the garden of Eden; and the LXX. render it, following apparently the last supposition, Εἰδαρ in both instances, according to their spelling of the Havilah of Gen. ii. 11.

These who separate the Cushite and Joktanite Havilah either place them in Neibahr's two Kalkans (as already stated), or place them on the north of the peninsula, following the supposed argument derived from Gen. xxxviii, 18 and 1 Sam. xv. 7, and finding the name in that of the Χαβοῦχα (Eratost. op. Strabo. xvi. 767), between the Nabatai and the Agrai, and in that of the town of Ḥambil on the Persian Gulf (Nicholl, Decr. 342). A Joktanite settlement so far north is however improbable. They discover 1 in the Avaliah on the Arabian coast (Ptol. iv. 7, Arrian. iv. 263, ed. Müller), the modern name of the shore of the Sinus Avalies being, says Gesenius, Zevlah = Zuwelah = Havilah, and Sadding having three times in Gen. written Zevah for Havilah. But Gesenius seems to have overlooked the true orthography of the name of the modern country, which is not זוֹעֵל, but זוֹעָל, with a final letter very rarely added to the Hebrew.

F. S. P.


Havoth-Jair (חַוֹּותָ יָיאֵר, i.e. Chavoth Jair, the village of Jair. i. e. of the enlightened

Hawk (חַוֹּלות, mts: מַעֲטַר; occipiter), the translation of the above named Heb. term, which occurs in Lev. xi. 16 and Lev. xix. 15 as one of the unclean birds, and in Job xxxix. 26, where it is asked, "Both the mts fly by thy wisdom and stretch her wings towards the south?" The word is doubtless generic, as appears from the expression in Deut. and Lev. e. after his kind," and includes various species of the Falco family, with more especial allusion perhaps to the small diurnal birds, such as the kestrel (Falco tinnunculus), the harrier (Falco subbuteo), the gregarious lesser kestrel (Tinunculus minor), common about the ruins in the plain districts of Palestine, all of which were
probably known to the ancient Hebrews. With respect to the passage in Job (l. c.), which appears to allude to the migratory habits of hawks, it is curious to observe that of the ten or twelve lesser raptors of Palestine, nearly all are summer migrants. The kestrel remains all the year, but T. cenchroides, Micrionia galara, Hupp elomone, and F. nebogloceros, are all migrants from the south. Besides the above-named smaller hawks, the two magnificent species, F. Saker and F. lnannaris, are summer visitors to Palestine. "On one occasion," says Mr. Tristram, to whom we are indebted for much information on the subject of the birds of Palestine, "while riding with an Arab guide I observed a falcon of large size rise close to us. The guide, when I pointed it out to him, exclaimed, 'Tahir Sop';* 'Tahir, the Arabic for 'bird,' is universally throughout N. Africa and the East applied to those falcons which are capable of being trained for hunting, i.e. the bird, par excellence.' These two species of falcons, and perhaps the hobby and goshawk (Astur palmararius) are employed by the Arabs in Syria and Palestine for the purpose of taking partridges, sand-grouse, quails, herons, gazelles, hares, etc. Dr. Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, ii. p. 196, 2d ed.) has given the Arabic names of several falcons, but it is probable that some at least of these names apply rather to the different sexes than to distinct species. See a very graphic description of the sport of falconry, as pursued by the Arabs of N. Africa, in the Bous, i. p. 284: and comp. Thomson, The Land and the Book, p. 208 (i. 369-311, Am. ed.).

Whether falconry was pursued by the ancient Orientals or not, is a question we have been unable to determine decisively. No representation of such a sport occurs on the monuments of ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, Am. Eqy. i. p. 321), neither is there any definite allusion to falconry in the Bible. With regard, however, to the negative evidence supplied by the monuments of Egypt, we must be careful ere we draw a conclusion; for the camel is not represented, though we have Biblical evidence to show that this animal was used by the Egyptians as early as the time of Abraham; still, as instances of various modes of capturing fish, game, and wild animals, are not unfrequent on the monuments, it seems probable the art was not known to the Egyptians. Nothing definite can be learnt from the passage in 1 Sam. xxvii. 20, which speaks of "a partridge hunted on the mountains," as this may allude to the method of taking these birds by "throw-sticks," etc. [PATERIDGE.] The hind or "fainting after the water-brooks" (Ps. xliii. 1) may appear at first sight to refer to the mode at present adopted in the East of taking gazelles, deer, and bustards, with the united aid of falcon and greyhound; but, as Hengstenberg (Conscient. on Ps. i. c.) has argued, it seems pretty clear that the expression spoken of is to be understood as arising not from pursuit, but from some prevailing drought, as in Ps. lxiii. 1, "My soul thirsteth for thee in a dry land." (See also Joel i. 20.) The poetical version of Brady and Tate—

"As pants the hart for cooling streams
When heated in the chase," has therefore somewhat prejudged the matter. For the question as to whether falconry was known to the ancient Greeks, see Beckmann, History of Inventions (i. 198-205, Bohn's ed.).

HAY (ןג"l,SHORT: gn in T. נדקת, פשת, הבד, the rendering of the A. V. in Prov. xxvii. 25, and Is. xvi. 6, of the above-named Heb. term, which occurs frequently in the O. T., and denotes "grass" of any kind, from an unused root, "to be green." [Grass.] In Num. xi. 5. this word is properly translated "leeks." [Leek.] Harmer (Observat. i. 423, ed. 1797), quoting from a MS. paper of Sir J. Chardin, states that hay is not made anywhere in the East, and that the fenian of the Vehe, (alba loca) and the "hay" of the A. V. are therefore errors of translation. It is quite probable that the modern Orientals do not make hay in our sense of the term; but it is certain that the ancients did mow their grass, and probably made use of the dry material. See Ps. xxxvii. 2. "They shall soon be cut down (nFmn, נדקת), and wither as the green herb;" Ps. lxxii. 6. "Like rain upon the meadow grass" (22). See also Am. vii. 1, "The king's mowings" (11 נדקת יד, נדקת), and Ps. cxxix. 7, where of the "grass upon the housetops" (Poa annua?) it is said that "the mower (ןדקת) filletth not his hand" with it, "nor he that bindeth sheaves his bosom." We do not see, therefore, with the author of Fragments in Continuation of Colinet (No. clxxiii.), any grass impropeity in our version of Prov. xxvii. 25, or in that of Is. xv. 6. A "Certainly," says this writer, "if the tender grass is but just beginning to show itself, the hay, which is grass cut and dried after it has arrived at maturity, ought by no means to be associated with it, still less ought it to be placed before it." But where is the impropeity? The tender grass (ןג"l) may refer to the springing after-grass.

a The word Sop', ינכ"l, is the name of all the raptores, of the falcons, hawks, and kites. G. B. P.

b "The hay appeareth, and the tender grass sheweth itself, and heret of the untains are gathered."
HAZÆL (םַחֵאֵל) [El (God) is seeing, First, Gen.]: 'Αχάη: Hazael was a king of Damascas, who reigned from about B.C. 866 to B.C. 849. He appears to have been previously a person in a high position at the court of Ben-hadad, and was sent by his master to Elisha, when that prophet visited Damascas, to inquire if he would recover from the malady under which he was suffering. Elisha's answer that Ben-hadad might recover, but would die, and his announcement to Hazael that he would one day be king of Syria, which seems to have been the fulfilment of the commission given to Elijah (1 K. xix. 15) to appoint Hazael king—led to the murder of Ben-hadad by his ambitious servant, who forthwith mounted the throne (2 K. viii. 7-15). He was soon engaged in hostilities with Alazoniah king of Judah, and Jehoram king of Israel, for the possession of the city of Ramoth-Gilead (ibid. viii. 24). The Assyrian inscriptions show that about this time a bloody and destructive war was being waged between the Assyrians on the one side, and the Syrians, Hititites, Hamathites, and the Phœnicians on the other. [See DAMASCUS.]

Ben-hadad had recently suffered several severe defeats at the hands of the Assyrians; and upon the accession of Hazael the war was speedily renewed. Hazael took up a position in the face of the hostilities of the Anti-Libanus, but was there attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss, killing 16,000 of his warriors, and capturing more than 1100 chariots. Three years later the Assyrians once more entered Syria in force; but on this occasion Hazael submitted and helped to furnish the invaders with supplies. After this, internal troubles appear to have occupied the attention of the Assyrians, who made no more incursions into these parts for about a century. The Syrians rapidly recovered their losses; and towards the close of the reign of Jehu, Hazael led them against the Israelites (about B.C. 800), whom he 'smote in all their coasts' (2 K. x. 32), thus accomplishing the prophecy of Elisha (ibid. viii. 12). His main attack fell upon the eastern provinces, where he ravaged 'all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aror, which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan' (ibid. x. 33). After this he seems to have held the kingdom of Israel in a semi-subjection (ibid. xiii. 3-7, and 22); and towards the close of his life he even threatened the kingdom of Judah. Having taken Gath (ibid. xii. 17; comp. Am. vi. 2), he proceeded to attack Jerusalem, defeated the Jews in an engagement (2 Chr. xxiv. 24), and was about to assault the city, when Joash induced him to retire by presenting him with 'all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house' (2 K. xii. 18). Hazael appears to have died about the year B.C. 840 (ibid. xiii. 24), having reigned 46 years. He left his crown to his son Ben-hadad (ibid.).

The true import of Hazael's answer to the prophet on being informed of his future destiny (2 K. viii. 13), does not appear in the A.V.: 'What shall I say, that he should do this great thing?' This is the language of a proud and self-approving spirit, spurring on an undeserved imputation: 'Thy servant is not a dog that he should do this great thing.' It is obvious, moreover, that in this form the terms of the question are incongruous. If he had said, 'Is thy servant a dog, that he should do so base a thing, the question would have been consistent with itself. But the incongruity disappears, and the perniciousness of the illusion is obvious, when we render according to the Hebrew: 'What is thy servant, the dog, that he should do this great thing?' The use of the definite article in the Hebrew, as well as the congruity of the expression, requires this rendering.® [Dougb.] T. J. C.

HAZÆAEL, HOUSE OF (Am. i. 4), probably some well-known edifice or palace, which this king had built at Damascas, and which, according to the prophet, the fire (God's instrument of punishment) was destined to burn up. Some understood by 'the house' Damascas itself, and others Hazael's family or personal descendants. But the clause which follows—'the palaces of Ben-hadad'—as Baur (In V. Prophet Amos, p. 217) points out, favors the other explanation.

HAZÁTIAH [3 syll.] (חָצְטַיָה): Jehonah deco- rates or rivers; Oµäi: [Vat. FA. Oµäa: Hazin], a man of Judah of the family of the Shilonites A. V. 'Shikoni,' or descendants of Shelah (Neh. xi. 5).

HAZAR-AD'DAR, etc. [Hazer.]

HAZARMAVETH (חָצָר-מָכֵו; [in Gen.], [Hazav.]

Sapûdath: [Alex. 2 Anouadéth; in Chr. Rom. Vat. Onom. Alex. Anouadéth; Avondath; the court of death, Ges.), the third, in order of the sons of Joktan (Gen. x. 26). The name is preserved, almost literally, in the Arabic Hdrümâwâdâ (حدورمود) and Hdrumudâîdâ (حدورمودید) (Hazar-Ma'ud)
HAZAZON-TAMAR

and the appellation of a province and an ancient people of Southern Arabia. This identification of the settlement of Hazaraveth is accepted by Biblical scholars as not admitting of dispute. It rests not only on the occurrence of the name, but is supported by the proved fact that Joktan sojourned in the Yemen, along the south coast of Arabia, by the physical characteristics of the inhabitants of this region, and by the identification of the names of several others of the sons of Joktan. The province of Hadramaut is situate east of the modern Yemen (anciently, as shown in Arabia, the limits of the latter province embraced almost the whole of the south of the peninsula), extending to the districts of Shibir and Mahrah. Its capital is Shibam, a very ancient city, of which the native writers give curious accounts, and its chief ports are Mirbat, Zafari (Seihan), and Kishcem, from whence a great trade was carried on in ancient times with India and Africa. Hadramaut itself is generally cultivated, in contrast to the contiguous sandy desert (called El-Alknaf, where lived the gigantic race of 'A'd), is partly mountainous, with watered valleys, and was described in its frankincense (El Idreesee, ed. Jouard, i. p. 54; Niebuhr, Descr. p. 245), exporting also gum-arable, myrrh, dragon's blood, and aloes, the latter, however, being chiefly from Socotra, which is under the rule of the sheiky of Kesheem (Niebuhr, i. c. et seq.). The early kings of Hadramaut were Joktanites, distinct from the descendants of Yaaruh, the progenitor of the Joktanite Arabs generally; and it is hence to be inferred that they were separately descended from Hazaraveth. They maintained their independence against the powerful kings of Himyari, until the latter were subdued at the Abyssinian invasion (Ihu-Khalidoo, op. Causin, Essai, i. 135 ff.). The Greeks and Romans call the people of Hadramaut, variously, Chatrammit, Chatrammita, etc.; and there is little doubt that they were the same as the Adramite, etc. (the latter not applying to the descendant of Hadram, as some have supposed); while the native appellation of an inhabitant, Hadramee, comes very near Adramita in sound. The modern people, although mixed with other races, are strongly characterized by fierce, fanatic, and restless dispositions. They are enterprising merchants, well known for their trading and travelling propensities.

E. S. P.

HAZ'AZON-T'AMAR, 2 Chr. xx. 2. [HAZAZON-TAMAR.]

HAZEL (נַז). The Hebrew term 'laz occurs only in Gen. xxx. 37, where it is coupled with the "poplar" and "chestnut," as one of the trees from which Jacob cut the rods, which he afterwards peed. Authorities are divided between the hazel and the almond-tree, as representing the 'laz; in favor of the former we have Kinachi, Rasibi, Luther, and others; while the Vulgate, Saxhins, and Genesius adopt the latter view. The rendering in the LXX, ἄσπερ, is equally applicable to either. We think the latter most probably correct, both because the Arabic word 'laz is undoubtedly the "almond-tree," and because there is another word in the Hebrew language, אַגּ֥ס (אַגִּ֫ס), which is applicable to the hazel. The strongest argument on the other side arises from the circumstance of another word, šâbâd (יָבָֹד), having reference to the almond: it is supposed, however, that the latter applies to the fruit exclusively, and the word under discussion to the tree: Rosemuller identifies the šâbâd with the cultivated, and 'laz with the wild almond-tree. For a description of the almond-tree, see the article on that subject. The Hebrew term appears as a proper name in Lux, the old appellation of Bethel.

W. L. B.

HAZELLELPONI (הַזְּרֵלֵלְפַּנִּי; Εὐστελεβ-βωύ; Alex. Ευστελεβωύ; Aseltelpanhi), the sister of the sons of Etam in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 3). The name has the definite article prefixed, and is accurately "the Hazelponi," as of a family rather than an individual.

* That the name is genealogical rather than individual appears also from the appended הָזְרֵלֵלְפַּנִּי (see Ges. Lesegeb, der Hebr. Sprache, p. 514). It is variously explained: protection of the presence (Furst); or, shade coming upon me (Gen.). Ewald makes the former sense more expressive than the latter, because he sees in the name a symbol of that protection which was accorded to him by God (Lehrbuch, p. 509). This gives a different force to the ending. H.

HA'ZER (תָּזֵר; i. e. Chatzar, from 'laz, to surround or inclose), a word which is of not uncommon occurrence in the Bible in the sense of a "court" or quadrangle to a palace or other building, and which topographically seems generally employed for the "villages" of people in a roving and unsettled life, the semi-permanent collections of dwellings which are described by travellers among the modern Arabs to consist of rough stone walls covered with the tent cloths, and thus holding a middle position between the tent of the wanderer — so transitory as to furnish an image of the sudden termination of life (Is. xxxviii. 12) — and the settled, permanent, town.

As a proper name it appears in the A. V. —

1. In the plural, HAZERIM, and HAZEROTH, for which see below.

2. In the slightly different form of HAZOR.

3. In composition with other words, giving a special designation to the particular "village" intended. When thus in union with another word the name is Hazar (Chatzar). The following are the places so named, and it should not be overlooked that they are all in the wilderness itself, or else quite on the confines of civilized country: —

1. HAZAR-AD'DAR (תָּזֵר-אָדָד: Παπαίαν Αράδ, Σαράδα: Alex. Αν' Σαραία: Villa nomine Ador, Adhler), a place named as one of the landmarks on the southern boundary of the land promised to Israel between Kadesh-barnea and Azion (Num. xxxiv. 4). In the specification of the south boundary of the country actually possessed (Josh. xv. 3), the name appears in the shorter form of Addar (A. V. Aadar), and an additional place is named on each side of it. The site of Hazar-addar does not appear to have been encountered in modern times.

The LXX. reading might lead to the belief that Hazar-addar was identical with Addar, a Canaan-
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HAZER-TAMAR
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Simeon in 1 Chr. iv. 31, with the express statement that they existed before and up to the time of David. This appears to invalidate Professor Stanley's suggestion (6, p. 160) that they were the depots for the trade with Egypt in chariots and horses, which commenced in the reign of Solomon. Still, it is difficult to know to what else to ascribe the names of places situated, as these were, in the Bedouin country, where a chariot must have been unknown, and where even horses soon carefully excluded from the possessions of the inhabitants—"canaan, sheep, oxen, and asses" (1 Sam. xxvii. 9). In truth the difficulty arises only on the assumption that the names are Hebrew, and that they are to be interpreted accordingly. It would cease if we could believe them to be in the former language of the country, adopted by the Hebrews, and so altered as to bear a meaning in Hebrew. This is exactly the process which the Hebrew names have in their turn undergone from the Arabs, and is in fact one which is well known to have occurred in all languages, though not yet recognized in the particular case of the early local names of Palestine.

1. HAZER [מֶזֶר], "village of horses": 'Homerowenin, as if ממר; [Vat. Haro- rob (cf. Eneas); Alex. Haro- Eneas)] Humesunin, the form under which the preceding name appears in the list of the towns of Simeon in 1 Chr. iv. 31.

HAZERIM. The Avvim, or more accurately the Avvim, a tribe commemorated in a fragment of very ancient history, as the early inhabitants of the southwestern portion of Palestine, are therein said to have lived in the villages (A. V. "Avvarin", "Avvarin, [O. a. Avaroin]; Alex. Ave- rum: B. B. ii. 23), before their expulsion by the Caphtorites. The word is the plural of "Avvar", noticed above, and as far as we can now appreciate the significance of the term, it implies that the Avvim were a wandering tribe who had retained in their new locality the transitory form of encampment of their original desert-life.

HAZEROTH [מֶזֶר עוֹרָת], "stations, camping grounds": 'Avaroin: [In Deut., Avvaron: Hazeron;] Num. xi. 25, xii. 16, xxvii. 17, Deut. i. 1), a station of the Israelites in the desert, mentioned next to Kilkath-Hattasah, and perhaps recognized in the Arabic al-,' the encampment near Hithra (Robinson, i. 151; Stanley, S. P. F. pp. 81, 82), which lies about eighteen hours' distance from Sinai on the road to the Akaba. The word appears to mean the sort of mixed-used villages in which the Bedouin were found to congregate. [HAZERIN.]

II. HAZERON-TAMAR, and HAZ ASON-TAMAR [מֶזֶר אוֹנ תָּמָר], but in Chron. מֶזֶר אוֹנ תָּמָר [prob. set place of palms, palm-wood, Diri.: stress of palms, palm-forest, First: 4. A'araw, or A'arow (for A'araw); Alex. A'araw: Vat. in 2 Chr. A'arow (A'arow); Alex. A'araw, A'araw)], the name under which, as a very early period of the history of Palestine, and where the Hebrew is Hazaron, they have Hazon, and the opposite in Chronicles.

a The translators of the A. V. have curiously reversed the two variations of the name. In Genesis,
HAZIEL

n a document believed by many to be the oldest of all these early records, we first hear of the place which afterwards became EN-GEDI. The Amorites were dwelling at Hazazon-Tamar when the four kings made their incursion, and fought their successful battle with the five (Gen. xiv. 7). The name occurs only once again in the records of the reign of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xx. 2)—when he is warned of the approach of the horde of Ammonites, Moabites, Meunim, and men of Mount Seir, whom he afterwards so completely destroyed, and who were no doubt pursuing thus far exactly the same route as the Assyrians had done a thousand years before them. Here the explanation, "which is En-gedi," is added. The existence of the earlier application, after En-gedi had been so long in use, is a remarkable instance of the tenacity of these old oriental names, of which more modern instances are frequent. See ACCIO, BETHSAIAD, etc.

Hazazon-tamar is interpreted in Hebrew to mean the "pruning or felling of the palm" (Gesen. Thes. p. 512). Jerome (Quest. in Gen.) renders it urbs palmarum. This interpretation of the name is borne out by the ancient reputation of the palms of En-gedi as those of En-gedi, xxiv. 14, and the citations from Pliny, given under that name. The Samaritan Version has יִֽבְרֹל־גֵּדִֽי יִֽמְלָלֶּֽי as the Valley of Cadi, possibly a corruption of En-gedi. The Targums have En-gedi.

Perhaps this was the "city of palm trees" (In-kat-temarim) out of which the Kenites, the tribe of Moses' father-in-law, went up into the wilderness of Judah, after the conquest of the country (Judg. i. 18). If this were so, the allusion of Balaam to the Kenite (Num. xxiv. 21) is at once explained. Standing as he was on one of the lofty points of the highlands opposite Jericho, the western shore of the Dead Sea as far as En-gedi would be before him, and the cliffs in the clefts of which the Kenites had fixed their secure "nest," would be a prominent object in the view. This has been already alluded to by Professor Stanley (S. d. P., p. 225, n. 4).

HAZIEL [יהַזְיֶל] [El's (God's) beholding]

Izebel; [Vat. Euseb.]: Alex. ΄Αξεβ: Haseih, A Levi in the time of king David, of the family of Shimeii or Shimi, the younger branch of the Geresbonites (1 Chron. xxiii. 9).

HAZO [חָזָו] [look, visibility, Furst.]: ΄Αξόα, a son of Nahor, by Milcah his wife (Gen. xxi. 22): perhaps, says Genesisi, for לְצָו, "a vision." The name is unknown, and the settlement of the descendants of Hazo cannot be ascertained. The only clue is to be found in the identification of Hazor, moth. of Sheshai, and he be other of the sons of Sheshai and hence he must, in all likelihood, be placed in Ur of the Chaldees, or the adjacent countries. Bunsen (Biblekern, i. pt. 2, p. 49) suggests Chasene by the Euphrates, in Mesopotamia, or the Chasene in Assyria (Strabo, xvi. p. 736).

E. S. P.

HAZOR [חָזָר] [enclosure, castle]: ΄Ασόα: [Alex. in 1 K. ix. 15, ΄Ασόα]: ΄Ασορ, [Hazor].

I. A fortified city, which on the occupation of the country was allotted to Naphtali (Josh. xix. 36). Its position was apparently between Ramah and Kedesh (Josh. xii. 19), on the high ground overlooking the Lake of Merom (ἐμπροσθεν τῆς Σωματιδίου λίμνης, Joseph. Ant. v. 5, § 1). There is no reason for supposing it a different place from that of which Jabin was king (Josh. xi. 1), both when Joshua gained his signal victory over the northern confederation, and when Deborah and Barak routed his general Sisera (Judg. iv. 2, 17; 6, 34; ix. 10). It was the principal city of the whole of the North Palatinate, "the head of all those kingdoms" (Josh. xi. 10, and see Onomasticon, Asor). Like the other strong places of that part, it stood on an eminence (טִּיר, Josh. xi. 3, 13, A. V. "strength"); but the district around must have been on the whole flat, and suitable for the manoeuvres of the "very many" chariots and horses which formed part of the forces of the king of Hazor and his confederates (Josh. iv. 6, 9; Judg. iv. 3). Hazor was the only one of those northern cities which was burnt by Joshua; doubtless it was too strong and important to leave standing in his rear. Whether it was rebuilt by the men of Naphtali, or by the second Jabin (Judg. i.), we are not told, but Sebaan of Sisera did not seem so important a post, and the fortification of Hazor, Megido, and Gezer, the points of defense for the entrance from Syria and Assyria, the plain of Esdraelon, and the great maritime lowland respectively, was one of the chief pretexts for his levy of taxes (1 K. xv. 13). Later still it is mentioned in the list of the towns and districts whose inhabitants were carried off to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (2 K. xiv. 20; Joseph. Ant. xi. 11, § 1). We encounter it once more in 1 Mac. xi. 7, where Jonathan, after encamping for the night at the "water of Genesar," advances to the "plain of Asor" (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 9, § 7; the Greek text of the Maccabees has prefixed an ο to the preceding word τέρανος: A. V. Naser) to meet Demetrius, who was in possession of Kadesh (xi. 63; Joseph. as above). [NASOR.]

Several places bearing names probably derived from ancient Hazors have been discovered in this district. A list will be found in Rob. iii. 316, note (and compare also Van de Velde, Syr. and Ptol. ii. 178; Porter's Anc. ii. 304). But none of them are more likely to answer to the requirements of this Hazor. The nearest is the site suggested by Dr. Robinson, namely, Tell Khirbat, "the ruins," which, though without any direct evidence of name or tradition in its favor, is so suitable, in its situation on a rocky eminence, and in its proximity both to Kedesh and the Lake Huleh, that we may accept it until a better is discovered (Rob. iii. 304, 315).

* The ruins of a large city of very ancient date have recently been found about two miles southeast of Kedesh (Kedesh, 3), on an isolated hill called Tell Harah. The walls of the citadel and a portion of the city walls are distinctly traceable. Captain Wilson, of the Palestine Exploring Expedition, inclines to regard this place as the site of the Bile Hazor (Josh. xix. 35), instead of Tell Khirbat (See Journ. of Soer. Literature, April, 1806, p. 245). It is not far from the ancient city of Mezon or any similar one, still adheres to the locality. Thomson proposes Hozere or Hozbey as the site of this Hazor, northwest of the Huleh (Merom), and in the centre of the mountainous region which overhangs that lake: the ruins are very extensive as well as ancient, and a living tradition among the Arabs supports this claim (see Land and Book, i 439). R. Robinson objects to this identification that it
HEAD-BANDS
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The Hebrews do not appear to have regarded a covering for the head as an essential article of dress. The earliest notice we have of such a thing is in connection with the aceribolata vestments, and in this case it is described as an ornamental appendage "for glory and for beauty" (Ex. xxviii. 40). The absence of any allusion to a head-dress in passages where we should expect to meet with it, as in the trial of jealousy (Num. v. 18), and the regulations regarding the leper (Lev. xiii. 45), in both of which the "uncovering of the head" refers undoubtedly to the hair, leads to the inference that it was not ordinarily worn in the Mosaic age, and this is confirmed by the practice, frequently alluded to, of covering the head with the mantle. Even in after times it seems to have been reserved especially for purposes of ornament: thus the taliykh (חַנֵית) is noticed as being worn by nobles (Josh. xix. 14), ladies (Is. iii. 23), and kings (Is. iii. 3), while the pe'er (פָּרֶח) was an article of holiday dress (Is. lix. 3; A. V. "beauty"); Ex. xxxiv. 23), and was worn at weddings (Is. lix. 10): the use of the mitpah was restricted to similar occasions (Jud. xvi. 8; 1 Sam. v. 2). The former of these terms undoubtedly describes a kind of turban: its primary sense (חַנֵית) "to roll around") expresses the folds of linen round round the head, and its form probably resembled that of the high-priest's mitzvapth (a word derived from the same root, and identified in meaning, for in Zech. iii. 5, taliykh = mitzvapth), as described by Josephus (Ant. iii. 7, § 3). The renderings of the term in the A. V., "hood" (Is. lix. 23), "diadem" (Job xxix. 14; Is. lix. 3), "mitre" (Zech. iii. 5), do not convey the right idea of its meaning. The other term, pe'er, primarily means an ornament, and is so rendered in the A. V. (Is. lix. 10; see also ver. 3, "beauty"), and is specifically applied to the head-dress from its ornamental character. It is uncertain what the term properly describes: the modern turban consists of two parts, the konik, a stiff, round cap occasionally rising to a considerable height, and the shork, a long piece of muslin wound about it (Russell, Aleppo, i. 104): Josephus' account of the high-priest's

Modern Syrian and Egyptian Head-dresses.

head-dress implies a similar construction; for he says that it was made of thick bands of linen doubled round many times, and sewn together: the whole covered by a piece of fine linen to conceal the seams. Sackshitz ( Archaeol. i. 27, note) says
HEAD-DRESS

gests that the tzānîykh and the peîr represent the shāsh and the ko’dos, the latter rising high above the other, and so the most prominent and striking feature. In favor of this explanation it may be remarked that the peîr is more particularly connected with the niqūbaḥ, the high cap of the ordinary priests, in Ex. xxix. 28, while the tzānîykh, as we have seen, resembled the high-priest’s mitre, in which the cap was concealed by the linen folds. The objection, however, to this explanation is that the etymological force of peîr is not brought out: may not that term have applied to the jewels and other ornaments with which the turban is frequently decorated (Russell, i. 106), some of which are represented in the accompanying illustration borrowed from Lane’s Mod. Egypt. Appendix A. The term used for putting on either the tzānîykh or the

Modern Egyptian Head-dresses. (Lana.)

peîr is שָׁשָׂן, “to bind round” (Ex. xxix. 9; Lev. viii. 13): hence the words in Ez. xvi. 10, “I girded thee about with fine linen,” are to be understood of the turban; and by the use of the same term Jonah (ii. 5) represents the weeds wrapped as a turban round his head. The turban as now worn in the East varies very much in shape; the most prevalent forms are shown in Russell’s Alaya, i. 102.

If the tzānîykh and the peîr were reserved for holiday attire, it remains for us to inquire whether any and what covering was ordinarily worn over the head. It appears that frequently the robes supplied the place of a head-dress, being so ample that they might be thrown over the head at pleasure: the ru’dîl and the tālîykh at all events were so used [Dress], and the veil served a similar purpose. [Veil.] The ordinary head-dress of the Bedouin consists of the kēfîyeh, a square handkerchief, generally of red and yellow cotton, or cotton and silk, folded so that three of the corners hang down across the back and shoulders, leaving the face exposed, and bound round the head by a cord (Barekhard, Notes, i. 48). It is not improbable that a similar covering was used by the Hebrews on certain occasions; the “kerchief” in Ex. xiii. 18, has been so understood by some writers (Harmer, Observations, ii. 303), though the word more probably refers to a species of veil; and the gμισθίνιον (Acts xix. 12, A V. “apron”), as explained by Suidas (τὸ κεφαλὴς φόρημα), was applicable to the purposes of a head-dress. [Handkerchief.] Neither of these cases, however, supplies positive evidence on the point, and the general absence of allusions leads to the inference that the head was usually uncovered, as is still the case in many parts of Arabia (Wellsted, Travels, i. 74).

The introduction of the Greek hat (μετακρατήριον) by Jason, as an article of dress adapted to the gymnasion, was regarded as a national dishonor (2 Mace. iv. 12); in shape and material the pomeios very much resembled the common felt hats of this country (Dicts. of Ant. art. Pilum).


HEARTH

The Assyrian head-dress is described in Ez. xxiii. 15 under the terms מַעֲלָה תַּנְיֵק; “excelling in dyed attire;” it is doubtful, however, whether מַעֲלָה describes the colored material of the head-dress (inveva a dolorious quibus tintae sint); another sense has been assigned to it more appropriate to the description of a turban (fascis orendi, Ges. Thes. p. 542). The term sâraḥî [סָרָהִי] expresses the flowing character of the Eastern head-dress, as it falls down over the back (Layard, Nineveh, ii. 308). The word rendered “hats” in Dan. iii. 21 ([vertex] properly applies to a cloak.

W. L. B.

HEARTH.

1. מַעֲלָה: כִּפְרָה: uraba (Ges. 69), a pot or brazier for containing fire. 2. מָרַל: קַשָּׁן; f.: קַשָּׁן, a pot or brazier (Ges. p. 620). 3. מָרַל, or מִלַּה (Zech. xii. 6). מָרַל: καύσος; in dual, מָרַל (Lev. xii. 35): χυμβόλων: χυμβολίων; A. V. “ranges for pots” (Ges. p. 672).

One way of baking, much practiced in the East, is to place the dough on an iron plate, either laid on, or supported on legs, and, after being sunk in the ground, which forms the oven. This plate or “hearth” is in Arabic طَبْقَة, a word which has probably passed into Greek in ὑγνας. The cakes baked on the “hearth” (Gen. xviii. 8 ἡγνας, subgeneris panes) were probably baked in the existing Bedouin manner, on hot stones covered with ashes. The “hearth” of King Jeholakin’s winter palace, Jer. xxxvi. 29, was possibly a pan or brazier of charcoal. (Barekhard, Notes on Bed. i. 58; P. della Valle, Viaggi, i. 437; Harmer, Obs. i. p. 477, and note; Ranwold, Travels, ap. Ray, ii. 103; Shaw, Travels, p. 231; Niebuhr,
HEATH (חַדְרָךְ, 'arōrēr, and חַדְרֶיךְ, 'arārē; see also Gk. ἱππόμηχος, ὠς ἵππος: myrican).

The prophet Jeremiah compares the man "who maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord," to the "'arōrēr" in the desert (xviii. 6). Again, in the judgment of Moab (xlviii. 6), to her inhabitants it is said, "'Flee, save your lives, and be like the 'arōrē in the wilderness," where the margin has "a naked tree." There seems no reason to doubt Celsius' conclusion (Hircib. ii. 195).

The 'arōrēr is identical with the 'arār of Arabic writers, which is some species of juniper. Robinson (Bib. Res. ii. 125, 6) states that when he was in the pass of Nemech he observed juniper trees (Arab. 'ar'or') on the porphyry rocks above. The berries, he adds, have the appearance and taste of the common juniper except that there is more of the aroma of the pine. "These trees were ten or fifteen feet in height, and hung upon the rocks even to the summits of the cliffs and needles." This appears to be the Juniperus Scabiana or savin, with small scale-like leaves, which are pressed close to the stem, and which is described as being a gloomy-looking bush inhabiting the most sterile soil (see English Cyc. N. Hist. iii. 311); a character which is obviously well suited to the naked or destitute tree spoken of by the prophet. Rosenmüller's explanation of the Hebrew word, which is also adopted by Maurer, "qui destitutus versatur" (Schol. ad loc. xlvii. 6), is very unsatisfactory.

Not to mention the trueness of the comparison, it is evidently contradicted by the antithesis in ver. 8: "Cursed is he that trusteth in man ... he shall be like the juniper that grows on the bare rocks of the desert." The word used is the same as is used in the O.T. (Ps. lxxx. 13; Jer. vii. 24), and is the name "of a shrub growing by a hilly road," and a Hebrew district (Godet, Thes. p. 170, 4) of the same desert. But the contrast between the shrub of the arid desert and the tree growing by the waters is very striking. It is as if the Hebrew writer were contrasting the desert in its depression appearing to us to spoil the whole. Even more unsatisfactory is Michaelis (Comm. Lev. Heb. p. 1971), who thinks "guineas hen" (Xmundē melanoria) are intended! Gesenius (Thek. p. 1073, 4) understands these two Heb. terms to denote "parrinetis, adjutca eversa" (ruins); but it is more in accordance with the Scriptural passages to suppose that some tree is intended, which explanation, moreover, has the sanction of the LXX and Vulgate, and of the modern use of a kindred Arabic word.

W. II.

HEATHEN. The Hebrew words גוי, גויים, together with their Greek equivalents ἐθνος, ἔθνη, have been somewhat arbitrarily rendered "nations," "gentiles," and "heathen" in the A. V. It will be interesting to trace the manner in which a term, primarily and essentially general in its signification, acquired that more restricted sense which was afterwards attached to it. Its development is parallel with that of the Hebrew people, and its meaning at any period may be taken as significant of their relative position with regard to the surrounding nations.

a From the root חַדְרָךְ, "to be naked," in allusion to the bare nature of the rocks on which the Juniperus

2. But, even in early Jewish times, the term גויים received by anticipation a significance of Sabines often grows. Comp. Ps. cxii. 17, בְּרֵאשֵׁית הַגָּן. ἐθνος is "the prayer of the destitute" (or lit. clai)
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sider range than the national experience (Lev. xxvi. 39, 58; Deut. xxx. 1), and as the latter was gradually developed during the prosperous times of the monarchy, the goyin were the surrounding nations generally, with whom the Israelites were brought into contact by the extension of their commerce, and whose idolatrous practices they readily adopted (Ezr. x. 24; Am. v. 26). Later still, it is applied to the Babylonians who took Jerusalem (Neh. v. 8; Ps. lxxx. 1, 6, 10), to the destroyers of Moab (Isa. xvi. 8), and to the several nations among whom the Jews were scattered during the Captivity (Ps. cvi. 47; Jer. xvi. 28; Lam. i. 3, &c.), the practice of idolatry still being their characteristic distinction (Is. xxxvi. 18; Jer. x. 2, 3, xiv. 22). This significance it retained after the return from Babylon, though it was used in a more limited sense as denoting the mixed race of colonists who settled in Palestine during the Captivity (Neh. v. 17), and who are described as fearing Jehovah, while serving their own gods (2 K. xvii. 20-33; Eze. vi. 21).

Tracing the synonymous term ἐβραῖος through the Apocryphal writings, we find that it is applied to the nations around Palestine (1 Mac. i. 11), including the Syrians and Philistines of the army of Gergesia (Mac. iii. 41, iv. 7, 11, 14), as well as the people of Ptolemæis, Tyre, and Sidon (1 Mac. v. 9, 10, 15). They were image-worshippers (1 Mac. iii. 48; Wisd. xvi. 15), whose customs and fashions the Jews seem still to have had an unceasing propensity to imitate, but on whom they were bound by national tradition to take vengeance (1 Mac. ii. 68; 1 Esdr. vii. 83). Following the customs of the goyin at this period the denoted the neglect or contempt of circumcision (1 Mac. i. 15), disregard of sacrifices, profanation of the Sabbath, eating of swine’s flesh and meat offered to idols (2 Mac. vi. 6-9, 18, xvi. 2, 2), and adoption of the Greek national games (2 Mac. iv. 12, 14). In all points Judaism and heathenism are strongly contrasted. The “barbarous multitude” in 2 Mac. ii. 21 are opposed to those who played the man for Judaism, and the distinction now becomes an ecclesiastical one (comp. Matt. xviii. 17). In 2 Esdr. iii. 33, 34, the “gentes” are defined as those “qui habitant in seculo.” (comp. Matt. vii. 32; Luke xii. 30).

As the Greek influence became more extensively felt in Asia Minor, and the Greek language was generally used, Hellenism and heathenism became convertible terms, and a Greek was synonymous with a foreigner of any nation. This is singularly evident in the Syriac of 2 Mac. v. 9, 10, 13; cf. John vii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 32; 2 Mac. xii. 2. In the N. T. again we find various shades of meaning attached to ἐβραῖος. In its narrowest sense it is opposed to “those of the circumcision” (Acts x. 45; cf. Eph. vii. 13, where ἐβραῖοι = ἀρχαῖοι ταπαροῖ), and is contrasted with Israel, the people of Jehovah (Luke ii. 32), thus representing the Hebrew goyin at one stage of its history. But, like goyin, it also denotes the people of the earth generally (Acts xvii. 26; Gal. iii. 14). In Matt. v. 7 ἀθροίζομαι is applied to an idolater.

But, in addition to its significance as an etymological term, ἐβραῖος had a moral sense which must not be overlooked. In Ps. ix. 5, 15, 17 (comp. Ez. vii. 21) the word stands in parallelism with ἁρίδω, the wicked, as distinguished by his moral obliquity (see Hupfeld on Ps. i. 1); and in ver. 17 the people thus designated are described as “forgetters of God,” that know not Jehovah (Jer. x. 25). Again in Ps. lx. 5 it is to some extent commensurate in meaning with תְּרֵיִים, bīyīdî āvën, “iniquitous transgressors;” and in these passages, as well as in Ps. x. 16, it has a deeper significance than that of a merely national distinction, although the latter idea is never entirely lost sight of.

In later Jewish literature a technical definition of the word is laid down which is certainly not of universal fixation. Elias Levi (quoted by Eisenmenger, "Entleuchteter Palästina," II. 480) explains the sing. goy as denoting one who is not of Israelitish birth. This can only have reference to its after significance: in the O. T. the singular is never used of an individual, but is a collective term, applied equally to the Israelites (Josh. iii. 17) as to the nations of Canaan (Lev. xxi. 33), and denotes simply a body politic. Another distinction, equally unsupported, is made between מַנְדָא, goyim, and גוֹיֶנִים, umanim, the former being defined as the nations who had served Israel, while the latter were those who had not (Jalilax Chafoth, fol. 20, no. 29; Eisenmenger, l. 667). Avarband on Joel iii. 2 applies the former to both Christians and Turks, or Ishmaelites, while in Sepher Jesudia (fol. 148, col. 2) the Christians alone are distinguished by this appellation. Eisenmenger gives some curious examples of the disabilities under which a goy labore. One who kept sabbaths was judged deserving of death (ib. 206), and the study of the law was prohibited to him under the same penalty; but on the latter point the doctors are at issue (ib. 209).

W. A. W.

HEAVEN. There are four Hebrew words thus rendered in the O. T., which we may briefly notice. 1. גוֹיֶנִים (נָטַרָם בָּאוּתָם; Luth. 130), a solid expance, from פָּזָל, “to beat out;” a word used primarily of the hammering out of metal (Ex. xxxix. 3, Num. xvi. 38). The fuller expression is בְּגֵי גוֹיֶנִים (Gen. i. 14 f.). That Moses understood it to mean a solid expance is clear from his representing it as the barrier between the upper and lower waters (Gen. i. 6 f.), i. e. as separating the reservoir of the celestial ocean (Ps. ciii. 22, xxxi. 3) from the waters of the earth, or those on which the earth was supposed to float (Ps. cxxxvi. 6). Through its open lattices (ברֵס בְּגֵי בּוֹז) Gen. vii. 11; 2 K. vii. 2, 19; comp. κόσμος, Aristoph. Nub. 373 or doors (ברֵס בְּגֵי בּוֹז, Ps. lxxxviii. 23) the dew and snow and hail are poured upon the earth (Job xxxviii. 22, 37, where we have the curious expression “bottles of heaven,” “utras coeli”). This firm vault, which Job describes as being “strong as a molten looking-glass” (xxxvii. 18), is transparent, like pellicid sapphire, and splendid as crystal (Dan. xii. 3; Ex. xxxiv. 10; Ez. i. 22; Rev. iv. 6), over which rests the throne of God (Is. lxvi. 1; Ez. i. 26), and which is opened for the descent of angels, or for prophetic visions (Gen. xxviii. 17; Ez. i. 1; Acts vii. 56, x. 11). In it, like gems or golden lamps, the stars are fixed to give light to the earth, and regulate the seasons (Gen. i. 14-19); and the whole magnificent, im-
measurable structure (Jer. xxxi. 37) is supported by the mountains as its pillars, or strong foundations (Ps. xviii. 7; 2 Sam. xxii. 8; Job xxxv. 11). Similarly the Greeks believed in an οὐρανός τούλαχιστον (Hom. II. v. 504), or σιδήρος (Hom. Od. xii. 328), or άδάμαστος (Orph. Hymno. ad Ceadum), which the philosophers called στέρεωμαν, or κρυστάλλοις (Emped. ap. Plat. de Phil. Phys. ii. 11; Arntz. ap. Sen Nat. Quest. vii. 13; quoted by Gessius, s. v.) It is clear that very many of the above notions were mere metaphors resulting from the simple primitive conception, and that later writers among the Hebrews had arrived at more scientific views, although of course they retained much of the old phraseology, and are fluctuating and undecided in their terms. Elsewhere, for instance, the heavens are likened to a curtain (Ps. civ. 2; Is. xl. 22). In A. V. "heaven" and "heavens" are used to render not only לְוָה and לְוָה, but also לְוָה, לְוָה, and לְוָה, for which reason we have thrown together under the former word the chief features ascribed by the Jewish writers to this portion of the universe. [FIRMAMENT, Auer. ed.]

2. לְוָה is derived from לְו, "to be high." This is the word used in the expression "the heaven and the earth," or "the upper and lower regions" (Gen. i, 1), which was a periphrasis to supply the want of a single word for the Cosmos (Deut. xxxii. 1; Is. i. 2; Ps. cxviii. 13). "Heaven of heavens" is their expression of infinity (Neh. ix. 6; Ecles. xvi. 18).

3. לְוָה is used for heaven in Ps. xviii. 16; Jer. xxxvi. 39; Is. xiv. 18. Properly speaking it means a mountain, as in Ps. ciii. 19, Ez. xviii. 23. It must not, however, be supposed for a moment that the Hebrews had any notion of a "Mountain of Meeting," like Mount Ararat, the northern hill of Babylonian mythology (Is. xiv. 13), or the Greek Ουρανος, or the Hindoo Meru, the Chinese K'uen-lun, or the Arabian "Ush" (see Kalisch, Gen. p. 24, and the authorities there quoted), since such a fancy is incompatible with the pure monotheism of the Old Testament.

4. לְוָה, "expanses," with reference to the extent of heaven, as the last two words were derived from its height; hence this word is often used together with לְוָה, as in Deut. xxxiii. 26; Job xxxv. 5. In the L. V. it is sometimes renderedcampo, for which the fuller term is סִפְרָם (Ps. xviii. 12). The word לְוָה means first "to pound," and then "to wear out." So that, according to some, "clouds" (from the notion of dust) is the original meaning of the word. Gessius, however, rejects this opinion (Theo. s. v.).

In the N. T. we frequently have the word οὐράνιον, which some consider to be a Hebrewism, or a plural of excellence (Schleusner, Lex. Nor. Test. s. v.). St. Paul's expression εις τρίτον οὐράνιον (2 Cor. xi. 2) has led to much conjecture. Gregory says that the Jews divided the heaven into three parts, namely, (1.) Nubiferum, the air or atmosphere, where clouds gather. (2.) Astriferum, the firmament, in which the sun, moon, and stars are fixed. (3.) Empyreum, or Angeliferum, the upper heaven, the abode of God and his angels, i. e. 1.

*HEAVE-OFFERING. [SACRIFICE.]

HEBER. The Heb. לְוָה and לְוָה are more forcibly distinguished than the English Eber and Heber. In its use, however, of this merely aspirate distinction the A. V. of the O. T. is consistent: Eber always = לְוָה, and Heber = לְוָה. In Luke iii. 35, Heber = Eber, kai ἔβρις; the distinction so carefully observed in the O. T. having been neglected by the translators of the N. T.

The LXX. has a similar distinction, though not consistently carried out. It expresses לְוָה by ἐβριον (Gen. ii. 21), Eber (1 Chr. i. 25), ἔβριον (Num. xxiv. 21); while לְוָה is variously given as אֵבָר, אֵבָר, אֵבָר, or אֵבָר. In these words, however, we can clearly perceive two distinct groups of equivalents, suggested by the effort to express two radically different forms. The transition from אֵבָר through אֵבָר to אֵבָר is sufficiently obvious.

The Vulg. expresses both indifferently by Heber except in Judg. iv. 17 where Haber is probably
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After the LXX. Xαβρή; and Num. xxiv. 24, Hebrews, evidently after the LXX. Ἐβραῖος. Excluding Luke iii. 35, where Heber = Eber, we have in the O. T. six of the name.

1. Grandson of the Patriarch Asher (Gen. xlvii. 17). [Vat. Langu. 1 Chr. vii. 31; Num. xxxvii. 7.]

2. The tribe of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 18). [Of the tribe of Judah (Ch. iv. 18).]

3. [Xαβρή is: Alex. Ιαβρή; Comp. *Ἐβρή: Heber.] A Gadite (1 Chr. v. 13). [Of the tribe of Judah (Ch. iv. 18).]

4. A Benjaminite (1 Chr. viii. 17). [Of the tribe of Judah (Ch. iv. 18).]

5. [Xαβρή is: Vat. Οβρή; Ald. *Ἀβρή: Heber.] Another Benjaminite (1 Chr. viii. 22). [Of the tribe of Judah (Ch. iv. 18).]

6. Heber, the Kenite, the husband of Jebel (Judg. iv. 11–17, v. 24). It is a question how he could be a Kenite, and yet trace his descent from Hobah, or Jethra, who was priest of Midian. The solution is probably to be sought in the nomadic habits of the tribe, as shown in the case of Heber himself, of the family to which he belonged (Judg. i. 16), and of the Kenites generally (in 1 Sam. xv. 6, they appear among the Amalekites). It should be observed that Jethro is never called a Midianite, but expressly a Kenite (Judg. i. 10); that the expression "a priest of Midian," may merely serve to indicate the country in which Jethro resided; lastly, that there would seem to have been two successive migrations of the Kenites into Palestine, one under the sanction of the tribe of Judah at the time of the original occupation, and attributed to Jethro's descendants generally (Judg. i. 16); the other a special, nomadic expedition of Heber's family, which led them to Kadesh in Naphtali, at that time the debatable ground between the northern tribes, and Judah, King of Canaan. We are not to infer that this was the final settlement of Heber: a tent seems to have been his sole habitation when his wife smote Sisera (Judg. iv. 21).

7. (Ἑβρή: Heber.) The form in which the name of the patriarch Eber is given in the genealogy. Luke iii. 35. T. E. B.

HEBERITES. THE (יֵּבְרִי: Ḥ Xαβרִי [Vat. πέρι: Heberiue). Descendants of Heber, a branch of the tribe of Asher (Num. xxvi. 45).

W. A. W.

*HEBREW LANGUAGE. See SHENIAC LANGUAGES, §§ 6–13.

HEBREWS, HE'BREWS. This word first occurs as applied to Abraham (Gen. xiv. 13): it was afterwards given as a name to his descendants. Four derivations have been proposed:—

I. Patronymic from Abram.

II. Appellative from יברי.

III. Appellative from יבריה.

IV. Patronymic from Eber.

I. From Abram, Abraham, and by euphony Hebrei (August., Ambrose). Displaying, as it does, the utmost ignorance of the language, this derivation was never extensively adopted, and was even retracted by Augustine (Retracct. 16). The euphony alleged by Ambrose is quite imperceptible, and there is no parallel in the Lat. meridie = meridian.

II. יברי, from יבר = 'crossed over,' applied by the Canaanites to Abraham upon his crossing the Euphrates (Gen. xiv. 13, where LXX. καταφέρει = transitur'. This derivation is open to be strong objection that Hebrew nouns ending in are either patronymics, or gentile nouns (Lux-

torfe, Lusden). This is a technical objection which, though fatal to the καταφέρει, or appellatives, derivation as traced back to the verb, does not apply to the same as referred to the noun יבר. The analogy of Galli, Angli, Spani, from Gallin, Anglia, Hispania (Lusden), is a complete blunder in etymology; and at any rate it would confirm rather than destroy the derivation from the noun.

III. This latter comes next in review, and is essentially the same with II.; since both rest upon the assumption that Abraham and his posterity were called Hebrews in order to express a distinction between the races E. and W. of the Euphrates. The question of fact is not essential whether Abraham was the first person to whom the word was applied, his posterity as such inheriting the name; or whether his posterity equally with himself were by the Canaanites regarded as men from "the other side" of the river. The real question at issue is whether the Hebrews were so called from a progenitor Eber (which is the fourth and last derivation), or from a country which had been the cradle of their race, and from which they had emigrated westward into Palestine; in short, whether the word Hebrew is a patronymic, or a gentile noun.

IV. The latter opinion in one or other of its phases indicated above is that suggested by the LXX., and maintained by Jerome, Theodoret, Orig., Chrysost., Alciat Montanus, B. Bechaj, Paul Burg., Müntzer, Grotius, Scholiag, Soden, Rosenmu., Gesen., Eichhorn: the former is supported by Jo-

sep., Suidas, Bochart, Vat., Drusius, Vossius, Buxtorf, Hottiinger, Lusden, Whiston, Bauer. As regards the derivation from יברי, the noun (or according to others the prep.), Lusden himself, the great supporter of the Buxtorfian theory, indicates the obvious analogy of Transmarini, Trans-

sylvania, Transalpini, words which from the description of a fixed and local relation attained in process of time to the independence and mobility of a gentile name. So natural indeed is it to suppose that Eber (trans, on the other side) was the term used here in Palestine to denote the coun-

try E. of the Euphrates, and Hebrew the name which he applied to the inhabitants of that country, that Lusden is driven to stake the entire issue as between derivations III. and IV. upon a challenge to produce any passage of the O. T. in which יבר = יבר; יבר. If we accept Ro-

sean, Schol. on Num. xxiv. 24, according to which Eber by parallelism with Assur = Trans-Euphratian, this challenge is met. But if not, the fac-

ility of the abbreviation is sufficient to create a presumption in its favor; while the derivation with which it is associated harmonizes more perfectly than any other with the later usage of the word Hebrew, and is confirmed by negative arguments of the strongest kind. In fact it seems almost impossible for the defenders of the patronymic Eber theory to get over the difficulty arising from the circumstance that no special prominence is in the genealogy assigned to Eber, such as might entitle him to the position of head or founder of the race. From the genealogical scheme in Gen. xi. 10–26, it does not appear that the Jews thought of any common source primary, or even secondary, of the national descent. The genealogy neither starts from him, nor in its uniform sequence does it rest.
upon him with any emphasis. There is nothing to distinguish Eber above Arphaxad, Peleg, or Serug. Like them is he but a link in the chain by which Shem is connected with Abraham. Indeed the tendency of the Israelitish retrospect is to stop at Jacob. It is with Jacob that their history as a nation begins; beyond Jacob they held their ancestry in common with the Edomites; beyond Isaac they were in danger of being confounded with the Ishmaelites. The predominant figure of the eminently Hebrew Abraham might tempt them beyond those points of affinity with other races, so distasteful, so anti-national; but it is almost inconceivable that they would voluntarily originate, and perpetuate an appellation of themselves which landed them on a platform of ancestry where they met the whole population of Arabia (Gen. x. 25, 30).

As might have been expected, an attempt has been made to show that the position which Eber occupies in the genealogy is one of no ordinary kind, and that the Hebrews stood in a relation to him which was held by none other of his descendants, and might therefore be called per excellence "the children of Eber." But this inference is easily false, for Eber is only one passage in which it is possible to imagine any peculiar resting-point as connected with the name of Eber. In Gen. x. 21 Shem is called "the father of all the children of Eber." But the passage is apparently not so much genealogical as etymological; and in this view it seems evident that the words are intended to contrast Shem with Ham and Japheth, and especially with the former. Now Babel is plainly fixed as the extreme limit of the posterity of Ham (ver. 11), while that of Nimrod or Eber was not limited in country, though with the name of A-V. in the next place, Egypt (ver. 13) is mentioned as the W. limit of the same great race; and these two extremes having been ascertained, the historian proceeds (ver. 15-19) to fill up his etymographic sketch with the intermediate tribes of the Canaanites. In short, in ver. 6-20, we have indications of three geographical points which distinguish the posterity of Ham, namely, Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. At the last-mentioned city, at the river Euphrates, their proper occupancy, unaffected by the exceptional movement of Assur, terminated, and at the same point that of the descendants of Shem began. Accordingly, the sharpest contrast that could be devised is obtained by generally chasimg these latter nations as those beyond the river Euphrates; and the words "father of all the children of Eber," i. e. father of the nations to the east of the Euphrates, find an intelligible place in the context.

But a more tangible ground for the specially implied in the derivation of Hebrew from Eber is sought in the suppositions fact that Eber was the only descendant of Noah who preserved the one primordial language; and it is maintained that this language transmitted by Eber to the Hebrews, and to them alone of all his descendants, constitutes a peculiar and special relation (Theodore, Voss, Leusid). It is obvious to remark that this theory rests upon three entirely gratuitous assumptions: first, that the primordial language has been preserved; next, that Eber alone preserved it; lastly, that having so preserved it, he communicated it to his son Peleg, but not to his son Joktan.

The first assumption is utterly at variance with the most certain results of etymology: the two others are grossly improbable. The Hebrew of the O. T. was not the language of Abraham when he first entered Palestine: whether he inherited his language from Eber or not, decidedly the language which he did speak must have been Chaldee (comp. Gen. xxx. 47), and not Hebrew (Eichhorn). This supposed primordial language was in fact the language of the Canaanites, assumed by Abraham as more or less akin to that in which he had been brought up, and could not possibly have been transmitted to him by Eber.

The appellative (πατρίδος) derivation is strongly confirmed by the historical use of the word Hebrew. A patronymic would naturally be in use only among the people themselves, while the appellative which had been originally applied to them as strangers in a strange land would probably continue to designate them in their relations to neighboring tribes, and would be their current name among foreign nations. This is precisely the case with the terms Israelite and Hebrew respectively. The former was used by the Jews of themselves among themselves, the latter was the name by which they were known to foreigners. It is used either when foreigners are introduced as speaking (Gen. xxxix. 14, 17, xili. 12; Ex. i. 16, ii. 6: 1 Sam. iv. 6, 9, xili. 14, xiv. 11, xxv. 3), or where they are opposed to foreign nations (Gen. xiii. 32; Ex. i. 15, ii. 11; Deut. xv. 12; 1 Sam. xiiii. 3, 7). So in Greek and Roman writers we find the name Hebrews, or, in later times, Jews (Pausan. v. 5, § 2, vi. 24, § 6; Plut. Sympoes. iv. 6, 11; Tac. Hist. v. 1; Joseph. Ant. ii. 13). In N. T. we find the same contrast between Hebrews and foreigners (Acts vi. 1; Phil. iii. 5): the Hebrew language is distinguished from all others (Luke xxii. 38; John v. 2, xii. 1; Acts viii. 1; xiii. 1). While in 2 Cor. xi. 22, the word is used as simply as second to Isr/aelite in the expression of national peculiarity.

Gesenius has successfully controverted the opinion that the term Israelite was a sacred name, and Hebrew the common appellation.

Briefly, we suppose that Hebrew was originally a Cis-Euphratian word applied to Trans-Euphratian immigrants; it was accepted by these immigrants as their proper name; and after the general substitution of the word Jew, it still found a place in that marked and special feature of national contradistinction, the language (Joseph. Ant. i. 6, § 4; Suidas, s. v. Ἐβραίος; Euseb. de Prap. Evang. ii. 4; Ambrose, Comment. in Phil. iii. 5; August. Quest. in Gen. 24; Conso. Evang. 14; comp. Retract. 16; Grat. antet. ad Gen. xiv. 13; Voss. Pymn. s. v. supers; Bochart, Philol. ii. 14; Buxt. Diss. de ling. Heb. Consens. 31; Hottinger, Theol. i. 1, 2; Lenden, Phil. Heb. Diss. 21, 1; Bauer, Enlatzeng, etc., § xi.; Rosenm. Schol. ad Gen. x. 21, xiv. 13, and Num. xxiv. 24; Eichhorn, Einladt. i. p. 60; Gesen. Lex., and Geach. d. Heb. Sprir, 11, 12).


W. A. W.

HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE. The principal questions which have been raised, and the opinions which are current respecting this epistle may be considered under the following heads:

I. Its canonical authority.
II. Its author.
III. To whom was it addressed?
IV. Where and when was it written?
V. In what language was it written?
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE

VI. Condition of the Hebrews, and scope of the epistle.

VII. Literature connected with it.

I. The most important question that can be entertained in connection with this epistle touches its canonical authority.

The universal Church, by allowing it a place among the Holy Scriptures, acknowledges that there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with the rest of the Bible. But the peculiar position which is assigned to it among the epistles shows a trace of doubts as to its authorship or canonical authority, two points which were blended together in primitive times. Has it then a just claim to be received by us as a portion of that Bible which contains the rule of our faith and the rule of our practice, laid down by Christ and his Apostles? Was it regarded as such by the Primitive Church, to whose clearly-expressed judgment in this matter all later generations of Christians agree to defer?

Of course, if we possessed a declaration by an inspired apostle that this epistle is canonical, all discussion would be superfluous. But the interpretation (by F. Spanheim and later writers) of 2 Pet. iii. 15 as a distinct reference to St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews seems scarcely tenable. For, if the "you" whom St. Peter addresses (i. e., all Christians (see 2 Pet. i. 2), the reference must not be limited to the Epistle to the Hebrews; or if it include only (see 2 Pet. iii. 1) the Jews named in 1 Pet. i. 1, there may be special reference to the Galatians (vi. 7-9) and Ephesians (ii. 3-5), but not to the Hebrews.

Was it then received and transmitted as canonical by the immediate successors of the Apostles? Then the most important witness among these, Clement (A. D. 70 or 95), refers to this epistle in the same way as, and more frequently than, to any other canonical book. It seems to have been "wholly transubursed," says Mr. Westcott (On the Canon, p. 32), into Clement's mind. Little stress can be laid upon the few possible allusions to it in Barnabas, Hermas, Polycarp, and Ignatius. But among the extant authorities of orthodox Christianity during the first century after the epistle was written, there is not one dissentient voice, whilst it is received as canonical by Clement writing from Rome; by Justin Martyr, familiar with the traditions of Italy and Asia; by his contemporaries, Tertullian (the Cretan bishop, and the predecessors of Clement and Origen at Alexandria); and by the compilers of the Peshito version of the New Testament. Among the writers of this period who make no reference to it, there is not one whose subject necessarily leads us to expect him to refer to it. Two heretical teachers, Basilides at Alexandria and Marcion at Rome, are recorded as distinctly rejecting the epistle.

But at the close of that period, in the North African church, where first the Gospel found utterance in the Latin tongue, orthodox Christianity first doubted the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Gospel, spreading from Jerusalem along the northern and southern shores of the Mediterranean, does not appear to have borne fruit in North Africa until after the destruction of Jerusalem had curtailed intercourse with Palestine.

And it came thither not on the lips of an inspired apostle, but shorn of much of that oral tradition in which, with many other facts, was embodied the ground of the eastern belief in the canonical authority and authorship of this anonymous epistle. To the old Latin version of the Scriptures, which was completed probably about A. D. 170, this epistle seems to have been added as a composition of Barnabas, and as destitute of canonical authority. The opinion or tradition thus embodied in that age and country cannot be traced further back. About that time the Roman Church also began to speak Latin; and even its latest Greek writers gave up, we know not why, the full faith of the Eastern Church in the canonical authority of this epistle.

During the next two centuries the extant fathers of the Roman and North African churches regard the epistle as a book of no canonical authority. Tertullian, if he quotes it, disclaims its authority and speaks of it as a good kind of apocryphal book written by Barnabas. Cyriacus leaves it out of the number of St. Paul's epistles, and, even in his books of Scripture Testimonies against the Jews, never makes the slightest reference to it. Irenaeus, who came in his youth to Gaul, defaulding in his...
great work the Divinity of Christ, never quotes, scarcely refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Muratorian Fragment on the Canon leaves it out of the list of St. Paul's epistles. So did Cains and Hippolytus, who wrote at Rome in Greek; and so did Victorinus of Panomus. But in the fourth century its authority began to revive; it was received by Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer and Faustus of Cagliari, Fabius and Victorinus of Rome, Ambrose of Milan, and Philaster (?) and Commodius of Brescia. At the end of the fourth century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin Fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal view of the Latin churches, was of less weight than the view, not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin churches united with the East in receiving the epistle. The 3d Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, and a decree of Pope Innocent, A. D. 416, gave a final confirmation to their decision.

So great and the only considerable opposition which has been made to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its origin has not been ascertained. Some critics have conjectured that the Montanist or the Novatian controversy instigated, and that the Arian controversy dissipated, so much opposition as proceeded from orthodox Christians. The references to St. Paul in the Clementine Homilies have led other critics to the startling theory that orthodox Christians at Rome, in the middle of the second century, commonly regarded and described St. Paul as an enemy of the Faith; a theory which, if it were established, would be a much stronger fact than the rejection of the least accredited of the epistles which bear the Apostle's name. But perhaps it is more probable that those jealous care, with which the Church everywhere, in the second century, had learned to scrutinize every book claim- ing canonical authority, misled, in this instance, the churches of North Africa and Rome. For to them this epistle was an anonymous writing, unlike an epistle in its opening, unlike a treatise in its end, differing in its style from every apostolic epistle, abounding in arguments and appealing to sentiments which were always foreign to the Gentile, and growing less familiar to the Jewish mind. So they went a step beyond the church of Alexandria, which, while doubtless the authorship of this epistle, always acknowledged its authority. The church of Jerusalem, as the original receiver of the epistle, was the depository of that oral testimony on which both its orthodoxy and canonical authority rested, and was the fountain-head of information which satisfied the Eastern and Greek churches. But the church of Jerusalem was early hidden in exile and obscurity. And Palestine, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became unknown ground to that class of "dwellers in Libya about Tyre, and strangers of Rome," who once maintained close religious intercourse with it. All these considerations may help to account for the fact that the Latin churches hesitated to receive an epistle, the credentials of which, from peculiar circumstances, were originally imperfect, and had become inaccessible to them when their version of Scripture was in process of formation, until religious intercourse between East and West again grew frequent and intimate in the fourth century.

But such doubts were confined to the Latin churches from the middle of the second to the close of the fourth century. All the rest of orthodox Christendom from the beginning was agreed upon the canonical authority of this epistle. No Greek or Syriac writer ever expressed a doubt. It was acknowledged in various public documents; received by the framers of the Apostolical Constitutions (about A. D. 259, Beter柏y); quoted in the epistle of the Synod of Antioch, A. D. 330; appealed to by the debaters in the first Council of Nica; included in that catalogue of canonical books which was added (perhaps afterwards) to the canons of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 365; and sanctioned by the Quinisextian Council at Constantinople, A. D. 692.

Cardinal Cajetan, the opponent of Luther, was the first to disturb the tradition of a thousand years, and to deny the authority of this epistle. Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza questioned only its authorship. The holder spirit of Luther, unable to perceive its agreement with St. Paul's doctrine, pronounced it to be the work of some disciple of the Apostle, who had built not only gold, silver, and precious stones, but also wood, hay, and stubble upon his master's foundation. And whereas the Greek Church in the fourth century gave it sometimes the tenth place, or at other times, as it now does, and as the Syrian, Roman, and English churches do, the fourteenth place among the epistles of St. Paul, Luther, when he printed his version of the Bible, separated this book from St. Paul's epistles, and placed it with the epistles of St. James and St. Jude, next before the Revelation; indicating by this change of order his opinion that the four regarded books are of less importance and less authority than the rest of the New Testament. His opinion found some promoters; but it has not been adopted in any confession of the Lutheran Church.

The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews is then secure, so far as it can be established by the tradition of Christian churches. The doubts which affected it were admitted in remote places, or in the failure of knowledge, or under the pressure of times of intellectual excitement; and they have disappeared before full information and calm judgment.

II. Who was the author of the Epistle? This question is of less practical importance than the last: for many books are received as canonical, whilst little or nothing is known of their writers. In this epistle the superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting. Its omission has been accounted for, since the days of Clement of Alexandria (epit. Faust., H. E. vi. 14) and Chrysostom, by supposing that St. Paul withheld his name, lest the sight of it should repel any Jewish Christians who might still regard him rather as an enemy of the law (Acts xxii. 21) than as a benefactor to their nation (Acts xxiv. 17).

a The Vatican Codex (B), A. D. 359, bears traces of an earlier assignment of the fifth place to the Ep. to the Hebrews. [See Beek, p. 247 and 447.]

b See Beek, I, pp. 247 and 447.
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Paulusmus, or some other predecessor of Clement, adds that St. Paul would not write to the Jews as an Apostle because he regarded the Lord himself as their Apostle (see the remarkable expression, Heb. iii. 1, twice quoted by Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 1. 29). It was the custom of the earliest fathers to quote passages of Scripture without naming the writer or the book which supplied them. But there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, St. Paul was regarded as the author. Among the Greek fathers, 'says Olschhausen (Pros-
caba, p. 85), no one is named either in Egypt, or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this epistle proceeds from St. Paul.' The Alexandrian fathers, whether guided by tradition or by critical discernment, are the ear-
est to note the discrepancy of style between this epistle and the other thirteen. And they received it in the same sense that the speech in Acts xxii. 1-21 is received as St. Paul's. Clement ascribed to St. Luke the transition of the epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of St. Paul. Origen, embracing the opinion of those who, he says, preceded him, believed that the thoughts were St. Paul's, the language and composition St. Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian, knowing noth-
ing of any connection of St. Paul with the epis-
tle, names Barnabas as the reputed author accord-
ing to the North African tradition, which in the time of Augustine had taken the less definite shape of a denial by some that the epistle was St. Paul's, and in the time of Isidore of Seville appears as a Latin opinion (found on the dissonance of style) that it was written by Barnabas or Clement. At Rome Clement was silent as to the author of this as of the other epistles which he quotes; and the
writers who follow him, down to the middle of the fourth century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is St. Paul's.

The view of the Alexandrian fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its victory in the Church. It was adopted as the most probable opinion by Eusebius, Cyril, Athanasius, and the Council of Jerusalem. In all subsequent reception may have led to the silent transfer which was made about his time, of this epistle from the tenth place in the Greek Canon to the fourteenth, at the end of St. Paul's epistles, and before those of other Apostles. This place it held everywhere till the time of Luther; as if to indic-
ate the deliberate and final acquiescence of the uni-
versal church in the opinion that it is one of the works of St. Paul, but not in the same full sense as the other ten [nine] epistles, addressed to particular churches, are his.

In the last three centuries every word and phrase in the epistle has been scrutinized with the most exact care for historical and grammatical evidence as to the authorship. The conclusions of individ-
ual inquirers are very diverse; but the result has not been any considerable disturbance of the an-
tient tradition. No new kind of difficulty has been discovered: no hypothesis open to fewer objec-
tions than the tradition has been devised. The laborious work of the Rev. C. Forster (The Apo-
tolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews), which is a storehouse of grammatical evidence, ad-
vocates the opinion that St. Paul was the author of the language, as well as the thoughts of the epistle. Professor Stuart, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Hebrews, not only of course, discusses the internal evidence at great length, and agrees in opinion with Mr. Forster, Dr. C. Wordsworth, On the Canon of the Scriptures,

a Professor Blunt, On the Right Use of the Early Fathers, pp. 433-441, gives a complete view of the evi-
dence of Clement, Origen, and Eusebius as to the au-
torship of the epistle.
b In this sense may be fairly understood the indi-
rect declaration that this epistle is St. Paul's, which the Church of England puts into the mouth of her ministers in the Offices for the Visitation of the Sick and the S6lemization of Matrimony.

De ascensione primi Hen
tophytorum, ch. viii. § 5] says that the way in which Timothy is mentioned (xii. 23) seems to him a su-
cient proof that St. Paul was the author of this epistle.

For another view of this passage see Bleek, i. 573.

d * It has been asserted by some German critics, as Schulte and Sayce, that an unusually large propor-
tion of δὲνογ λεγόμενα, or peculiar words, is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews as compared with other epistles of Paul. This is denied by Prof. Stuart, who in-
stitutes an elaborate comparison between this epistle and others of Paul, and finds no proportion similar to this point. (See his Comm. on Hebrews, 21 ed., p. 217 ff., 223 ff.) As the result of this examination, he finds in 1 Cor. 230 words which occur nowhere else in the writings of Paul; while in the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to the reckoning of Sayce, there are only 115 words of this class. Taking into
account the comparative length of the two epistles, the number of peculiar words in the Epistle to the Heb-
naeas as compared with that in 1 Cor. is, according to Prof. Stuart, in the proportion of 1 to 1. 17. Hence he argues, that "if the number of δὲνογ λεγόμενα in our epistle proves that it was not from the hand of Paul, it must be more abundantly evident that Paul cannot have been the author of the First Epistle to the Cor-
inthen." The facts in the case, however, are very different

from what Prof. Stuart supposes. In the first place, 20 of his δὲνογ λεγόμε

in 1 Corinthians are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, to make the comparison tolerably fair, should be assumed as Pauline; 5 others are found only in quotations; and 13 more do not properly belong in the list, while 28 should be added to it. Correcting these errors, we find the number of peculiar words in 1 Cor. to be about 217. On the other hand, the number of δὲνογ λεγόμε

in the Epistle to the Hebrews, not only of course, those in quotations from the Old Testament, instead of being only 115, as Prof. Stuart assumes, is about 390. (The precise numbers vary a little according to the text of the Greek Testament adopted as the basis of comparison.) Leaving out of account quotations from the Old Testament, the number of lines in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, in Knapp's edition of the Greek Testament, is 922; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 690. We have then the proportion — 920 690 (922 1390) showing 1390 to the Hebrews, no more than 1390 to 690. The number of peculiar words was as great in 1 Corinthians in proportion to its length as in the Epistles to the Hebrews, we
should find there 432 instead of about 217. In other
words, the number of δὲνογ λεγόμε in Hebrews exceeds that in 1 Corinthians in nearly the propor-
tion of 2 to 1. No judicious critic would rest an ar-
gument in such a case on the mere number of pecu-
liar words; but if this matter is to be discussed at all, it is desirable that the facts should be correctly pre-
sented. There is much that is erroneous or fallacious in Professor Stuart's Notice remarking on the internal evi-
dence. The work of Mr. Forster in relation to this subject (mentioned above), displays the same intellect-
ual characteristics as his treatise on the Himyarite

Inscriptions, his One PIEIVAL AND LANGUAGE, and his N-e

Pen for the Authenticity of the Test of the Two Hebrew

Only Witnesses (1 John v. 7), recently published A
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Lect. ix., leans to the same conclusion. Dr. S. Davidson, in his Introduction to the New Testament, gives a very careful and minute summary of the arguments of all the principal modern critics who reason upon the internal evidence, and concludes, in substantial agreement with the Alexandrian tradition, that St. Paul was the author of the epistle, and that, as regards its theology and style, St. Luke cooperated with him in making it what it now appears. The tendency of opinion in Germany has been to ascribe the epistle to some other author than St. Paul. Luther’s conjecture, that Apollos was the author, has been widely adopted by Le Clerc, Bleeke, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, and others. Apollos, Amer. ed.] Barnabas has been named by Wieseler, Thiersch, and others, Luke by Grotius, Silhus by others. Neander attributes it to some apostolic man of the Pauline school, whose training and method of stating doctrinal truth differed from St. Paul’s. The distinguished name of II. Ewald has been given recently to the hypothesis (partly anticipated by Wetstein), that it was written neither by St. Paul, nor to the Hebrews, but by some Jewish teacher residing at Jerusalem to a church in some important Italian town, which is supposed to have sent a deputation to Palestine. Most of these guesses are quite desultory of historical evidence, and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditional account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability; but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of St. Paul’s contemporaries.

The tradition of the Alexandrian fathers is not without some difficulties. It is truly said that the style of reasoning is different from that which St. Paul uses in his acknowledged epistles. But it may be replied,—Is the adoption of a different style of reasoning inconsistent with the versatility of that mind which could express itself in writings so diverse as the Pastoral Epistles and the preceding nine? or in speeches so diverse as those which are severally addressed to Pagans at Athens and Jews at Antioch. These and other passages are quite desultory of historical evidence, and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditional account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability; but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of St. Paul’s contemporaries.

The tradition of the Alexandrian fathers is not without some difficulties. It is truly said that the style of reasoning is different from that which St. Paul uses in his acknowledged epistles. But it may be replied,—Is the adoption of a different style of reasoning inconsistent with the versatility of that mind which could express itself in writings so diverse as the Pastoral Epistles and the preceding nine? or in speeches so diverse as those which are severally addressed to Pagans at Athens and Jews at Antioch. These and other passages are quite desultory of historical evidence, and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditional account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability; but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of St. Paul’s contemporaries.

Among these must now be placed Dean Alford, whose fourth volume of his伟大著作 (published since the above article was in type), discusses the question with great care and candor, and concludes that the epistle was written by Apollos to the Romans, about A.D. 60, from Ephesus.

Among these are some, who, unlike Origen, deny that Barnabas is the author of the epistle which bears his name. If it be granted that we have no specimen of his style, the hypothesis which connects him with the Epistle to the Hebrews becomes less improbable. Many circumstances show that he possessed some qualities which would make it very likely that he should have written the letter. The reply must be in the words of Orig. &c. There is ample evidence to show that he is the most likely to have written it. The style is not quite like that of Clement of Rome. Both style and sentiment are quite unlike those of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas. The style is not quite like that of Clement of Rome. Both style and sentiment are quite unlike those of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas. The style is not quite like that of Clement of Rome. Both style and sentiment are quite unlike those of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas. The style is not quite like that of Clement of Rome. Both style and sentiment are quite unlike those of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas.
been inscribed by the writer of the epistle, might have been given to it, in accordance with the use of the term Hebrews in the N. T., if it had been addressed either to Jews who lived at Jerusalem, and spoke Aramaic (Acts vi. 1), or to the descend ants of Abraham generally (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5).

But the argument of the epistle is such as could be used with most effect to a church consisting exclusively of Jews by birth, personally familiar with, and attached to, the Temple-service. And such a community (as Black, Hebberd, i. 31, argues) could be found only in Jerusalem and its neighborhood. And if the church at Jerusalem retained its former distinction of including a great company of priests (Acts vi. 7) — a class professionally familiar with the songs of the Temple, accustomed to discuss the interpretation of Scripture, and acquainted with the prevailing Alexandrian philosophy — such a church would be peculiarly fit to appreciate this epistle. For it takes from the Book of Psalms the remarkable proportion of sixteen out of thirty-two quotations from the O. T., which it contains. It relies on the examples of Timothy and Titus from Scripture that this circumstance has been pointed out as inconsistent with the tone of independent apostolic authority, which characterizes the undoubted epistles of St. Paul. And so frequent is the use of Alexandrian philosophy and exegesis that it has suggested to some critics Apollos as the writer, to others the Alexandrian church as the primary recipient of the epistle. If certain members of the church at Jerusalem possessed goods (Heb. x. 34), and the means of ministering to distress (vi. 10), this fact is not irreconcilable, as has been supposed, with the deep poverty of other inhabitants of Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 26, &c.); but it agrees exactly with the condition of that church thirty years previously (Acts ii. 45, and vi. 34), and with the historical estimate of the material prosperity of the Jews at this time (Mivrale, History of the Romans under the Empire, vi. 531, ch. i.). If St. Paul quotes to Hebrews the LXX without correcting it where it differs from the Hebrew, this agrees with his practice in other epistles, and with the fact that, as elsewhere so in Jerusalem, Hebrew was a dead language, acquired only with much pains by the learned. The Scriptures were popularly known in Aramaic or Greek, quotations were made from memory, and verified by memory. Probably Prof. Jowett is correct in his inference (1st ed. i. 301), that St. Paul did not familiarly know the Hebrew original, while he possessed a minute knowledge of the LXX.

Ebrard limits the primary circle of readers even to a section of the church at Jerusalem. Considering such passages as v. 12, vi. 10, x. 32, as probably inapplicable to the whole of that church, he conjectures that St. Paul wrote to some neophytes whose conversion, though not mentioned in the Acts, may have been partly due to the Apostle's influence in the time of his last recorded sojourn in Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 22).

Some critics have maintained that this epistle was addressed directly to Jewish believers everywhere; where, as others have restricted it to those who dwelt in Asia and Greece. Almost every city in which St. Paul labored has been selected by some critic as the place to which it was originally sent. Not only Rome and Cæsarea, where St. Paul was long imprisoned, but, amid the profound silence of its early Fathers, Alexandria also, which he never saw, have each found their advocates. And one conjecture connects this epistle specially with the Gentile Church of Ephesus, which was the nearest, and, in being entirely unsupported by historical evidence; and each of them has some special plausibility combined with difficulties peculiar to itself.

IV. Where and when was it written? — Eastern traditions of the fourth century, in connection with the opinion that St. Paul is the writer, name Italy and Rome, or Athens, as the place from whence the epistle was written. Either place would agree with, perhaps was suggested by, the mention of Clement of Rome. But the authenticity of his epistle, and the opinion that it was written in Italy; but Winer (Grammatik, § 66, 6), denies that the preposition necessarily has that force.

The epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. The whole argument, and specially the passages viii. 4 and ff., ix. 6 and ff. (where the present tenses of the Greek are unaccountably changed into past in the English version), and xiii. 10 and ff. imply that the Temple was standing; and that its usual course of Divine service was carried on without interruption; a Christian reader, keenly watching in the doomed city for the fulfillment of his Lord's prediction, would at once understand the ominous references to "that which beareth thorns and briers, and is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned:" "that which decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away:" and the coming of the expected "Day," and the removing of those things that are shaken, vi. 8, viii. 19, x. 35, 37, xii. 27. But these forerunings seem less distinct and circumstantial than they might have been if uttered immediately before the catastrophe. The references to former teachers xiii. 7, and earlier instruction v. 12, and x. 32, might suit any time after the first years of the church; but it would be interesting to connect the first reference with the martyrdom of St. James at the Passover A. D. 62. Modern criticism has not destroyed, though it has weakened.

a For an explanation of the alleged ignorance of the author of Heb. ix. as to the furniture of the Temple, see Ebrard's Commentary on the passage, or Professor Stuart's Exegesis, xvi. and xvii.

b The influence of the Alexandrian school did not begin with Philo, and was not confined to Alexandria, [ALEXANDRIA.] The means and the evidence of its progress may be traced in the writings of the son of Menach (Maurice's Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, § 9, p. 294), the author of the Book of Wisdom Ewald, Schottische, iv. 545), Aristobulus, Eusebius, Philo.

and Theodotus (Ewald, iv. 297); in the phraseology of St. John (Prof. Jowett, On the Theologicals, etc 1st ed. i. 408), and the arguments of St. Paul (ibid p. 531); in the establishment of an Alexandrian synagoge at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9), and the existence of schools of scriptural interpretation there (Ewald, Geschichte, v. 63, and vi. 231).

c See Josephus, B. J. vi. 5, § 3.

d See Josephus, Ant. xx. 9, § 1; Euseb. H. E 22; and Recogn. Clement. i. 70, 10, 500.
HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE

The connection of this epistle with St. Paul's Roman captivity (A. D. 61-63) by substituting the reading τοὺς διδάσκοντας, "the prisoners," for τοὺς διδάσκοντας τοῦ (A. V. "me in my bonds"); x. 34; by proposing to interpret ἄπολεξιν, xiii. 23, as "sent away," rather than "set at liberty;" and by urging that the condition of the writer, as portrayed in xiii. 18, 19, 23, is not necessarily that of a prisoner, and that there may possibly be no allusion to it in xiii. 3. On the whole, the date which best agrees with the traditional account of the authorship and destination of the epistle is A. D. 63, about the end of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, or a year after Albinus succeeded Festus as procurator.

V. In what language was it written?—Like St. Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for much unimportant controversy respecting the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria (preserved in Eus. H. E. vi. 14), to the effect that it was written by St. Paul in Hebrew, and translated by St. Luke into Greek; and hence, as Clement observes, arises the identity of the style of the epistle and that of the Acts. This statement is repeated, after a long interval, by Eusebius, Theodoret, Jerome, and several later fathers; but it is not noticed by the majority. Nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the epistle. No person is said to have used or seen a Hebrew original. The Aramaic copy, included in the Peshito, has never been regarded otherwise than as a translation. Among the few modern supporters of an Aramaic original the most distinguished are Joseph Hallet, an English writer in 1727 (whose able essay is most easily accessible in a Latin translation in Wolf's Oeuvres Philologiques, x. 808-837), and J. D. Michaelis. Eékloq. des Briefes an die Hebräer. Bleek (i. 6-23), argues in support of a Greek original, on the grounds of (1) the purity and easy flow of the Greek; (2) the use of Greek words which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long paraphrase; (3) the use of paronomasia—under which head he discerns the inference against an Aramaic original which has been drawn from the double sense given to διδασκον, ix. 15; (4) the use of the Septuagint in quotations and references which do not correspond with the Hebrew text.

VI. Condition of the Hebrews, and scope of the Epistle.—The numerous Christian churches scattered throughout Judaea (Acts ix. 31; Gal. i. 22) were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews (1 Thess. ii. 14), which would become more searching and extensive as churches multiplied, and as the increasing turmoils of the nation ripened into the insurrection of A. D. 13. Personal violence, spoliation of property, exclusion from the synagogue, and domestic strife were the universal forms of persecution. But in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. Their magnificent national Temple, hallowed to every Jew by ancient historical and by gentle personal recollections, with its lifelessśbling attractions, its solemn strains, and mysterious ceremonies, might be shut against the Hebrew Christian. And even if, amid the false facts and frequent oscillations of authority in Jerusalem, this affliction were not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which every Hebrew Christian bore within him—the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. Paralyzed, perhaps, by this consciousness, and emboldened by their attachment to a lower form of Christianity, they became stationary in knowledge, weak in faith, void of energy, and even in danger of apostasy from Christ. For, as afflictions multiplied round them, and made them feel more keenly their dependence on God, and their need of near and frequent and associated approach to Him, they seemed, in consequence of their Christianity, to be receding from the God of their fathers, and losing that means of communion with Him which they used to enjoy. Angels, Moses and the High-priest—their intercessors in heaven in the grave, and on earth—became of less importance in the creed of the Jewish Christian; then glory waned as he grew in Christian experience. Already he felt that the Lord's day was superseding the Sabbath, the New Covenant the Old. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices and the Holy City, when they should cease to exist? What compensation could Christianity offer him for the thing which was pressing—the Hebrew Christian more and more.

James, the bishop of Jerusalem, had just left his place vacant by a martyr's death. Neither to Cephas at Babylon, nor to John at Ephesus, the third pillar of the Apostolic Church, was it given to understand all the greatness of his want, and to speak to him the word in season. But there came to him from Rome the voice of one who had been the foremost in sounding the depth and breadth of that love of Christ which was all but incomprehensible to the Jew, one who feeling more than any other Apostle the weight of the care of all the churches, yet clung to his own people with a love ever ready to break out in impassioned words, and unsought and ill-requited deeds of kindness. He whom Jerusalem had sent away in chains to Rome again lifted up his voice in the hallowed city among his countrymen; but with words and arguments suited to explain the new era of Christianity, and to press home the anger of a God against the old, and a tone in which reigned no apostolic authority, and a face veiled in very love from wayward children who might refuse to bear divine and saving truth, when it fell from the lips of Paul.

He meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is—"Your new faith gives you Christ, and, in Christ, all you seek, all your fathers sought. In Christ the Son of God you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more prevailing than the high-priest as an intercessor: His blood awaits you in heaven; to His covenant the old was intended to be subservient; His atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; His city heavenly, not made with hands. Having Him, believe in Him, with all your heart, with a faith in the unseen future, stronger than that of the saints of old, patient under present, and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love." Such was the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews...
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brews. We do not possess the means of tracing out step by step its effect upon them; but we know that the result at which it aimed was achieved. The church at Jerusalem did not apostatize. It migrated to Alexandria (Eusebius, Eclog. III., 5); and there, no longer dwindled under the cold shadow of overhanging Judaism, it followed the Hebrew Christians of the Dispersion in gradually entering on the possession of the full liberty which the law of Christ allows to all.

And this great epistle remains to after times, a keystone binding together that succession of inspired men which spans over the ages between Moses and Christ. It contains the most substantial identity of the revelation of God, whether given through the Prophets, or through the Son; for it shows that God's purposes are unchangeable, however diversely in different ages they have been "reflected in broken and fitful rays, glancing back from the troubled waters of the human soul." It is a source of inexhaustible comfort to every Christian sufferer in inward perplexity, or amid "reproaches and afflictions." It is a pattern to every Christian teacher of the method in which larger views should be imparted, gently, reverently, and seasonably, to feeble spirits prone to cling to ancient forms, and to rest in accustomed feelings.

VII. Literature connected with the Epistle.—In addition to the books already referred to, four commentaries may be selected as the best representatives of distinct lines of thought:—those of Chrysostom, Calvin, Estius, and Bleek. Lüningmann (1855 [2d ed. 1867]), and Deissmann (1858) have recently added valuable commentaries to those already in existence.

The commentaries accessible to the English reader are those of Professor Stuart (of Andover, U. S. [2d ed., 1833], abridged by Prof. R. D. C. Robbins, Andover, 1860), and of Ebrard, translated by the Rev. J. Fulton [in vol. vi. of Olshausen's Bibl. Comm., Amer. ed.]. Dr. Owen's Exegetical Notes on the Hebrews are not chiefly valuable as an analysis of collections. The Paraphrase and Notes of Peirce [2d ed. Lond. 1734] are praised by Dr. Doddridge. Among the well-known collections of English notes on the Greek text or English version of the N. T., those of Hammond, Fell, Whitby, Macknight, Wordworth, and Aldrington may be particularly mentioned. In Prof. Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age there is a thoughtful and eloquent sermon on this epistle; and it is the subject of three whole voluminous Lectures, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice [Lond. 1846].

A tolerably complete list of commentaries on this epistle may be found in Bleek, vol. ii., pp. 10-16, and a comprehensive but shorter list at the end of Ebrard's Commentary.

W. T. B.

* The opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul has found favor with many besides those whose names have been mentioned. Among these are Ullmann (Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 388 f.), Schott (Langreise, 1830, §§ 70-87), Schliermacher (Einl. ins N. T. p. 439), Lechler (Das Apost. Zeitalt. p. 159 f.), Wieseler (Chron. d. Apost. Zeitalt. p. 504 f.), and in a separate treatise (Übersicht über den Hebräerbrief, Kiel, 1861), Twisten (Dogmatt., 4te Aufl., i. 95, and in Piper's Evangel. Kalender for 1838, p. 43 f.), Kostlin (in Baur and Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. 1834, p. 425 f.).

Ueberden (Gesch. des Neuest. Kanon, edited by Fehlmann, p. 161), Schmid (Bibl. Theol. des N. T. 72), Raus (Gesch. des N. T. 4te Aufl.), Weiss


In justice to this opinion, the chief arguments urged in its support will be more particularly stated. Those furnished by the epistle itself may be classified according to their general nature as formal, doctrinal, personal:

i. To the first class belong, (1.) The absence of a salutation, and in general the treatise-like character of the epistle. The explanation of Paulus (?) is inadequate, for Paul might have sent a salutation without styling himself "apostle" (cf. Epp. to Phil. Thess. Phil.) the supposition of Clement of Alexandria attributes to the Apostle a procedure which, even if it were worthy of him, was hardly practicable, certainly hazardous, and plainly at variance with the indications that the author was known to his readers (cf. xii. 18, 19, 22 f.). The assumption that Paul in this epistle abandoned his ordinary manner of composition for some unknown reason, admits the facts, but adopts what, in view of the thirteen extant specimens of his epistolary style, is the less probable explanation of them. (2.) The peculiar electric character of the O. T. Paul quotes the O. T. freely, in the epistle it is quoted with punctilious accuracy; Paul very often gives evidence of having the Hebrew in mind, the epistle almost (if not quite) uniformly reproduces the LXX. version, and that, too, in a form of the text (Cod. Alex.) differing generally from the LXX. text employed by the Apostle (Cod. Vet.), Paul commonly introduces his quotations as "Scripture," often gives the name of the human author, but in the epistle the quotations, with but a single exception (ii. 6), are attributed more or less directly to God. (3.) The characteristics of expression. (a.) The epistle is destitute of many of Paul's favorite expressions — expressions which, being of a general nature and pertinent in any epistle, betray the Apostle's habits of thought. For instance, the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἥλιων (variously modified as respects arrangement and pronouns), which occurs in every one of Paul's epistles, and more than 80 times in all, is not to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews; the word εὐαγγελίζον, though used 60 times by Paul, and in all his epistles except that to Titus, is not met
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with in this epistle; he seems παρίδος, applied to God 36 times by Paul (exclusive of 6 instances in which God is called the Father of Christ), and occurring in every one of his epistles, is so used but once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and then by way of antithesis (Heb. xii. 9). (b.) It substitutes certain synonymous words and constructions in place of those usual with Paul: ex. gr. μισθος διαδοθέντα for the simple μισθός employed by Paul; μετοχία εἰπα, etc., instead of Paul's κοινωνία etc.; the intransitive use of καθίζω in the phrase καθίζω εν διζίν τοις, where Paul uses the verb transitively; the expression διαπαντους, εἰς τὸ παντελές, εἰς τὸ διαπέρνεται instead of Paul's πάντοτε.

(c.) It exhibits noticeable peculiarities of expression: the phrase εἰς τὸ διαπέρνεται belongs to this class also; other specimens are the use of ὅσον... κατὰ τοσοῦτον ὡς ὀνόμα, τοσοῦτον... ὅσον alone, and of παρά and ὑπὲρ in expressing comparison: connectives, like εἰς τὸν παρευρ. (three times, ἓνεκεν six times), which are never used by Paul. (d.) And in general its language and style differ from Paul's—its language, in being less Hebraistic, more literary, more idiosyncratic in construction; its style, in being less impassioned, more regular, more rhetorical and euphonious. These differences have been generally conceded from the first, and by such judges as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, to whom Greek was vernacular. They are not satisfactorily accounted for by supposing a considerable interval of time to have elapsed between the composition of the other epistles and this—for so far as we are acquainted with the Apostle's history we can find no room for such an interval, and his style as exhibited in the other epistles shows no tendency towards the required transformation; nor by assuming that Paul elaborated his style because writing to Jews—for the Jews were not accustomed to finished Greek, and he who to the Jews became as a Jew did not trouble himself to polish his style on occasions when such labor might have been appreciated (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 6); nor by attributing the literary elegance of the epistle to its amanuensis—for the other epistles were dictated to different persons, yet exhibit evident marks of a common author.

II. The doctrinal indications at variance with the teaching of Paul's Partnership do amount to a conflict in any particular with the presentations of truth made by the Apostle; nor are its divergencies from the Pauline type of doctrine so marked as those of James and John. Still, it has peculiarities which are distinctive: Paul delights to present the Gospel as justification before God though faith in the Crucified One; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, it is represented as consummated Judaism. Without a marked difference, the epistle defines and illustrates faith in a generic sense, as trust in God's assurances and as antithetic to sight; whereas with Paul faith is specific—a sinner's trust in Christ—and antithetic (generally) to works; it sets forth the eternal high priesthood of the Messiah, while Paul dwells upon Christ's triumphant resurrection: in it the seed of Abraham are believing Jews, while Paul everywhere makes his converts Jews simply by the grace of life: it is conspicuous, too, among the N. T. writings for its spiritualizing, at times half-mystical, mode of interpreting the O. T. Further, these different presentations of the Christian doctrine are general made to rest upon different grounds: Paul speaks as the messenger of God, often referring, indeed, to the O. T.; but still often quietly assuming plenary authority to declare that a passage was revealed to holy men of old; but the writer to the Hebrews rests his teaching upon Biblical statements almost exclusively.

III. Among the matters personal which seem to conflict with the opinion that the epistle is Paul's, are enumerated, (1.) The circumstance that it is addressed to Jewish readers: if Paul wrote it, he departed, in doing so, from his ordinary province of labor (cf. Gal. ii. 9; Rom. xv. 20). (2.) The omission of any justification of his apostolic course relative to Judaism; and, assuming the epistle to have been destined for believers at Jerusalem, his use of language implying affectionate intimacy with them (xiii. 19, etc.; cf. Acts xxi. 17 f). (3.) The cool, historic style in which reference is made to the early persecutions and martyrdoms of the church at Jerusalem (xiii. 7, xii. 4). In these Paul had a prominent actor; and such passages as I Cor. xv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12 f, show how he was accustomed to allude to them, even in writing to third parties. (4.) The intimation (ii. 3) that the writer, like his readers, received the Gospel indirectly, through those who had been the personal disciples of Christ. Paul, on the contrary, uniformly insists that he did not receive the Gospel through any human channel, but by direct revelation; and he accordingly claims equality with the other Apostles (Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 13, 16; ii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 1, 11, 23; Eph. iii. 2, 3; 2 Cor. xi. 5). The reply, that the writer here uses the plural communicatively and, strictly speaking, does not mean to include himself, is unsatisfactory. For he does not quietly drop a distinction out of sight; he expressly designates three separate classes, namely, "the Lord," "them that heard," and "we," and, in the face of this explicit distinction, includes himself in the third class—this he does, although his argument would have been strengthened had he been able (like Paul) to appeal to a direct revelation from heaven.

These internal arguments are not offset by the evidence from tradition. Respecting that evidence, statements like Olshausen's give an impression not altogether correct. For, not to mention that Eusebius, although often citing the epistle as Paul's, elsewhere admits (as Origen had virtually done before him, Eusebius, H. E. xi. 21) that its apostolic origin was not wholly unquestioned by the oriental churches (H. E. iii. 3), and in another passage (H. E. vi. 13) even classes it himself among the antilegomena, it is noticeable that the Alexandrian testimony from the very first gives evidence that the epistle was left to possess characteristics at variance with Pauline authorship. The statement of Clement that the epistle was translated from the Hebrew into Greek at a later period is regarded as incorrect: how can we be assured of the truth of the accompanying assertion—or rather, the other half of the same statement—that it was written by Paul? Further, in the conflict of testimony between the East and the West, it is not altogether clear that the probabilities favor the East. Half a century before we find the epistle mentioned in the Church at Antioch; nearly thirty years after it was written, it was known and prized at Rome by a man anciently believed to have been a fellow-laborer with the Apostle. It seems hardly possible, that Paul surnamed its author, Clement should have been ignorant of the fact; or that, the fact once known, know edge of it should have died out while the epistle itself survived. And yet in all parts of the West —
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n Gaul, Italy, Africa—the epistle is un-Pauline.

The theory that Paul was mediately or indirectly the author has been adopted by Hug (Eind. ii. 422 f.), Eberard (in Olshausen's Com. on N. T., vi. 520, Kendrick's ed.), Guericke (Gesammelte Abh. des N. T. p. 419 f.), Davidson (Introduction to the N. T. iii. 256 f.), Delitzsch (in Rudolph and Guericke's Zeitschr. for 1849, trans. in the Evangel. Rec. Mercersburg, Oct. 1850, p. 184 ff., and in his Com. p. 707), Bloomfield (Gr. Text., 9th ed., ii. 574 ff.), Buchholz on the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 1 chap. 2, and others, who think Luke to have given the epistle its present form; by Thiersch (in the Progr. named above, and in Die Kirche im Apos. Zeit. d. p. 197 f.), Conybeare (as above), and others, who make Barnabas chiefly responsible for its style; by Olshausen (Opusc. p. 118 ff.), who supposes that sundry precursors were concerned in its origin; and by many who regard the Apostle's assistant as unknown. Now respecting the theory of mediately authorship it may be remarked: If Paul dictated the epistle, and Luke or some other scriba merely penned it, Paul remains its sole author; this was his usual mode of composing; this mode of composition does not occasion any perceptible diversity in his style; hence, this form of the hypothesis is useless as an explanation of the epistle's peculiarities. Again, if the epistle is assumed to be the joint production of Paul and some friend or friends, the assumption is unnatural, without evidence, without unequivocal analogy in the origin of any other inspired epistle, and insufficient to remove the difficulties in the case. Once more, if we suppose the ideas to be in the main Paul's, but their present form to be due to some one else, then Paul, not having participated actively in the work of composing the epistle, cannot according to the ordinary use of language be called its author. Whatever be the capacity in which Paul associates Timothy, Silvanus, and Sosthenes with himself in the salutation prefixed to some of his epistles,—and it is noteworthy that he does not on this account hesitate to continue in the 1st pers. sing. (see Phil. i. 3), or to use the 3d pers. of his associate at the very next mention of him (ii. 19),—the assumption of some similar associate in composing the Epistle to the Hebrews, even if it had historic warrant, would not answer the purpose designed. For the style of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, in which Sosthenes is conjoined with Paul, bears the Apostle's impress as unmistakably as does the style of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, where Timothy writes in the salutation. And in both, the individuality of the Apostle is as sharply defined as it is in the Epistle to the Romans. (The philologeal evidence thought by Delitzsch to show Luke's hand in the composition, has been collected and examined by Linnemann, as above, § 1.)

The opinion that Paul was the proper and sole author (besides the modern advocates of it already named), has been defended by Gelpeke (Vindictio, etc.), a writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims for 1828 and 1829 (in reply to Prof. Norton), Gurney in the Bibl. Repos. for 1832, p. 409 ff., e. transcted from Biblical Notes and Dissertations, Lond. 1830), Eier (Der Brief an die Hebrüer, p. 422), Lewis (Lippincott's Discourses on the Gospels, 1845), in the Journal of the Sacred Lit., for 1890, p. 192 f., 193 ff., Hofmann (Schreibung, ii. 2, 2te Aufl., p. 573, cf. p. 105), Robbins (in the Bibl. Sacra for 1861, p. 469 ff.), cf. Tobler (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. for 1864, p. 533 ff.); Wordsworth (Gr. Text. ii. (1) 961 ff.); Stone (Origins and Hist. of the Books of the N. T. 1866, p. 370 ff.); Pond (in the Cong. Review for 1868, p. 28 ff.);—see a review of the evidence in favor of, and against, the Pauline authorship, in the Bibl. Sacra for Oct. 1867.

The opinion that the epistle was destined originally for Alexandrian readers (in opposition to which see Linnemann, Handb. Eind. § 2), has been adopted by Kastlin (as above, p. 383 ff.), Wieseler (as above, and in the Stud. u. Krit. for 1897, p. 605 ff.), Conybeare and Howson (as above), Bunsen (Hippol. and his Age, ii. 140, Germ. ed. 1865), Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 104), Ritschl (as above), and seems to be favored by Muratoru's Fragment (see Westcott, Canon of the N. T. 2d ed. p. 480, cf. p. 190). Rome as its destination has been advocated fully by Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift for 1867, pp. 1-35.

The date of the epistle is fixed by Eberard at A. D. 62; by Lardner, Davidson, Schaff, Lindsay, and others at 63; by Lange (in Herzog's Real-Encycl. xi. 245) to 64; by Stuart, Tholuck, and others about 64; by Wieseler in the year 64 "between spring and July"; by Riehn, Hilgenfeld (as above) 64-66; De Wette, Linnemann, and others 65-67; Ewald "summer of 66"; Bunsen 67; Conybeare and Howson, Bleek (Eind. iia N. T. p. 553) 68-9; Alford 68-70.

The doctrine of the epistle has been generally discussed by Neander (Pilagint, etc. bk. vi. chap. ii. Robinson's ed. p. 187 f.), Kastlin (Jehan. Lehrbegr. p. 387 ff.), Reuss (Histoire de la Theologie Chrétienne, tom. ii.), Messner (as above), most fully by Riehn (as above); its Christology by Moll (in a series of programs, 1854 ff.), A. Sarrus (Jesus Christ d'apres l'Opiniére de l'E'ge aux Hibr., Strassb. 1851, and Beyerlag (Christologie des N. T., 1866, p. 170 ff.). The Melchisedee priesthood is treated of by Auberlen (Stud. u. Krit. for 1857, p. 453 ff.).

Its mode of employing the O. T. has been considered by De Wette (Theol. Zeitschr. by Schleierm., De Wette and Lücke, 3te Heft, p. 1 ff.), Tholuck (Beilage i. to his Com., also published separately with the title Das alte Text. im N. T., 3te Aufl 1861), and Fairlairn (Typology of Scripture. bk. ii. Append. B, viii. Amer. ed. vol. i. 302 ff.).


J. H. T.

HEBRON (גֵּרְבֹּן [union, allience]: Xαβρόν; [Rom. in 1 Chr. xxv. 9, Χαβρόν]: Hebrón). 1. The third son of Kohath, who was the second son of Levi; the younger brother of Anram, father a See also Norton, in the Christian Examiner 1825, v. 37-70, and a trans of the 34t of Tholuck's Das A. T. im N. T. by Rev. C. A. Aiken, in the Bibl. Sacra for July, 1854.
HEBRON

of Moses and Aaron (Ex. vi. 18; Num. iii. 19; 1 Chr. vi. 2, 18, xxiii. 12). The immediate children of Hebron are not mentioned by name (comp. Ex. vi. 21, 22), but he was the founder of a "family" (Mishpachath) of Hebronites (Num. iii. 27, xxvi. 58; 1 Chr. xxvi. 39, 30, 31) or Bene-Hebron (1 Chr. xxv. 29, xxiii. 19), who are often mentioned in the enumerations of the Levites in the passages above cited. **Jerahmeel** was the head of the family in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiii. 19, xxvi. 31, xxiv. 23; in the last of these passages the name of Hebron does not now exist in the Hebrew, but has been supplied in the A. V. from the other lists). In the last year of David's reign we find them settled at Jazer in Gilead (a place not elsewhere named as a Levitical city), "mighty men of valor." (1 Chr. xxvi. 2, 700 in number, who were superintendent for the king over the two and a half tribes in regard to all matters sacred and secular (1 Chr. xxviii. 31, 32). At the same time 1700 of the family under Hashabiah held the same office on the west side of Jordan (1 Chr. xxi. 30).

2. This name appears in the genealogical lists of the tribe of Judah (1 Chr. ii. 42, 43), where Maresah is said to have been the "father of Hebron," who again had four sons, one of whom was Tappuach. The three names just mentioned are those of phases, as are also many others in the subsequent branches of this genealogy—Ziph, Maon, Beth-zur, etc. But it is impossible at present to say whether these names are intended to be those of the places themselves or of persons who founded them.

G. Hebron (יהבון [see supra]: Heb. בון and נֶבֶון; [Hebron]; 1 Mc. v. 65; Chaldean). Arab. حِرْمْنُّ := the friendly), a city of Judah (Josh. xv. 54): situated among the mountains (Josh. xii. 7), 29 Roman miles south of Jerusalem, and the same distance north of Beer-sheba (Othoam. v. s. Æsop.). Hebron is one of the most ancient cities in the world still existing; and in this respect it is the rival of Damascus. It was built, says a medieval writer, "seven years before Zosim in Egypt." (Num. xxvii. 22). But if Zosim built? It is well we can prove the high antiquity of Hebron independently of Egypt's mystical annals. It was a well known town when Abraham entered Canaan 3780 years ago (Gen. xiii. 18). Its original name was Kirjath-Arba (כִּירָעַת-אָרָבָּא; LXX., Κυραθ-ερβοκείφωρ, Judg. ii. 10), "the city of Arba:" so called from Arba, the father of Anak, and progenitor of the giant Anakim (Josh. xxi. 14, xv. 13, 14). It was sometimes called Mamre, doubtless from Abraham's friend and ally, Mamre the Amorite (Gen. xxiii. 19, xxvii. 27); but the "cave of Mamre," where the Patriarch so often pitched his tent, appears to have been not in, but near Hebron. (MAYNE.) The chief interest of this city arises from its having been the scene of some of the most remarkable events in the lives of the patriarchs. Sarah died at Hebron; and Abraham then bought from Ephron the Hittite the field and cave of Machpelah, to serve as a family tomb (Gen. xxiii. 2-9). The cave is still there; and the massive walls of the Hebron or mosque, within which it lies, form the most remarkable object in the whole city. (MAYNE.) Abraham is called by Mohammedans, el-Khulif, "the Friend," i.e. of God, and this is the modern name of Hebron. When the Israelites entered Palestine Hebron was taken by Joshua from the descendants of Anak, and given to Caleb (Josh. x. 36, xiv. 6-15, xv. 13, 14). It was assigned to the Levites, and made "a city of refuge" (Josh. xxi. 11-13). Here David first established the seat of his government, and dwelt during the seven years and a half he reigned over Judah (2 Sam. v. 5). Hebron was rebuilt after the Captivity; but it soon fell into the hands of the Edomites, from whom it was rescued by Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc. viii. 65; Joseph. Ant. xiii. 8, § 6). A short time before the capture of Jerusalem Hebron was burned by an officer of Vespasian (Joseph. B. J. iv. 9, § 9). About the beginning of the 12th century it was occupied by Crusaders. It subsequently lay a time in ruins (Albert Aqu. vii. 15; Swaolf in Early Travels in Pala., p. 45); but in A. D. 1167 it was made the seat of a Latin bishopric (Will. Tyr. xx. 3). In 1187 it reverted to the Muslims, and has ever since remained in their hands.

Hebron now contains about 5000 inhabitants, of whom some 50 families are Jews. It is picturesque situated in a narrow valley, surrounded by rocky hills. This, in all probability, is that "valley of Edom," whence the Jewish spies got the great bunch of grapes (Num. xiii. 23). Its sides are still clothed with luxuriant vineyards, and its grapes are considered the finest in Southern Palestine. Groves of gray olives, and some other fruit-trees, give variety to the scene. The valley runs from north to south; and the main quarter of the town, surrounded by the lofty walls of the venerable Hebron, lies partly on the eastern slope (Gen. xxvii. 14; comp. xxi. 19). [EASTRON.] The houses are all of stone, solidly built, that-roofed, each having one or two small cupolas. The town has no walls, but the main streets opening on the principal roads have gates. In the bottom of the valley south of the town is a large tank, 130 ft. square, by 50 deep; the sides are solidly built with hewn stones. At the northern end of the principal quarter is another, measuring 50 ft. long, by 55 broad. Both are of high antiquity; and one of them, probably the former, is that over which David hanged the murderers of Ish-bosheth (2 Sam. iv. 12). About a mile from the town, up the valley, is one of the largest oak-trees in Palestine. It stands quite alone in the midst of the vineyards. It is 33 ft. in girth, and its branches cover a space 80 ft. in diameter. This, says some, is the very tree beneath which Abraham pitched his tent; but, however this may be, it still bears the name of the patriarch. (Porter's Hand-ook, p. 67 ff.; Rob. ii. 76 ff.)

J. L. *

The meaning be that Hashabiah and his brethren were seated on the western side of the Transjordanic country?

5. The visit of the Prince of Wales to Hebron was made after this article on Hebron was written. The results of the attempt on that occasion to explore the celebrated Mosque there, will be stated under MACPHELAH (Amer. ed.).

H.
2. (אֲבֹדֶל, and שֵׁבְרֹם: Ἂξαβών, Alex. Αξ-), Achran, later editions Abdon). One of the towns in the territory of Asher (Josh. xix. 28), on the boundary of the tribe. It is named next to Rehob, and is apparently in the neighborhood of Zidon. By Eusebius and Jerome it is merely mentioned (Onomast. Achran), and no one in modern times has discovered its site. It will be observed that the name in the original is quite different from that of Hebron, the well-known city of Judah (No. 1), although in the A. V. they are the same, our translators having represented the aion by H, instead of by G, or by the vowel only, as is their usual custom. But, in addition, it is not certain whether the name should not rather be Ebdon or Abdon (עֵבְדוֹן), since that form is found in many MSS. (Davidson, Hebr. Text; Ges. Thes. p. 980), and since an Abdon is named amongst the Levitical cities of Asher in other lists, which otherwise would be unmentioned here. On the other hand, the old versions (excepting only the Vat. LXX., which is obviously corrupt) unanimously retain the H [Abdon].

* Kirjath Arba does not appear to have been the
original name of Hebron; but simply the name immediately prior to the Israelitish occupancy. For we are told that it was so called from Arba, the father of Anak (Josh. xv. 13, 14); and the children of Anak were the occupants when Caleb took it, as we learn from the same passage. But in Abraham’s time there was a different occupant, Manure the ally of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 13, 24); and the place was then called by his name (Gen. xxviii. 19, xxxv. 27). This appellation, then, preceded that of Kir- jath Arba. But as the place was a very ancient one (Num. xiii. 22), and as Manure was Abraham’s contemporary, it had some name older than either of these two. What was that previous name? The first mention of the place (Gen. xiii. 18) would obviously indicate Hebron as the previous and original name — subsequently displaced (in part at least) by Manure, afterwards by Arba, but restored to its ancient and time-honored rights when Arba’s descendants, the Anakim, were driven out by the descendants of Abraham.

S. C. B.

HEBONITES, THE (חָבִיִּים, חָבִיִּים, חָבִיִּים: δ Ἑβραῖοι, δ Ἑβραῖοι [Vat. πα.: Ἑβρόνιται, Ἑβρόνιται]). A tribe of the Kohathite Levites, descendants of Hebron the son of Kohath (Num. iii. 27, xxvi. 58; 1 Chr. xxvi. 23). In the reign of David the chief of the family west of the Jordan was Hashabiah; while on the east in the land of Gilead were Jerijah and his brethren, “men of valor,” over the Hebeni- nites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (1 Chr. xxvi. 30, 31, 32).

W. A. W.

HEDGE (חֵץ, חֵץ, חֵץ: φράσας). The first three words thus rendered in the A. V., as well as their Greek equivalent, denote simply that which surrounds or incloses, whether it be a stone wall (חֵץ, פֶּהֶר), Prov. xxiv. 31; Ez. xiii. 10), or a fence of other materials. חֵץ, פֶּהֶר, and חֵץ, חוֹדֶר, are used of the hedge of a vineyard (Num. xxii. 24; Ps. lxxxix. 40; 1 Chr. iv. 23), and the latter is employed to describe the wide walls of stone, or fences of thorn, which served as a shelter for sheep in winter and summer (Num. xxxii. 16). The stone walls which surrounded the sheepfolds of modern Palestine are frequently crowned with sharp thorns (Thomson, Land and Book, i. 299), a custom at least as ancient as the time of Homer (Od. xiv. 10), when a kind of prickly pear (אֵיזֵבְּרָס) was used for that purpose, as well as for the fences of cornfields at a later period (Arist. Exec. 355). In order to protect the vineyards from the ravages of wild beasts (Ps. lixx. 12) it was customary to surround them with a wall of loose stones or mud (Matt. xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1), which was a favorite haunt of serpents (Exod. x. 8), and a retreat for locusts from the cold (Nah. iii. 17). Such walls are described by Manoah as surrounding the gardens of Dannahus; “they are built of great pieces of earth, made in the fashion of brick and hardened in the sun. In their dimensions they are each two yards long and somewhat more than one breadth, and half a yard thick. Two rows of these, placed one upon another, make a cheap, expedient, and, in this dry country, a durable wall” (Early Trav. in Pet. p. 487). A wall or fence of this kind is clearly distinguished in Is. v. 5 from the tangled hedges, מַעְרַכָּה (מַעְרַכָּה, Mic. vii. 4), which was planted as an additional safeguard to the vineyard (cf. Ezech. xxviii. 24), and was composed of the thorny shrubs with which Palestine abounds.

The prickly pear, a species of cactus, so frequently employed for this purpose in the East at present, is believed to be of comparatively modern introduction. The aptness of the comparison of a tangled hedge of thorns to the difficulties which a foolish man conjures up as an excus e for his inactivity, will be at once recognized (Prov. xv. 19; cf. Hos. ii. 6). The narrow paths between the hedges of the vineyards and gardens, “with a fence on this side and a fence on that side” (Num. xxxii. 24), are distinguished from the “highways,” or more frequented tracks, in Luke xiv. 23.

W. A. W.

HEGAI (2 esyl) (חָגָי [Persian name, Ges.]: Φαί: Φαίος), one of the eunuchs (A. V. “chamberlains”) of the court of Abasuerus, who had special charge of the women of the harem (Esth. ii. 8, 15). According to the Hebrew text he was a distinct person from the “keeper of the concubines” — Shashagaz (14), but the LXX. have the same name in 14 as in 8, while in 15 they omit it altogether. In verse 3 the name is given under the different form of

HEGE (חָגָי, Φαίος), probably a Persian name. Φαί signifies eunuch in Sanskrit, in accordance with which the LXX. have Ἰωσίφος, Hegas, Ηγής, is mentioned by Ctesias as one of the people about Xerxes, Gesenius, Thes. Addenda, p. 81 b.

HEIFEI (חָפֵה, חָפֵה, חָפֵה: δαμαλις: κορέα). The Hebrew language has no expression that exactly corresponds to our heifer; for both εἶδνυς and περίκες are applied to cows that have calved (1 Sam. vi. 7-12; Job xii. 10; Is. vii. 21): indeed εἶδνυς means a young animal of any species, the full expression being εἶδνυς βοτρις, “heifer of kine” (Deut. xxxi. 3; 1 Sam. xvi. 2; Is. vii. 21). The heifer or young cow was not commonly used for ploughing, but only for treading out the corn (Hos. x. 11; but see Judg. xiv. 18),5 when it ran about without any headstall (Judg. xiv. 24): hence the use of the unheadled heifer (Hos. iv. 16; A. V. “a lack-sidering”), to which Israel is compared. A similar sense has been attached to the expression “a calf of three years old,” i.e., unbridled, in Is. xv. 5, Jer. xxxii. 34; but it is much more probably to be taken as a proper name, Ephthah Shekibzib, such names being not uncommon. The sense of “disolute” is conveyed undoubtedly in Am. iv. 1. The comparison of Egypt to a “fair heifer” (Jer. xiv. 20) may be an allusion to the well-known form under whichApis was worshipped (to which we may also refer the words in ver. 15, as understood in the LXX., “Why is the bullock, μαγεύς ἐκλειπόντας, swept away? ”), the “destruction” threatened being the bite of the gad-fly, to which the word keretz would aptly apply. “To plough with another man’s heifer” (Judg. xiv. 18) implies that an advantage has been gained by unfair means. The proper names Ephah, Eiphchaim, and Yar, are derived from the Hebrew terms at the head of this article.

W. L. B.

HEIR. The Hebrew institutions relative to inheritance were of a very simple character. Under the patriarchal system the property was divided

* Ploughing with heifers, as implied in that passage, is sometimes practiced in Palestine at present (See Hearns. of Scripture, p. 152.)
among the sons of the legitimate wives (Gen. xxi. 10, xxiv. 36, xxv. 5), a larger portion being assigned to one, generally the eldest, on whom devolved the duty of maintaining the females of the family. [Because of...]
The sons of concubines were particularly concerned with the question of inheritance, occasionally they were placed on a par with the legitimate sons (Gen. xlix. 1 f.), but this may have been restricted to cases where the children had been adopted by the legitimate wife (Gen. xxx. 3). At a later period the exclusion of the sons of concubines was rigidly enforced (Judg. xi. 1 f.). Daughters had no share in the patrimony (Gen. xxvii. 14), but received a marriage portion, consisting of a maid-servant (Gen. xxix. 24, 29), or some other property. As a matter of special favor they sometimes took part with the sons (Job xlii. 15). The Mosaic law regulated the succession to real property thus: it was to be divided among the sons, the eldest receiving a double portion (Deut. xxi. 17), the others equal shares: if there were no sons, it went to the daughters (Num. xxvii. 8), on the condition that they did not marry out of their own tribe (Num. xxxvi. 6 f.; Tob. vi. 12, 17), otherwise the patrimony was forfeited (Josh. iv. 1 f., 7, § 5). If there were no daughters, it went to the brother of the deceased; if no brother, to the paternal uncle; and, failing these, to the nearest of kin (Num. xxvii. 9-11). In the case of a widow left without children, the nearest of kin on her husband's side had the right of marrying her, and in the event of his refusal the next of kin (Ruth iii. 12, 13): with him rested the obligation of re-securing the property of the widow (Ruth iv. 1 f.), if it had been either sold or mortgaged: this obligation was termed כשלון השם ("the right of inheritance"), and was exercised in other cases besides that of marriage (Gen. xxvii. 7 f.).

If none stepped forward to marry the widow, the inheritance remained with her until her death, and then reverted to the next of kin. The object of these regulations evidently was to prevent the alienation of the land, and to retain it in the same family: the Mosaic law enforced, in short, a strict entail. Even the assignment of the double portion, which under the patriarchal régime had been at the disposal of the father (Gen. xviii. 22), was by the Mosaic law limited to the eldest son (Deut. xxi. 15-17). The case of David and Caleb presents a field (Josh. xiv. 18, 19; Judg. i. 15), an exception: but perhaps even in that instance the land reverted to Caleb's descendants either at the death of Achshah or in the year of Jubilee. The land being thus so strictly tied up, the notion of heasip, as we understand it, was hardly known to the Jews: succession was a matter of right, and not of favor—a state of things which is embodied in the Hebrew language itself, for the word נכס (A. v. "to inherit") implies possession, and very

often forceful possession (Dent. ii. 12; Judg. i. 29 xi. 24), and a similar idea lies at the root of the words הַבְּשַׁדַּי and הַבְּשַׁדַּי, generally translated "inheritance." Testimonial dispositions were of course superfluous: the nearest approach to the idea is the blessing, which in early times conveyed temporal as well as spiritual benefits (Gen. xxvii. 10, 37; Josh. xxv. 19). The references to wills in St. Paul's writings are borrowed from the usages of Greece and Rome (Heb. ix. 17), whence the custom was introduced into Judaea: several wills are noticed by Josephus in connection with the Herods (Ant. xiii. 16, § 1, xviii. 3, § 2; B. J. ii. 2 § 3).

With regard to personal property, it may be presumed that the owner had some authority over it, at all events during his lifetime. The admission of a slave to a portion of the inheritance with the sons (Prov. xvii. 2) probably applies only to the personal estate. A presentation of half the property formed the marriage portion of Tobit's wife (Tob. viii. 21). A distribution of goods during the father's lifetime is implied in Luke xvi. 11-13: a distinction may be noted between ωσια, a general term applicable to personalty, and καμπηοτηρία, the landed property, which could only be divided after the father's death (Luke xii. 13).

There is a striking resemblance between the Hebrew and Athenian customs of heasip, particularly as regards the daughter (ἐγερτοφόρος), who, were in both nations, bound to marry her nearest relation: the property did not vest in the husband even for his lifetime, but devolved upon the son of the heasip as soon as he was of age, who also bore the name of his father, but of his maternal grandfather. The object in both countries was the same, namely, to preserve the name and property of every family (Dict. of Ant. art. ἐγεερτοφόρος).

**HELAH (יהלא; v. 1) [root]: Αἰαδία; Alex. Alass; Hellen], one of the two wives of Ashur, father of Tekoa (1 Chr. iv. 5). Her three children are enumerated in ver. 7. In the LXX. the passage is much more confused, the sons being ascribed to different wives from what they are in the Hebrew text.

**HELAH (יהלא) [perh. power of the people, Gr.: Αἰαδία; Hellen], a place east of the Jordan, but west of the Euphrates ("the river"), at which the Syrians were collected by Halahzeru, and which David met and defeated them (2 Sam. x. 16, 17). In the latter verse the name appears as Chelannah (יהלאנה), but the final syllable is probably only the particle of motion. This longer form, Χαλανάδα, the present text b in the LXX. inserts in ver. 16 as the name of the river (but Alex. and Comp. omit it); while in the two other places it has Αἰαδία, corresponding to the Hebrew text. By Josephus (Ant. vii. 6, § 3) the name is

decorative as to the existence of such a right among the Galatians (see Lightfoot's St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 104, 2d ed.). The Apostle, in arguing his point (Gal. iv. 2), may have framed a case of this nature for the sake of illustration, or have had in mind certain discretionary power which the Roman laws granted to the father.

a It has been suggested that in Gal. iv. 2 Paul may have referred to a peculiar testamentary law among the Galatians (see Galas, Institutiones, i. § 55) conferring on the father a right to determine the time of the son's majority, instead of its being fixed by statute. In that case we should have the facility with which Paul could avail himself of his knowledge of minute local regulations in the lands in which he visited. (See Baung-Crusius, Comm. über τα Βιβλια τον Οικετην, p. 51.) But that passage in ius, when most closely examined, proves not to be

b This is probably a late addition, since in the LXX text as it stood in Orig. n's Ἠραρχα, Χαλανάδα was omitted after Αἰαδία (cf. Ant. Bahr, i. iv).
given as Χαλαμαί, and as being that of the king of the Syrians beyond Euphrates — πρὸς Χαλαμαί τον τῶν πέραν Ἑυφράτου Σιών Βασιλέα. In the Vulgate no name is inserted after plurimum; but in ver. 16, for "came to Helam," we find adjecturum verum, reading Ἡλβαθον, "their army." This too is the rendering of the old translator A vila — in δυνάμει αὐτῶν — of whose version v r. 16 has survived. In 17 the Vulgate agrees with the L. V. Many conjectures have been made as to the locality of Helbon; but to none of them does any certainty attach. The most feasible perhaps is that it is identical with Amathath, a town named by Ptolemy, and located by him on the west of the Euphrates near Nicopolium. 

HELBAH (Ἑλβαθον) [fort]: Χεβδαι; [Alex. Σχεβδαι (acc.); Comp. Ἐλβαι]: Helbon, a town of Asher, probably on the plain of Phoenicia, not far from Siron (Josul. i. 31). J. L. P.

HELION (Ἑλίον) [fort, i.e. νεφελεῖα]: Χεβδεαν; [Alex. Χεβρον], a place only mentioned once in Scripture. Ezekiel, in describing the wealth and commerce of Tyre, says, "Damascus was thy merchant in the wine of Helbon [xxvii. 18]." The Vulgate translates these words in rino piissimis and some other ancient versions also make the word descriptive of the quality of the wine. There can be no doubt, however, that Helbon is a proper name. Strabo speaks of the wine of Chalbon (αὐτόν ἐκ Συρίας τὸν Χαλβδεαν) from Syria as among the luxuries in which the kings of Persia indulged (xx. p. 735); and Athenaeus assigns it to Damascus (i. 22). Geographers have hitherto represented Helbon as identical with the city of Aleppo, called Helbo (هَلْبُ) by the Arabs; but there are strong reasons against this. The whole force and beauty of the description in Ezekiel consists in this, that in the great market of Tyre every kingdom and city found ample demand for its own staple products. Why, therefore, should the Damascusen supply wine of Aleppo, conveying it a long and difficult journey overland? If strange merchants had engaged in this trade, we should naturally expect them to be some maritime people who could carry it cheaply along the coast from the port of Aleppo. A few year ago the writer directed attention to a village and district within a few miles of Damascius, still bearing the ancient name Helbon (the Arabic Ḥawra), and still celebrated as producing the finest grapes in the country. (See Journal of Soc. Lit. July 1873, p. 209, Five Years in Damascus, ii. 349 ff.). There cannot be a doubt that this village, and not Aleppo, is the Helbon of Ezekiel and Strabo. The village is situated in a wild grove, high up in Antilebanon. The remains of some large and beautiful structures are strewn around it. The bottom and sides of the glen are covered with terraced vineyards; and the whole surrounding country is rich in vines and fig-trees (Hawth., for Eycr. and Pat., pp. 435-6). J. L. P.

- The discovery of this Helbon is one of the results of missionary labor in that part of the East. Mr. Porter, who writes the article above, was formerly connected with the mission at Damascus. Dr. Robinson accepts the proposed identification as unquestionably correct. The name alone is not decisive, for Helib (Aleppo) may answer to Helbon; but Aleppo "produces no wine of any reputation; nor is Damascus the natural channel of commerce between Aleppo and Tyre" (Later Res. iii. 472). Fairfair (Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy, p. 301, 2d ed.) follows the old opinion. Rütcher (Herzog's Real-Konigl. v. 698) makes Ezekiel's Helbon and this one near Damascus the same, but thinks Ptolemy's Chalbon (see above) too far north to be identical with them.

HELCH'AH (Χαλκάς: [Vat.-κετ.—] Helcias), 1 Esdr. viii. 1. [Hilkiah].

HELCH'AS (Χαλκάς) the same person as the preceding, 2 Esdr. i. 1. [Hilkiah].

HELD'AI (Xel'kai) [skilful, trustworthy]: Χελδαία: [Vat. Χαλδαία; Alex. Χαλδαία]: Heldoc. 1, the twelfth captain of the monthly courses for the temple service (1 Chr. xxvii. 15). He is specified as "the Netophathite," and as a descendant of Othniel.

2, An Israelite who seems to have returned from the Captivity; for whom, others, Zechariah was commanded to make certain crowns as memorials (Zech. vi. 10). In ver. 14 the name appears to be changed to Helem. The LXX. translate ἤλεκτος τῶν ἁρχιέρων.

HEL'EB (Ἑλέβ) [milk]: Vat. omits: Alex. Αλεφ: [Comp. Ἐλεδ]: Helbo, son of Bananah, the Netophathite, one of the heroes of king David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 29). In the parallel lath the name is given as —

HELED (Ἑλέδ): Χαλδαίς: [Vat.-Χαλδαί]: Alex. Χαλδαί: Heloch, 1 Chr. xi. 30 [where he is mentioned as one of "the valiant men" of David's army].

HELEK (Ἑλέκ) [port, porton]: Χελέ: Αlex. Χελέ: [in Josh. Χαλέ]: Alex. Φελέχ]: Helok, one of the descendants of Manasseh, the second son of Gilead (Num. xxvi. 30), and founder of the family of the Helkitites. The Ben-Chedek [sons of C.] are mentioned in Josh. xvii. 2 as of much importance in their tribe. The name has not however survived, at least it has not yet been met with.

HELEKITES, THE (Ἑλέκιται, i.e. the Chelkite: δ Ἰελέκη [Vat. -γελ], Alex. Χελέκη: familia Helckerburnii), the family descended from the foregoing (Num. xxvi. 30).

HELEM (Ἑλέμ) [hammer or blow]: [Rom. Βαρνάβα: Vat. Βαλέας; Alex.] Ελέας: Helem). A man named among the descendants of Asher, in a passage evidently much disordered (1 Chr. vii. 35). If it be intended that he was the brother of Shamer, then he may be identical with Hotham, in ver. 32, the name having been altered in copying; but this is mere conjecture. Lorington (i. 269) quotes two Hebrew MSS., in which the name is written אֵלֶם, Cheles.

HELEPH (חֵלֶפּ) [exchange, instead of]:

Matarim: Alex. Melaph — both include the preparation made: Heliaph, the place from which the boundary of the tribe of Naphtali started (Josh. xix. 33), but where situated, or on which quarter, cannot be ascertained from the text.

Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 320) proposes to identify it with Beitefuh, an ancient site, nearly due east of the River Jordan, and west of Kedesh, on the edge of a very marked ravine, which probably formed part of the boundary between Naphtali and Asher (Van de Velde, Syrie, i. 293; and see his map, 1858). G.

HELEZ (הֵלֶז) [perh. loins, thigh, Gesen.]:

Xalalath — the initial ס is probably from the end of the preceding word, [Xalalath; 1 Chr. xxvii. 10, Vat. Εξαλαθα]: Alex. Ελλης, Έλλης: Hellen, Helle.

1. One of “the thirty” of David’s guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 26): 1 Chr. xi. 2: in the latter, γήλην: an Ephraimithe, and captain of the seventh monthly course (1 Chr. xxvii. 10). In both these passages of Chronicles he is called “the Pelonite,” of which Kennicott decides that the Παλητίς of Samuel is a corruption of Παλητίς, a contraction of the name, as that by employed by the LXX. in the O. T. to render the Hebrew γήλην, Elmi the high-priest.

2. The third of three names inserted between Achitophel and Amariah in the genealogy of Ezra, in 2 Esdr. i. 2 (compare Ezra vii. 2, 3).

HELIES, 2 Esdr. vii. 39. [Ελαίας.]

HELIODYNES (Ἠλιόδυνης [gift of the sun]): Alex. Heliodounes (ὁ ἐν τοῖς πρωταγοραῖοις τοῦ Σελενίου Φίλοπαθος), who was commissioned by the king, at the instigation of Apollonius [Apol- lonius] to carry away the private treasures deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem. According to the narrative in 2 Macc. iii. 9 ff., he was stayed from the execution of his design by a “great apparition” (ἐπιφάνεια), in consequence of which he fell down “compassed with great darkness,” and speechless. He was afterwards restored at the intercession of the high-priest Onias, and bore witness to the king of the inviolable majesty of the Temple (2 Macc. iii.). The full details of the narrative are not supported by any other evidence.

Josephus, who was unequainted with 2 Macc., takes no notice of it; and the author of the so-called iv. Macc. attributes the attempt to plunder the Temple to Apollonius, and differs in his account of the miraculous interposition, though he distinctly refers, as we pole, to the καταστροφὴν καὶ τυφώσειν τῶν ἀπολλώνων . . . .). Heliodorus afterwards murdered Seleucus, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the Syrian crown n. c. 175 (App. Syr. p. 45). Cf. Wernsdorff, De fide Lib. Macc. § liv. Raphael’s grand picture of “Heliodorus” will be known to most by copies and engravings, if not by the original.

B. F. W.

HELKAI [2 synt. (חֵלֶק) [whole portion in Jeuchok] : Ελάκας: [Vat. Alex. F. A. omit] Helka,

A priest of the family of Merioth (or Meremoth, see ver. 3), who was living in the days of the high-priest, i. e. in the generation following the return from Babylon under Joshua and Zerubbabel (Neh. xii. 16; comp. 10, 12).

HELKATH (חֵלֶק) [field]: Εκκλησιατός:

[Xelakia]: Alex. Xelath, [Xelakia]: Helleath, and Helkath, the town named as the starting-point for the boundary of the tribe of Asher (Josh. xix. 25), and allotted with its “suburb” to the Gerizomite Levites (xxi. 31). The enumeration of the boundary seems to proceed from south to north; but nothing absolutely certain can be said thereon, nor has any traveller recovered the site of Helkath.

Eusebius and Jerome report the name much corrupted (Onom. Ethes), but evidently knew nothing of the place. Schwarz (p. 191) suggests the village Yerko, which lies about 8 miles east of Akko (see Van de Velde’s map); but this requires further examination.

In the list of Levitical cities in 1 Chr. vi. Hulok is substituted for Helkath.

HEL KATH HAZZURIM (חֵלֶק הָאָצוּרִים) [field of the sharp edges, Keil; but see infra]: μερίς τῶν ἐπιδομῶν — perhaps reading "τῶν ἐπιδομῶν": Aquila, Καρύς τῶν στεφεών: Ager robustorum, a smooth piece of ground, apparently close to the pool of Gibeon, where the combat took place between the two parties of Joab’s men and Abner’s men, which ended in the death of the whole of the combatants, and brought on a general battle (2 Sam. ii. 16).

[ ג ב ר נ א צ י א נ : Ἰουαβ] Various interpretations are given of the name. In addition to those given above, Gesenius (Theor. p. 485 a) renders it “the field of swords.” The margin of the L. V. has “the field of strong men,” agreeing with Aquila and the Vulgate; Ewald (Gesch. iii. 147), “das Feld der Flickischen.” G.

* The field received its name from the bloody duel fought there, as expressly said (2 Sam. ii. 16). The Scripture words put before us the horrible scene: “And they caught every one his bow by the head and thrust his sword in his fellow’s side; so they fell down together: wherewith place was called Helkath-hazzurim.” The name may be “field of the rocks,” i. e. of the strong men, firm as rocks (see Wordsworth, in loc.).

HELKIAS (Xelidias: [Vat. Xelaxias]: Vulg. omits.

A fourth variation of the name of Hilkiah the high priest, 1 Esdr. i. 8. [Hilkiahs.]

HELL. This is the word generally and unfortunately used by our translators to render the Hebrew Shed (שֵׁד), or חֶדִית: “Ađhit, and once פארוס: 2 Sam. xxili. 6: Inferi or Inferno, or sometimes Moris). We say unfortunately, because — although, as St. Augustine truly asserts, Shed, with its equivalents Inferri and Hells, are never used in a good sense (De Gen. et Lit. xii. 33), yet — the English word Hell is mixed up with numberless associations entirely foreign to the minds of the ancient Hebrews. It would perhaps have been better to retain the Hebrew word Shed, or else render it always by “the grave” or “the pit.”

Ewald accepts Luther’s word Helle; even Unterwel, which is suggested by De Wette, involves exceptions too-known for the purpose.
Passing over the derivations suggested by other writers, it is now generally agreed that the word comes from the root הילא, "to make hollow" (comp. Germ. Hölle, "hell," with Höhle, "a hollow"), and therefore means the vast hollow subterraneous rest-place which is the nearest equivalent of the dead (Ges. Thes. p. 1348; Et ticher, de Inferiis, c. iv. p. 137 ff.; Ewald, ad Ps. p. 42). It is deep (Job xi. 8) and dark (Job v. 21, 22), in the centre of the earth (Num. xvi. 30; Deut. xxxii. 22), having within it depths on depths (Prov. ix. 18), and fastened with gates (Is. xxxviii. 10) and bars (Job xvii. 16). Some have fancied (as Jahn, Arch. Bibb. § 203, Eng. ed.) that the Jews, like the Greeks, believed in infernal rivers: thus Clemens Alex. defines Gehenna as "a river of fire" (Strom. xxxviii. 38), and expressly compares it to the fiery rivers of Tartarus (Strom. v. 14, 92); and Tertullian says that it was supposed to resemble Pyrphilegethon (Apolog. cap. xlvii.). The notion, however, is not found in Scripture, for Ps. xvii. 5 is a mere metaphor. In this cavernous realm are the souls of dead men, the Rechabim and ill-spirits (Is. lxxxvi. 15, lxxxviii. 48; Prov. xxiii. 14; Ez. xxxii. 21, 22). It is "all-devouring" (Prov. i. 12, xxxvi. 16), insatiable (Is. v. 14), and remorseless (Cant. viii. 6). The shadows, not of men only, but even of trees and kingdoms, are placed in Sheol (Is. xiv. 9-20; Ez. xxxi. 14-18, xxxii. passion.). It is clear that in many passages of the O. T. Sheol can only mean "the grave," and is so rendered in the A. V. (see, for example, Gen. xxxviii. 35, xliii. 38; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Job xiv. 13). In other passages, however, it seems to involve a notion of punishment, and is therefore rendered in the A. V. by the word "hell." But in many cases this is a translation misleads the reader. It is obvious, for instance, that Job xi. 8; Ps. cxxxiii. 8; Am. iv. 2 (where "hell" is used as the antithesis of "heaven"), merely illustrate the Jewish notions of the locality of Sheol in the bowels of the earth. Even Ps. ix. 17, Prov. xxv. 24, v. 5, iv. 18, seem to refer rather to the danger of terrible and precipitate death than to a place of infernal anguish. An attentive examination of all the passages in which the word occurs will show that the Hebrew notions respecting Sheol were of a vague description. The rewards and punishments of the Mossaic law were temporal, and it was only gradually and slowly that God revealed to his chosen people a knowledge of future rewards and punishments. Generally speaking, the Hebrews regarded the grave as the final end of all sentient and intelligent existence, "the land where all things are forgotten" (Ps. lxxxviii. 10-12; Is. xxxviii. 9-20; Ps. vi. 5; Eccl. iv. 10: Ecclus. xvii. 27, 28). Even the righteous Hezekiah trembled lest, "when his eyes closed upon the cherubim and the mercy seat," he should no longer "see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living." In the N. T. the word Hades (like Sheol) sometimes means merely "the grave" (Rev. xx. 13; Acts ii. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 55), or in general "the unseen world." It is in this sense that the creeds say of the Lord kaiarhthek ev airop or ei σαμων, diexkei se el ev infernion, "in the state of the dead in general, without any restriction of happiness or misery" (Beveridge on Act. iii.), a doctrine certainly, though only virtually, expressed in Scripture (Eph. iv. 9; Acts ii. 25-31). Similarly J. sephon uses Hades as the name of the place whence the soul of Samuel was evoked (Acts vi. 14, § 9). Elsewhere in the N. T. Hades is used of a place of torment (Luke xvi. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Matt. xx. 27, &c.). Consequently it has been the prevalent, almost the universal, notion that Hades is an intermediate state between death and resurrection, divided into two parts, one the abode of the blessed and the other of the lost. This was the belief of the Jews after the exile, who gave to the places the names of Paradise and Gehenna (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 1, § 58; et Orph. Lex. Robb. s. v.), of the Fathers generally (Tert. de Anima, c. vii.)."
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which is full of fine irony against the enemy, the name is applied to purposes of threatening (with a probable allusion to the recent acts of Hezekiah, see Rosenmuller, ad loc.). Besides the authorities quoted, see Bochart (Phædro, p. 528), Ewald (Proph. ii. 77, in loc.), and Wilson (Leads of the Bible, i. 499), etc.

The subject of the punishment of the wicked, and of Hell as a place of torment, belongs to a Theological rather than a Biblical Dictionary.

F. W. F.

* Some of the positions in the previous article cannot be viewed as well established. That "generally speaking, the Hebrews regarded the grave as the final end of all sentient and intelligent existence" is a statement opposed to the results of the best scholarship. Against it stand such considerations as these: a four hundred years' residence of the Israelites among a people proved to have held the doctrine of a future life; the Hebrew doctrine of the nature of the soul; the translation of Enoc and Elijah: the prevalent views of necromancy, or conjuring by the spirits of the dead, (a practice prohibited by law, and yet endorsed by a monarch of Israel): the constant assertion that the dead were gathered to their fathers, though buried far away: the explicit and deliberate utterances of many passages, e.g., the 16th, 17th, 49th, 72d Psalms, Eccles. xii. 14, 13, Daniel xii. 2, 3; and the known fact that the doctrine of immortality existed among the Jews (excepting the small sect of Sadducees) at the time of Christ. The utterances about the silence and inactivity of the grave must therefore be understood from the present point of view, and as having reference to the activities of this life.

The statements of Gesenius and very many others about the gates and bars of Hades simply convert rhetoric into logic, and might with equal propriety invest the Kingdom of Heaven with "keys." The theory so prevalent, that Hades was the common province of departed spirits, divided, however, into two compartments, Paradise and Gehenna, seems to have been founded more upon the classical writers and the Rabbins — to whom it appeals so largely — than upon the Bible. It is undoubtedly true, that under the older economy the whole subject was much more distinct than under the new, and the Hades of the N. T. expresses more than the Sheol of the O. T. (See Fairbairn, Horne's Manual, p. 230 ff.) Sheol was, no doubt, the unseen world, the state of the dead generally. So in modern times we often intentionally limit our views, and speak of the other world, the invisible world, the undiscovered country, the grave, the spirit land, etc. But vagueness of designation is not to be confounded with community of lot or identity of abode or condition.

Sheol, the unknown region into which the dying disappeared, was naturally and always invested with gloom to a sinful race. But the vague term was capable of becoming more or less definite according to the writer's thought. Most commonly it was simply the grave. As we use the phrase: sometimes the state of death in general; sometimes a dismal place opposed to heaven, e.g., Job xi. 8, Ps. xxxix. 8, Am. ix. 2; sometimes a place of extreme suffering, Ps. lxxiv. 13, Is. 17, Prov. xxiii. 14. (See Bible Sacra, xiii. 155 ff.) No passage of the O. T. we believe, implies that the spirits of the good and bad were there brought together. The mention of the place (Is. xiv. 9) implies the contrary, sprawling us only the heathen kings meeting another king in mockery.

To translate this Hebrew term, the LXX adopted the nearest Greek word, Hades, which by derivation signifies the invisible world. But the Greek word does not carry Greek notions into Hebrew theology.

When Christ and his Apostles came, they naturally laid hold of this Greek word already introduced into religious use. But, of course, they employed it from their own stand-point. And as it was the purpose of their mission to make more distinct the doctrine of retribution, and as under their teachings death became still more terrible to the natural man, so throughout the N. T. Hades seems invariably viewed as the enemy of man, and from its alliance with sin and its doom, as hostile to Christ and his church. In many instances it is with strict propriety translated "hell." Even in Acts ii. 27, 31, quoted from the O. T., Hades is the abode of the wicked dead. In Luke xvi. 23 it certainly is the place of torment. In Matt. xvi. 18 it is the abode and centre of those powers that were arrayed against Christ and his church. In Luke x. 15, Matt. x. 23, it is the opposite of heaven. The word occurs, according to the Received Text, in 1 Cor. xv. 55; but the reading is not supported by the older MSS. The only remaining instances are the four that are in Rev. i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 13, 14, where, though in three of these cases personified, it is still viewed as a terror to man and a foe to Christ and his kingdom, over which at length he has gained the victory. While therefore Gehenna is the term which most distinctly designates the place of future punishment, Hades also repeatedly is nearly its equivalent: and, notwithstanding the greater vagueness of the terms, it remains true, as Augustin asserts, that neither Hades nor Sheol are ever used in a good sense, or (we may add) in any other than a sense that carries the notion of terror.

S. C. B.

* For a full discussion of the terms and passages of the Old Testament relating to this subject, consult Bötticher, De Inferis Resuscitate post Mortem futuris ex Hebraeorum et Graecorum Opinionibus, Dresd. 1846, and for a view of the literature pertaining to it, see the bibliographical Appendix to Alger's Critical Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life (4th ed. New York, 1880), Nos. 1734-1863. See also the art. of Oehler, Unterblöckl, Lehrte des A. T., in Herzog's Real-Encycl. vii. 409-429; and Hävernick's Forkegenen über die Theologie des A. T., pp. 103-111. A.

HELLENIST (ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΩΣ: Grecus; cf. ΕΛΛΗΝΑ: Grecus, 3 Mark. iv. 13). In one of the earliest notices of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 1), two distinct parties are recognized among its members, "Hebrews" and "Hellenists" (Grecians), who appear to stand towards one another in some degree in a relation of jealous rivalry. So again, when St. Paul first visited Jerusalem after his conversion, he "spake and disputed with the Hellenists" (Acts ix. 29), if expecting to find more sympathy among them than with the rulers of the Jews. The term Hellenist occurs again in the N. T. according to the common text, in the account of the foundation of the church at Antioch (Acts xi. 20), but there the context, as well as the form of the sentence...
The name, according to its derivation, whether the original verb (Eλληνιζει) be taken, according to the etymology of similar forms (Μηθιζει, Ιπταειει, Φιλτηνει), in the general sense of adopting the spirit and character of Greeks, or, in the more limited sense of using the Greek language (Xen. Anab. vii. 3, § 25), marks a class distinguished by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Hellenists as a body included not only the prose-lytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage (οἱ σεβημενοι Ελληνες, Acts xxi. 4 (7); οἱ σεβημενοι προσλητα), Acts xiii. 45; οἱ σεβημενοι, Acts xvii. 17), but also those Jews who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew. Hellenism was thus a type of life, and not an indication of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used (Eλληνες, John xii. 20), the point of view seems to be that which is forthwith in the mind of the writer.

The general influence of the Greek conquests in the East, the rise and spread of the Jewish Dispersion, and the essential antagonism of Jew and Greek, have been noticed in other articles [Alexander the Great; Alexandria; Dispersion; Antiquities. Emphases], and it remains only to characterize briefly the elements which the Hellenic civilization added to the language of the N. T. and the immediate effects which they produced upon the Apostolic teaching:

1. The flexibility of the Greek language gained for it in ancient times a general currency similar to that which French enjoys in modern Europe; but with this important difference, that Greek was not only the language of educated men, but also the language of the masses in the great centres of commerce. The colonies of Alexandria were one of the chief points of contact between the Hellenic and the Jewish worlds; but this had not been so before the advent of the Macedonian dialect throughout the East; but even in this the prevailing power of Attic literature made itself distinctly felt. Peculiar words and forms adopted at Alexandria were undoubtedly Macedonian origin, but the later Attic may be justly regarded as the real basis of Oriental Greek. This first type was, however, soon modified, at least in common use, by contact with other languages. The vocabulary was enriched by the addition of foreign words, and the syntax was modified by new constructions. In this way a variety of local dialects must have arisen, the specific characters of which were determined in the first instance by the conditions under which they were formed, and which afterwards passed away with the circumstances which had produced them. But one of these dialects has remained preserved by the influence of the people among whom it arose, by being consecrated to the noblest service which language has yet fulfilled. In other cases the dialects perished together with the communities who used them in the common intercourse of life, but in that of the Jews the Alexandrine version of the O. T., acting in this respect like the great vernacular versions of England and Germany, gave a definiteness and fixity to the popular language which could not have been gained without the existence of some recognized standard. The style of the LXX. itself is, indeed, different in different parts, but the same general character runs through the whole, and the variations which it presents are not greater than those which exist in the different books of the N. T. The functions which this Jewish-Greek had to discharge were of the widest application, and the language itself combined the most opposite features. It was essentially a fusion of Eastern and Western thought. For disregarding peculiarities of inflexion and novel words, the characteristic of the Hellenistic dialect is the combination of a Hebrew spirit with a Greek body, of a Hebrew form with Greek words. The conception belongs to one race, and the expression to another. Nor is it too much to say that this combination was one of the most important preparations for the reception of Christianity, and one of the most important aids for the adequate expression of its teaching. On the one hand, by the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the deep, theoretic aspect of the world and life, which distinguishes Jewish thought, was placed before men at large; and on the other, the subtle truths, which philosophy had gained from the analysis of mind and action, and enshrined in words, were transferred to the speech of faithful men. In the fullness of time, when the great message came, a language was prepared to convey it; and thus the very dialect of the N. T. forms a great lesson in the true philosophy of history and becomes in itself a monument of the providential government of mankind.

This view of the Hellenistic dialect will at once remove one of the commonest misconceptions relating to it. For it will follow that its deviations from the ordinary laws of classic Greek are themselves bound by some common law, and that irregularities of construction and altered usages of words are to be traced to their first source, and interpreted strictly according to the original conception out of which they sprang. A popular, and even a corrupt, dialect is not less precise, or, in other words, is not less human than a polished one, though its interpretation may often be more difficult than that of a classical text. But in the case of the N. T., the books themselves furnish an ample store for the critic, and the Septuagint, when compared with the Hebrew text, provides him with the history of the language which he has to study.

2. The adoption of a strange language was essentially characteristic of the true nature of Hellenism. The purely outward elements of the national life were left aside with a facility of which history offers few examples, while the inner character of the people remained unchanged. In every respect the thought, so to speak, was clothed in a new dress. Hellenism was, as it were, a fresh incorporation of Judaism according to altered laws of life and worship. But as the Hebrew spirit made itself distinctly visible in the new dialect, so it remained unalloyed by the new conditions which regulated its action. While the Hellenic spirit had the natural instinct for trade, which was originally buried by the Mosaic Law, and gained a deeper insight into foreign character, and with this a truer sympathy, or at least a wider tolerance towards foreign opinions, they found means at the same time to extend the knowledge of the principles of their divine faith, and to gain respect and attention even from those who did not openly embrace their religion. Hellenism accomplished for the outer world what the
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Hetuo [Cyrene] accomplished for the Palestinian Jews: it was the necessary step between a religion of form and a religion of spirit: it witnessed against Judaism as final and universal, and it witnessed for it, as the foundation of a spiritual religion which should be bound by no local restrictions. Under the influence of this wider instruction a Greek body grew up around the Synagogue, not admitted into the Jewish Church, and yet holding a recognized position with regard to it, which was able to apprehend the Apostolic teaching, and ready to receive it. The Hellenists themselves were at once missionaries to the heathen, and prophets to their own countrymen. Their lives were an abiding protest against polytheism and pantheism, and they retained with unshaken zeal the sum of their ancient creed, while the preacher had popularly occupied the place of the priest, and a service of prayer and praise and exhortation had succeeded in daily life to the elaborate ritual of the Temple. Yet this new development of Judaism was obtained without the sacrifice of national ties. The connection of the Hellenists with the Temple was not broken, except in the case of some of the Egyptian Jews. [The Dispersion.] Unity coexisted with dispersion: and the organization of a catholic church was formulated, not only in the widening breadth of doctrine, but even externally in the scattered communities which looked to Jerusalem as their common centre.

In another aspect Hellenism served as the preparation for a catholic creed. As it furnished the language of Christianity, it supplied also that literary instinct which counteracted the traditional reserve of the Palestinian Jews. The writings of the N. T., and all the writings of the Apostolic age, with the exception of the original Gospel of St. Matthew, were, as far as we know, Greek; and Greek seems to have remained the sole vehicle of Christian literature, and the principal medium of Christian worship, till the Church of North Africa rose into importance in the time of Tertullian. The Canon of the Christian Scriptures, the early Creeds, and the Liturgies, are the memorials of this Hellenistic predomiance in the Church, and the two centuries following; and if the Greek spirit descended to the investigation of painful subtleties, it may be questioned whether the fullness of Christian truth could have been developed without the power of Greek thought tempered by Hebrew discipline.

The general relations of Hellenism to Judaism are well treated in the histories of Ewald and Jost; but the Hellenistic language is as yet, critically speaking, almost unexplored. Winer’s Grammar (Grundr. d. N. T. Sprachlehren, 6te Aufl. 1853; 7th Aufl. by Linemann, 1867) has done great service in establishing the idea of law in N. T. language, which was obliterated by earlier interpreters, but even Winer does not investigate the origin of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect.

The idiom of the N. T. cannot be discussed apart from those of the LXX.; and no explanation can be considered perfect which does not take into account the origin of the corresponding Hebrew idiom. For this work even the materials are as yet deficient. The text of the LXX. is still in a most unsatisfactory condition; and while Bruder’s Concordance leaves nothing to be desired for the vocabulary of the N. T., Trümmler’s Concordance to the LXX., however useful, is quite unworthy for critical purposes. [See Language of the New Testament.]

HEM OF GARMENT

HELMET. [Arms, p. 161.]

HELON (Ἑλων: Helon), father of Eliah, who was the chief man of the tribe of Zebulun, when the census was taken in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i. 9, ii. 7, viii. 24, 29; x. 16).

* HELPS. This is the term used in the authorized English Version, and in the Rheims N. T. for ἄρτιεράξωμεν, I Cor. xii. 28. The Vulgate translates, opulitioines; Wycliffe, helpyngis (helpings); Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva Bible, helpers: Luther, Helfer. The noun occurs only once in the N. T., but the verb ἄρτιεράξωμαι, i. e., to take in turn, to hold on of, to help, also to partake in, occurs three times, Luke i. 54 (= hath helped his servant Israel”), Acts xx. 35 (="to support the weak”), 1 Tim. vi. 2 (οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄρτιεραξωμενοι, “parfakers of the benefit”). With the classics ἄρτιεραξίς signifies a taking in turn, seizure; receipt; perception, but with the later writers and in the O. T. Apocrypha (2 Macc. viii. 19; 3 Macc. v. 50; Exclus. xii. 12; li. 7; 1 Esdr. vii. 27 al.) also οἰκ. support. This must be the meaning of the word in 1 Cor. xii., and it is so understood by nearly all the commentators from (chrysostom ἄρτιεραξίας τῶν ἅγνωσε) down to De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Wordsworth, and King (in Lange’s Bible-Exeget.). It corresponds with the meaning of the verb in Luke i. 54 and Acts xx. 35, and suits the connection. Paul enumerates the ἄρτιεραξίαι among the charisms, and puts them between the miraculous powers (ὑπερήφανες and χαρίσματα λανδάνων) which were not confined to any particular office, and the gifts of government and administration (συνεργείαις) which belonged especially to the presbyter-bishops, and in the highest degree to the Apostles as the gubernatores ecclesiae. ἄρτιεραξίαι doubtless comprehends the various duties of the deacons and deaconesses of the Apostles’ church, especially the care of the poor and the sick. We may take it, however, in a more comprehensive sense for Christian charity and philanthropy. The plural indicates the diversity of the gift in its practical operation and application; comp. δοκιμασίαι, 1 Cor. xiv. 5. These helps or helping were represented here as a gift of the Spirit. The duty is based on the possession of the gift, but the gift is not confined to the deacons or any class of church officers. It is found also among the laity, especially the female portion, in all ages and all branches of Christendom. But from time to time God raises up heroes of Christian charity and angels of mercy whom He endows, in an extraordinary measure, with the charisma of ἄρτιεραξίας, δοκιμασίας, and ἀγάπη for the benefit of suffering humanity.


HEM OF GARMENT (χεραρις: κρασε-}

Way). The importance which the later Jews, especially the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 5), attached to the hem or fringe of their garments was founded upon the regulation in Num. xv. 38, 39, which attached a symbolical meaning to it. We must not, however, conclude that the fringe owed its origin to that passage: it was in the first instance the ordinary mode of finishing the robe, the ends of the threads composing the woof being
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left in order to prevent the cloth from unraveling, just as in the Egyptian calotria (Her. ii. 81; Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, ii. 90), and in the Assyrian robes as represented in the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, the blue ribbon being added to strengthen the border. The Hebrew word κεθήθ is expressive of this frettèd edge: the Greek κρυστάλλα (the etymology of which is uncertain), being variously traced to κρύσταλλος, ἀκρος πέδων, and κρυπτή (applies to the edge of a river or mountain ( Xen. Hist. Gr. ii. 16, iv. 6, § 8), and is explained by Hesychius as τα ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱλιουκoε-μένα ῥάματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρων αὐτοῦ. The begeti or outer robe was a simple quadrangular piece of cloth, and generally so worn that two of the corners hung down in front; these corners were ornamented with a "ribbons of blue," or rather dark violet, the ribbon itself being, as we may conclude from the word used, ἱμαίνει, as narrow as a thread or piece of string. The Jews attached great sanctity to this fringe (Matt. xix. 20, xiv. 69; Luke viii. 44), and the Pleriscnes made it more prominent than it was originally designed to be, enlarging both the fringe and the ribbon to an undue width (Matt. xxviii. 5). Directions were given as to the number of threads of which it ought to be composed, and other particulars, to each of which a symbolical meaning was attached (Carpzov, Appunt, p. 198). It was appended in later times to the тобб more especially, as being the robe usually worn at devotions: whence the proverbial saying quoted by Lightfoot (Ewsert, in Matt. v. 40), "He that takes care of his fringes deserves a good coat."

W. L. B.

HEMAM [הֵמָמ] (extirminating, or razing); [Aja'da; Heman]. Hori (i.e. Horite) and Heman are occasionally written by the older Rabbis, while the word is Bene of Lotan, the eldest son of Seir (Gen. xxxvi. 22). In the list in 1 Chr. i. the name appears as Heman, which is probably the correct form.

HEMAM [הֵמָמ] [true, reliable]; [Ajoinar, Aivar; Alex.] Aja'da; [Haman; Eman, Heman]. 1. Son of Zerah, 1 Chr. ii. 6; 1 K. iv. 31. See following article.

2. [Aja'da; Vat. i. 1 Chr. xxv. 6, Ajoami, 2 Chr. xxix. 14, Διακόνος; Alex. Ps. Lxxviii. i., Aja'da; Heman, Hemon, Eman.] Son of Joel, and grand-son of Samuel the prophet, a Kohathite. He is called "the singer" (חָנִיָּה חָנִיָּה), rather, the musician, 1 Chr. vi. 33, and was the first of the three chief Levites to whom was committed the vocal and instrumental music of the temple-service in the reign of David, as we read 1 Chr. xv. 16-22, Asaph and Ethan, or rather, according to xxvi. 1-5, Jeduthun, as chief of the Levites. The name of this general of the Levites is given in 1 Chr. vi. 33-38 (A. V.), but the generations between Assir, the son of Korah, and Samuel are somewhat confused, owing to two collateral lines having got mixed. A rectification of this genealogy will be found at p. 214 of the Genealogies of our Lord, where it is shown that Heman is 14th in descent from Levi. A further account of Heman is given 1 Chr. xxv., where he is called (ver. 5) "the king's ser in the matters of God," the word חָנִיָּה, a "seren, which in 2 Chr. xxxv. 15 is applied to Jeduthun, and in xxix. 22 to Asaph, being probably used in the same sense as is נֵגֶפ, "prophesied," of Asaph and Jeduthun in xxx. 1-3. We there learn that Heman had fourteen sons, and three daughters [Hana'niah 1], of which the sons all assisted in the music under their father, and each of whom was head of one of the twenty-four wards of Levites, who "were instructed in the songs of the Lord," or rather, in sacred music. Whether or not this Heman is the person to whom the 88th Psalm is ascribed is doubtful. The chief reason for supposing him to be the same is, that as 88th Psalms are ascribed to Asaph and Jeduthun, so it is likely that this one should be to Heman the singer. But on the other hand he is there called ' the Ezrahite,' and the 88th Psalm is ascribed to ' Ethan the Ezrahite.' But since Heman and Ethan are described in 1 Chr. ii. 6, as 'sons of Zerah,' it is in the highest degree probable that Ezrahite means the family of Zerah, and consequently that Heman of the 88th Psalm is different from Heman the singer, the Kohathite. In 1 K. iv. 31 again (Heb. v. 11), we have mention, as of the wisest of mankind, of Ethan the Ezrahite, Heman, Chaleol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol, a list corresponding with the names of the sons of Zerah, in 1 Chr. ii. 6. The inference from which is that there was a Heman, different from Heman the singer, of the family of Zerah the son of Judah, and that he is distinguished from Heman the singer, the Levite, by being called the Ezrahite. As regards the age when Heman the Ezrahite lived, the only thing that can be asserted is that he lived before Solomon, who was said to be 'wiser than Heman,' and after Zerah the son of Judah. His being called 'son of Zerah' in 1 Chr. ii. 6 indicates nothing as to the precise age when he and his brother lived. They are probably mentioned in this abbreviated genealogy, only as having been illustrious person of their family. Nor is anything known of Mahol their father. It is of course uncertain whether the tradition which ascribed the 88th Psalm to Heman's authorship is trustworthy. Nor is there anything in the Psalm itself which clearly marks the time of its composition. The 88th Psalm, ascribed to Ethan, seems to be subsequent to the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah, unless possibly the psalms described in the latter part of the Psalm may be understood of David's flight at Absalom's rebellion, in which case ver. 41 would allude to Shimei the son of Gera.

If Heman the Kohathite, or his father, had married an heiress of the house of Zerah, as the sons of Hakkoz did of the house of Barzillai, and was so reckoned in the genealogy of Zerah, then all the sons of Zerah, Jeduthun, Heman, Ethan, and the musical skill of David's chief musician, and the wisdom of David's seer, and the genius of the author of the 88th Psalm, concurring in the same individual, would make him fit to be joined with those other worthies whose wisdom was only excelled by that of Solomon. But it is impossible to assert that this was the case.


A. C. H.
HEMATH

HEMATH (יוֹם 2 [fortress, citadel]: A: 

[18]. [Vat.] Alex. Arab: Jmathom). Another form — not warranted by the Hebrew — of the well-known name Hamath (Am. vi. 14).

HEMATH (יוֹם 2) i. e. Hammath [heat, warm spring]: Amed; [Vat. Marpaya]. Vulg. translates de colore, a person, or a place, named in the genealogical lists of Judah, as the origin of the Kenites, and the "father" of the house of Rechab (1 Chr. ii. 55).

HEMDAN (יוֹמַד) [pleasant one, Firstl]: Amed: Ammon or Hammnoun, some copies Hamnon), the eldest son of Dishon, son of Anah the Horite (Gen. xxxvi. 26). In the parallel list of 1 Chr. (i. 41) the name is changed to Honaron (יהִנָּה), which in the A. V. is given as Amram, probably following the Vulgate Hamram, in the earliest MSS. Amram.

The name Hemedan is known to Knobel (Genesis, p. 256) compared with those of Hammedy and Hamady, two of the five families of the tribe of Ovaran or Amran, who are located to the E. and S. E. of Akaba. Also with the Beno-Hemady, who are found a short distance S. of Kerek (S. E. corner of the Dead Sea); and from thence to El-Bastorich, probably the ancient Bozraath, on the road to Petra. (See Burruckhardt, Syria, etc., pp. 669, 407.:

HE'LOCK. [GALL-]

HEN (יה 2) [favor, grace]: Hem. According to the rendering of the passage (Zech. vi. 14) adopted in the A. V. Hen (or accurately Chen) is the name of a son of Zephaniah, and apparently the same who is called Josiah in ver. 10. But by the LXX. (pam), Ewald (Gonat), and other interpreters, the words are taken to mean "for the favor of the son of Zephaniah."

HEN. The hen is nowhere noticed in the Bible except in the passages (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34) where our Saviour touchingly compares His anxiety to save Jerusalem to the tender care of a hen «gathering her chickens under her wings.»

The word employed is עִובָץ, which is used in the same specific sense in classical Greek (Aristoph. A.R. 297: άδ. οὔβας). That a bird, so intimately connected with the household, and so common in Palestine, as we know from Rabbinical sources, should receive such slight notice, is certainly singular; it is almost equally singular that it is nowhere represented in the paintings of ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, i. 234.a

W. L. B.

HE'NA (יה 2) [depression, low land, Firstl]: "Av'd; [in 2 K. xii. 18, Vat. Arab. Alex. Anah]; in Is., by confusion with next word, Rom. Anayoyayava, Vat. Sin. Anayoyoyayava; Anah] seems to have been one of the chief cities of a monarchical state which the Assyrian kings had reduced shortly before the time of Semmacherib (2 K. [xxvi. 34.], xix. 13; Is. xxxvii. 13). Its connection with Sippurain, or Sippuna, would lead us to place it in Babylonia, or at any rate on the Euphrates. Here, at a great distance from Sippura (now Mosul), is an ancient town called Anan or Anah, which seems to have been

a Ṣirā in Ṣirā at the present day. The peasants rely on them, and the eggs from them, as one of their chief items of subsistence (Themist, Land and Book. II. 1. 25). In former times a place of considerable importance. It is mentioned by Abuulfed, by William of Tyre and others (see Assenian. Bibl. Or. vol. III. pt. ii. p. 506, and p. 717). The conjecture by some (see Winers' Rabbinisches, s. v.) that this may be Hemn, is probable, and deserves acceptance. A further conjecture identifies Anah with a town called Arat (נַים is merely the feminine termination), which is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions as situated on an island in the Euphrates (Fox Talbot's Assyrian Texts, 21, Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, 355) at some distance below its junction with the Tigris; and which appears as Anatho (אנהו) in Isidore of Charax (Musa. Parth. p. 4).

The modern Arat is on the right bank of the stream, while the name also attaches to some ruins a little lower down upon the left bank; but between them is "a string of islands" (Chesney's Euphrates Expedition, p. 3), on one or more of which the ancient city may have been situated. G. R.

HENADAD (יה 2) [favor of Iladod, First, Gen.]: Henedad, Enadad (2 Chron. xxxi. 11), the head of a family of Levites who took a prominent part in the rebuilding of the Temple under Jehoshua (Ezr. iii. 9). Bavi and Immui (Neh. iii. 18, 24), who assisted in the repair of the wall of the city, probably belonged to the same family. The latter also represented his family at the signing of the covenant (Neh. x. 9).

HENOCH (יה 2): Enoch. 1. The form in which the well-known name Enoch is given in the A. V. of 1 Chr. i. 3. The Hebrew word is the same both here in Genesis, namely, Cahan. Perhaps in the present case our translators followed the Vulgate.

So they appear also to have done in 1 Chr. i. 33 with a name which in Gen. xxiv. 4 is more accurately given as Hanoch.

HEPHER (יה 2) [a well]: Opher: Hepher. 1. A descendant of Manasseh. The youngest of the sons of Gilead (Num. xxxvii. 32), and head of the family of the Hephrites. Hepher was father of Zelophehad (xxvi. 33, xxvii. 1; [Josh. xvii. 2, 3]), whose daughters first raised the question of the right of a woman having no brother, to hold the property of her husband (Num. xxvii. 11). 2. (Hepher: Hosea). The second son of Naarah, one of the two wives of Ashur, the "father of Tekoa" (1 Chr. iv. 6), in the genealogy of Judah.

[Rom. Vat. Alex. FA. corrupted by false division of the words: Comp. "Ophah: Ald. "Aphai."

The Moerathite, one of the heroes of David's guard, according to the list of 1 Chr. xi. 36. In the catalogue of 2 Samuel this name does not exist (see xxiii. 34); and the conclusion of Kennicott, after a full investigation of the passages, is that the names in Samuel are the originals, and that Hepher is a mere corruption of them.

HEPHER (יה 2) [a well]: Opher: [Vat in 1 K. corrupt; Comp. "Ophor: 2 K. Opher], a place in ancient Canaan, which, though not mentioned in the history of the conquest, occurs in the list of conquered kings (Josh. xii. 17). It was on the west of Jordan (comp. 7). So was also the "land of

552). The eggs of the hen are no doubt meant in the Saviour's illustration (Luke xi. 12), which implies also that they were very abundant. H
HERD

HERD, HERDSMAN. The herd was greatly regarded both in the patriarchal and Mosaic period. Its multiplying was considered as a blessing, and its decrease as a curse (Gen. xxxii. 2; Deut. vii. 14, xxviii. 4; Ps. xxviii. 38, excr. iv. 14; Jer. li. 23). The ox was the most precious stock next to horse and mule, and (since those were rare) the thing of greatest value which was commonly possessed (1 K. xviii. 5). Hence we see the force of Saul's threat (1 Sam. xi. 7). The herd yielded the most esteemed sacrifice (Num. vii. 3; Ps. lix. 31; Is xxviii. 3); also flesh-meat and milk, chiefly converted, probably, into butter and cheese (Deut. xxxvii. 14; 2 Sam. xxvii. 29), which such milks yields more copiously than that of small cattle (Arist. Hist. Anim. iii. 20). The full-grown ox is hardly ever slaughtered in Syria; but, for sacrificial and festive purposes, the young animal was preferred (Ex. xxix. 1)—perhaps three years might be the age up to which it was so regarded (Gen. xv. 9)—and is spoken of as a special dainty (Gen. viii. 8; Am. vi. 4; Luke xv. 23). The ease of Gideon's sacrifice was one of exigency (Judg. vi. 25) and exceptional. So that of the people (1 Sam. xiv. 22) was an act of wanton excess. The agricultural and general usefulness of the ox, in ploughing, threshing [AGRICULTURE], and as a beast of burden (1 Chr. xii. 40; Is. xvi. 1), made such a slaugthering seem wasteful; nor, owing to difficulties of grazing, fattening, etc., is beef the product of an eastern climate. The animal was broken to service probably in his third year (Is. xv. 5; Jer. xxxvi. 31; comp. Plein. II. viii. 70, ed. Pur.). In the moist season, when grass abounded in the waste lands, especially in the "south" region, means cheese of cows' milk; שָׁגֵר, Arab. جمس. Gen. xvii. 8, Is. viii. 15, 2 Sam. xvii. 29, Job xx. i, Jer. v. 25, Prov. xxx. 33, is properly rendered "better" (which Gesenius, s. v., is mistaken in declaring to be "hardly known to the Orientals, except as a medicine"). The word שָׁגֵר, Job x. 10, is the same as the Arabic גֶּשֶׁר, applied by the Bedouins to their goats'-milk cheese. [HICHER; CHEESE.]

HERD

light the offense of Jason in sending envoy (οὖ[ν] πέρας) to his festival (2 Macc. iv. 19 ff.).

There can be little doubt but that Melkart is the proper name of the Baal—the Prince (βα[λ]λ)—mentioned in the later history of the O. T. The worship of “Baal” was introduced from Tyre (1 K. xvi. 31; cf. 2 K. xi. 18) after the earlier Canaanitish idolatry had been put down (1 Sam. iv. 4; cf. 1 K. i. 5—8), and Melkart (Heracles) and Astarte appear in the same close relation (Joseph. Ant. I. c.) as Baal and Astarte. The objections which are urged against the identification appear to have little weight; but the supposed connections between Melkart and other gods (Moloch, etc.) which have been suggested (Pauly, Real-Encycl. s. v. Melkarth) appear less likely (cf. Gesenius, L. c. c. Movers, Prouvicier, i. 176 ff., 385 ff.) [Baal].

The direct derivation of the word Heracles from Phœnician roots, either as הֶרְכָלִים, scribe, the traveller, in reference to the course of the sun, with whom he was identified, or to the journeys of the hero, or again as חֵרָךְ (Arphkalés, Phym. M.), the strong conqueror, has little probability.

B. F. W.

HERALD

HERALD (Ἑράλδος [Her-Ad's]), the name commonly applied by the western nations to the tutelary deity of Tyre, whose national title was Melkart, the king of the city = πολιοῦχος, Melikbas, Phyl. Illyb. ap. Euseb. Porph. Fr. 1. 10). The identification was based upon a similarity of the legends and attributes referred to the two deities, but Hesiodus (ii. 44) recognized their distinctness, and dwells on the extreme antiquity of the Tyrian rite (Heron. l. c.; cf. Strabo, xvi. p. 757; Arr. Alex. ii. 16; Joseph. Ant. viii. 5, § 3; cf. Aplom. i. 18). The worship of Melkart was spread throughout the Tyrian colonies, and was especially established at Carthage (cf. Hamilcar), where it was celebrated even with human sacrifices (Plin. N. H. xxi. 4) (5); cf. Jer. xix. 5). Mention is made of public embassies sent from the colonies to the mother state to honor the national God (Arr. Alex. ii. 24; Q. Curt. iv. 2; Polyb. xxxi. 20), and this fact places in a clearer
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a This identification is distinctly made in a Maltese inscription quoted by Gesenius (Ersch und Gruber's Enzyklop. s. v. Eski, and Theologus, s. v. Ἑραλδός), where ἐραλδος implies answers to Ἑραλδός ὁ ἅρπος, etc. ἔραλτος, etc.

b These were common, and are frequently alluded to.

w. The expression ἐραλδος, 2 Sam. xvii. 29
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Herds grazed there: e. g. in Carmel on the W. side of the Dead Sea (1 Sam. xxv. 2; 2 Chr. xxvi. 10). Dothan also. Mishor, and Sharon (Gen. xxxvii. 17; comp. Robinson, iii. 122; Stanley, S. & P. pp. 247, 260, 484, 485; 1 Chr. xxvii. 21; Is. xvi. 10) were favorite pastures. For such purposes Uzziah built towers in the wilderness (2 Chr. xxvi. 10). Not only grass, a but foliage, is acceptable to the ox, and the hills and woods of Bashan and Gilead afforded both abundantly; on such upland (Ps. i. 10; lvx. 12) pastures cattle might graze, as also, of course, by river sides, when driven by the heat from the regions of the "wilderness." Especially was the eastern table-land (Ex. xxix. 18; Num. xxxii. 4) "a place for cattle," and the pastoral tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh who settled there retained something of the nomadic character and handed down some image of the patriarchal life (Stanley, S. & P. pp. 324-5). Herdsmen, etc., in Egypt were a low, perhaps the lowest, caste; hence as Joseph's kindred, through his position, were brought into contact with the highest castes, they are described as "an abomination"; but of the abundance of cattle in Egypt, and of the care there bestowed on them, there is no doubt (Gen. xvii. 6, 17; Ex. iv. 4, 20). Brands were used to distinguish the owner's herds (Wilkinson, iii. 8, 105; iv. 125-131). So the plague of hail was sent to smite especially the cattle (Ps. lxxviii. 48), the first-born of which also were smitten (Ex. xii. 29). The Israelites departing stipulated for (Ex. x. 26) and took "much cattle" with them (xii. 38). [WILDERNESS OF WANDERING.] Cattle providential care and legislative ordinance (Ex. xx, 10, xxii. 28, xxxiv. 19; Lev. xix. 19, xxv. 7; Deut. xi. 15, xxii. 1, 4, 10, xxv. 4; Ps. civ. 14; Is. xxx. 23; Jon. iv. 11), and even the Levites, though not holding land, were allowed cattle (Num. xxxv. 2, 3). When pasture failed, a mixture of various grains (called, Job vi. 5, 7, rendered "fodder") in the A. V., and, Is. xxx. 24, "provender:" e comp. the Roman farrengo and ogymus, Plin. xviii. 10 and 42) was used, as also (7,7, "chopped straw" (Gen. xxiv. 25; Is. xi. 7, lvx. 25), which was torn in pieces by the threshing-machine and used probably for feeding in stalls. These last formed an important adjunct to cattle-keeping, being indispensable for shelter at certain seasons (Ex. iv. 6, 19). The herd, after its harvest-duty was done, which probably caused it to be in high condition, was specially worth caring for; at the same time most open pastures would have failed because of the heat. It was then probably stalled, and would continue so until vegetation returned. Hence the failure of the herd from the stalls is mentioned as a feature of scarcity (Hab. iii. 17). "Calves of the stall" (Mal. iv. 2; Prov. xv. 17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle in "cities" when they passed the Jordan to share the toils of conquest (Deut. iii. 19), i. e. probably in some pastures closely adjoining, like the "suburbs" appointed for the cattle of the Levites (Num. xxxv. 2, 3; Josh. xxvi. 2). Cattle were ordinarily allowed as a prey in war to the captor (Deut. xx. 14; Josh. viii. 24), and the case of Amalek is exceptional, probably to mark the extreme curse to which that people was devoted (Ex. xvii. 14; 1 Sam. xv. 3). The occupation of herdsman was honorable in early times (Gen. xlvi. 6; 1 Sam. xi. 5; 1 Chr. xxvii. 24, xxviii. 1). Saul himself assumed it in the interval of his cares as king; also Doeg was certainly high in his confidence (1 Sam. xi. 7). Pharaoh made some of Joseph's brethren "rulers over his cattle." David's herd-masters were among his chief officers of state. In Solomon's time the relative importance of the pursuit declined as commerce grew, but it was still extensive (Ecc. ii. 7; 1 K. iv. 23). It must have greatly suffered from the inroads of the

a In Num. xxii. 4, the word 77, in A. V. "grass," really includes all vegetation. Comp. Ex. x. 15. Is. xxxvii. 27; Geno, de R. K. c. 30; Varro, de R. K. i. 15, and ii. 5. 77, Job viii. 12. xl. 15, seems used in a signification equally wide. [Grass.]

b Judith differs on the question whether the owner of the animal was under this enactment liable or not liable. See de Re Rust. Veterum Hebraorum, c. ii.; Ugochil, xxix.
c The word seems to be derived from 77, to mix. The passage in Isaiah probably means that in the abundant yield of the crops the cattle should eat of the best, such as was usually consumed by man.
HERESIES to which the country under the later kings of Judah and Israel was exposed. Uzziah, however, (2 Chr. xxvi. 10), and Hezekiah (xxxii. 28, 29), resuming command of the open country, revived it. Josiah also seems to have been rich in herds (xxxv. 7–9). The prophet Amos at first followed this occupation (Am. i. 1, vii. 14). A goad was used (Judg. iii. 31; 1 Sam. xiii. 21, 27, 28, 29), being, as mostly, a staff armed with a spike. For the word ἄγον as applied to swine, see SWINE; and on the general subject, Ugolini, xxi., de R. H. rett. Hebr. c. ii., which will be found nearly exhaustive of it.

HERES (ls. xix. 18: A. V. "destruction" or "the sun"). See HENCE-HERES.

HERESH (ירש = artificer: Apis: [Var. Panamul]: Alex. Apis: carpenterius), a Levite; one of the staff attached to the tabernacle (1 Chr. ix. 15).

HERMAS (Ἐρώμας, from Ἐρώμης, the "Greek god of gain," or Mercury), the name of a person to whom St. Paul sends greeting in his Epistle to the Romans (xvi. 14), and consequently then resident in Rome, and a Christian: and yet the origin of the name, like that of the other four mentioned in the same verse, is Greek. However, in those days, even a Jew, like St. Paul himself, might acquire Roman citizenship. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen, agree in attributing to him the work called the Shepherd; which, from the name of Clement occurring in it, is supposed to have been written in the pontificate of Clement I.; while others affirm it to have been the work of a namesake in the following age, and brother to one Irenius; others again have argued against its genuineness. (Cave, Hist. Lit. s. v.; Bull. Inl. P. V. Nich. i. 2, 3–4; Dindorf, Prof. ad Hermae Post.) From internal evidence, its author, whoever he was, appears to have been a married man and father of a family: a deep mystic, but without ecclesiastical rank. Further, the work in question is supposed to have been originally written in Greek — in which language it is frequently cited by the Greek Fathers — though it now only exists entire in a Latin version. It was never received into the canon; but yet was generally cited with respect only second to that which was paid to the authoritative books of the N. T., and was held to be in some sense inspired (Caillan's Patres, tom. i. p. 17). It may be styled the Pilgrim's Progress of ante-Nicene times; and is divided into three parts: the first containing four visions, the second twelve moral and spiritual precepts, and the third ten simultudes, each intended to shadow forth some verity (Caillan, ibid.). Every man, according to this writer, is attended by a good and bad angel, who are continually attempting to affect his course through life; a doctrine which forcibly recalls the fable of Proclus respecting the choice of Hercules (Xenoph. Mem. ii. 1).

The Hermas of the Epistle to the Romans is celebrated as a saint in the Roman calendar on May 9 (Butler's Lives of the Saints, May 9).

HERMON (ἕρμος) [prominent, lofty]: "Apebaew: [Hermon], a mountain on the northeastern border of Palestine (Dent. iii. 8; Josh. xii. 1), over against Lebanon (Josh. xii. 17), adjoining the plateau of Bashan (1 Chr. v. 23). Its situation being thus clearly defined in Scripture, there can be no doubt as to its identity. It stands at the southern end, and is the culminating point of the Anti-Lebanon range; it towers high above the ancient border-city of Pan and the fountains of the Jordan, and is the most conspicuous and beautiful mountain in all Transjordan or Syria. The name was doubtless suggested by its appearance — "a lofty prominent peak," visible from afar (ἅρμος) has the same meaning as the Arabic (المر) ; just as Lebanon was suggested by the white character of its limestone strata. Other names were also given to Hermon, each in like manner descriptive of some striking feature. The Sidonians called it Sirion (Sirión), from סיירון, "to glitter," and the Amorites Bēnîr (בְּנֵיר), from בְּנ-יר (to glitter), both signifying "breathe-plait," and suggested by its rounded glittering top, when the sun's rays were reflected by the snow that covers it (Dent. iii. 9; Cant. iv. 8; Ez. xxvii. 5).

from a place at Leopolis in 1560, better by Thesleff in Druck's Patris Apostolici, Lips. 1597 (2d ed. with the readings of the Cod. Sin. 1603); but the best edition is that of Hilgenfeld, Fasc. iii of his Nuncii Testamenti extra Canones receptae, Lips. 1869. A.
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It was also named Sirion, "the elevated" (םירון), lowering over all its companions (Deut. iv. 48). So, now, at the present day, it is called Jebel edh-Shikh (جبيل الشيخ), "the chief mountain" — a name it well deserves; and Jebel eth-Thel (جبيل التلم), "snowy mountain," which every man who sees it will say is peculiarly appropriate. When the whole country is parched with the summer-sun, white lines of snow streak the head of Hermon. This mountain was the great landmark of the Israelites. It was associated with their northern border almost as intimately as the sea was with the western (see ס in Ex. xxvii. 12, A. V., "west;" Josh. viii. 9). They conquered all the land east of the Jordan, "from the river Arnon unto Mount Hermon" (Deut. iii. 8, iv. 48; Josh. xi. 17). Baal-god, the border-city before Dan became historic, is described as "under Mount Hermon" (Josh. xiii. 5, xi. 17); and when the half-tribe of Manasseh conquered their whole allotted territory, they are said to have "increased from Bashan unto Baal-hermon and Senir, and unto Mount Hermon" (1 Chr. v. 23). In one passage Hermon would almost seem to be used to signify "north," as the word "sea" (םים) is for "west" — the north and the south Thou hast created them; Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name" (Ps. lxxxix. 12). The reason of this is obvious. From whatever part of Palestine the Israelites started toward the northward, Hermon was there, terminating the view. From the plain along the coast, from the mountains of Samaria, from the Jordan valley, from the heights of Moab and Gilead, from the plateau of Bashan, that pale-blue, snow-capped cone forms the one feature on the northern horizon. The "dew of Hermon" is once referred to in a passage which has long been considered a geographical puzzle — "As the dew of Hermon, the dew that descended on the mountains of Zion" (Ps. cxxxiii. 3). Zion (סַלְמִין) is probably used here for Sinai (סֵינֵי), one of the old names of Hermon (Deut. iv. 48). The snow on the summit of this mountain condenses the vapors that float during the summer in the higher regions of the atmosphere, causing light clouds to hover around it, and abundant dew to descend on it, while the whole country elsewhere is parched, and the whole heaven elsewhere cloudless.

Hermon has three summits, situated like the angles of a triangle, and about a quarter of a mile from each other. They do not differ much in elevation. This may account for the expression in Ps. xlii. 7 (6), "I will remember thee from the land of the Jordan and the Hermonas (סַלְמִין) — perhaps also for the three appellations in 1 Chr. v. 23. On one of the summits are curious and interesting ruins. Round a rock which forms the crest of the peak are the foundations of a rude circular wall, composed of massive stones; and within the circle is a large heap of hewn stones, surrounding the remains of a small and very ancient temple. This is evidently one of those "high places," which the old inhabitants of Palestine, and the Jews frequently in imitation of them, set up "upon every high mountain and upon every hill" (Deut. xii. 2; 2 K. xvii. 10, 11). In two passages of Scripture this mountain is called Baal-hermon (בָּאל-הֵרְменно), Judg. iii. 3; 1 Chr. v. 23); and the only reason that can be assigned for it is that Baal was there worshipped. Jerome says of it, "diciatur in vertice ejus insigne templum, quod ad ethnicius cultui habebatur e regione Pancadis et Lianu" — reference must here be made to the building whose ruins are still seen (Onom. s. v. Hermon). It is remarkable that Hermon was anciently encompassed by a circle of temples, all pointing the summit. Can it be that this mountain was the great sanctuary of Baal, and that it was to the old Syrians what Jerusalem was to the Jews, and what Mekkah is to the Moslems? (See Handb. for Syr. and Pal. 454, 457; Ireland, Pal. p. 323 f.)

The height of Hermon has never been measured, though it has been often estimated. It is unquestionably the second mountain in Syria, ranking next to the summit of Lebanon near the Orontes, and only a few hundred feet lower than it. It may safely be estimated at 10,000 feet. It rises up an obtuse truncated cone, from 2000 to 3000 feet above the ridges that radiate from it — thus having a more commanding aspect than any other mountain in Syria. The cone is entirely naked. A coating of disintegrated limestone covers the six eyes, rendering it smooth and bleak. The snow never disappears from its summit. In spring and early summer the top is entirely covered. As summer advances the snow gradually melts from the tops of the ridges, but remains in long glittering streaks in the ravines that radiate from the centre, looking in the distance like the white locks that scantily cover the head of old age. (See Fire Years in Damascus, vol. i.)

A tradition, originating apparently about the time of Jerome (Ireland, p. 320), gave the name Hermon to the range of Jebel ed-Duby near Tabor, the better to explain Ps. lxxxix. 12. The name still continues in the monasteries of Palestine, and has thus crept into books of travel. [GILBOA, note.]

• But few of the travellers in Syria have gone to the top of Hermon, and the view from it has not been often described. We are indebted to Mr. Tristram for the following sketch (Land of Israel, p. 614, 2d ed.): —

"We were at last on Hermon, whose snowy head had been a sort of pole-star for the last six months. We had looked at him from Sidon, from Tyre, from Carmel, from Gerizim, from the hills about Jerusalem, from the Dead Sea, from Gilead, and from Nebo; and now we were looking down on them all, as they stood out from the embossed map that lay spread at our feet. The only drawback was a light fleecy cloud which stretched from Carmel's top all along the Lebanon, till it rested upon Jebel Sannin, close to Baal-bec. But it lifted sufficiently..."
to give us a peep of the Mediterranean in three places, and amongst them of Tyre. There was a haze, too, over the Ghur so that we could only see as far as Jebel Ajlun and Gilead; but Lakes Huleh and Gennesaret, sunk in the depths beneath us, and reflecting the sunlight, were magnificent. We could scarcely realize that at one glance we were taking in the whole of the land through which, for more than six months, we had been incessantly wandering. Not less striking were the views to the north and east, with the head waters of the Aewy (Pharpar) rising beneath us, and the Bequra (Alema), in the far distance, both rivers marking the courses of their fertilizing streams by the deep green lines of verdure, till the eye rested on the brightness of Damascus, and then turned up the wide opening of Cede-Syria, until shut in by Lebanon.

A ruined temple of Baal, constructed of squared stones arranged neatly in a circle, crowns the highest of the three peaks of Hermon, all very close together. We spent a great part of the day on the summit, but were before long painfully affected by the rarity of the atmosphere. The sun had sunk behind Lebanon before we descended to our tents, but long after we had lost him he continued to paint and gild Hermon with a beautiful mingling of Alpine and desert hues."

Mr. Porter, author of Five Years in Damascus, ascended Hermon in 1852. For an extended account of the incidents and results of the exploration, see Bild, Sirea, xi. 41-66. See the notices, also, in Mr. Porter's Handbook, ii. 453 ff. Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 438) speaks of his surprise at finding that from the shores of the Dead Sea he had a distinct view of "Mount Hermon hovering to the sky far, far up the Ghur to the north." It was a new evidence, he adds, that Moses also could have seen Hermon (Deut. xxxiv. 1 ff.) from the mountains of Moab [Nath, Amer, ed.].

Sirion or Shirion, the Sidonian name of Hermon, signifies a "breast-plate," or "coat of mail;" and it (as assumed above), it be derived from ʿāṣīr, "to glistens," or "to gleam," naturally, to any supposed resemblance of figure or shape, but to the shining appearance of that piece of armor. Hermon answers remarkably to that description. As seen at a distance through the transparent atmosphere, with the snow on its summit and stretching in long lines down its declivities, it glows and sparkles under the rays of the sun as it robed in a vesture of silver.

It is altogether probable that the Saviour's transfiguration took place on some one of the heights of Hermon. The Evangelists relate the occurrence in connection with the Saviour's visit to Caesarea Philippi, which was in that neighborhood. Hence also the healing of the lunatic boy (Luke iv. 37) took place at the foot of Hermon. Dean Aldrich assumes (Greek Test, i. 168) that Jesus had been journeying southward from Caesarea Philippi during the six or eight days which immediately preceded the transfiguration, and hence infers that the high mountain which he ascended must be sought near Capharnam. But that is not the more obvious view. Neither of the Evangelists says that Jesus was journeying southward during these days, but, on the contrary, having stated just before that Jesus came into "the parts" (Matt. xvi. 13) or "the villages" (Mark viii. 27) of Caesarea Philippi, they leave us to understand that he preached during the time mentioned, in that region, and there came to the mountain there on which he was transfigured. [Tawton.]

HERMON, DEW OF. The dew on this mountain is proverbially excellent and abundant. The "more copious dew," says Tristan (Land of Israel, p. 608 f. 2d ed.), "we never experienced than that on Hermon. Everything was drenched with it, and the tents were small protection. The under sides of our maccintosh sheets were in water, our guns were rusted, dew-drops were hanging everywhere. . . ." The hot air in the daytime comes streaming up the Ghur from the Huleh, while Hermon arrests all the moisture, and deposits it congregated at night. As Mr. Potter states, "one of its bills is appropriately called Tell Abu Nedy, i. e. Father of the Dew," for the clouds seem to cling with peculiar fondness round its wooded top and the little Wely of Sheikl Abu Nedy, which crowns it." (Handbook, i. 463.) Van de Veult (Syr. and Pal. i. 126) testifies to this peculiarity of Hermon.

It has perplexed commentators not a little to explain how the Psalmsist (xxixii. 5) could use of the dew of Hermon in the north of Palestine as falling on Zion in Jerusalem. The A. V. does not show the difficulty; for the words "and the dew" being interpolated between the clauses, the dew of Hermon appears there as locally different from that which descended on Mount Zion. But the Hebrew sentence will not bear that construction (see Hengel, Die Psalmen, iv. 320). Nor, where the places are so far apart from each other, can we think of the dew as carried in the atmosphere from one place to the other. Hengel (iv. 322) suggests that perhaps "as the dew of Hermon" may be a formula of blessing (comp. the curse on Gilboa, 2 Sam. i. 21), and as applied here may represent Zion as realizing the idea of that blessing, both spiritual and natural, in the highest degree. Kölker (Achreolose zum A. T., p. 58) assumes an appellative sense of יְהֵלָה, "dew," not of any particular mountain of that name), but of lofty heights generally, which would include Zion. Hengstenberg's explanation is not essentially different from this (Die Psalmen, iv. 89), except that with him the generalized idea would be = Dew of Hermon, instead of = Dew of Hermons.

HERMONTES, THE (הֶרֶמְתֵּס: Ἑρμοντησ): Ep. 26. Hermonthes, the a. V. Properly, the "Herms," with reference to the three or two "summits of Mount Hermon" (Ps. xi. 6 [7]), etc. [Ps. cxiii. 3]. (Heng. p. 147.) W. A. W.

HERMONS (according to the Hebrew), Ps. xi. 7 (6). Only one mountain is known in the Bible as Hermon; the plural name refers, no doubt, to the different summits for which this was noted. [HERMON.] See also Rob. Phys. Geogr. p. 347.

HEROD (הָרוֹד, i.e. Hero'des). The HERODIAN FAMILY. The history of the Herodian family presents one side of the last development of the Jewish nation. The evils which had existed in the hierarchy which grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embellishment in the-

a. * So Gessenus in Hoffmann's ed. 1847; but according to Dietrich and Förster, from הֶרֶמְתָּס to graze, fasten, as in making a shield. H.
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cyranus of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the Hellenizing designs of Antigonus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in their spirit, by men who professed to observe the Law. Side by side with the spiritual "kingdom of God," proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnificence of Solomon. The simultaneous realization of the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews, in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fullness of time a descendant of Esau established a false counterpart of the promised glories of Messiah.

Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods; but neglecting the exaggerated statements of friends and enemies, it seems certain that they were of Idumean descent (Jos. Ant. xiv. 1, 3), a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names which were retained in the family (Ewald, Geschichte, iv. 477, note). But though aliens by race, the Herods were Jews in faith. The Idumeans had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (Jos. Ant. xxiii. 9, § 1); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, looking upon Jerusalem as their mother city and claiming for themselves the name of Jews (Joseph. Ant. xx. 7 § 7; B. i. 10, § 4, iv. 4, § 4).

The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centered in the endeavor to found a great and independent kingdom, in which the power of Judaism should subservi the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity, but the designs of Herod I. and Agrippa I. point to an independent eastern empire as their end, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first (Herodotus); and by a natural reaction the temporal domination followed as the easy way to the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of uncen susful ambition lost its power to quicken a united people. The high-priests were appointed and de posed by Herod I. and his successors with such a reckless disregard for the character of their office (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenlands, i. 322, 325, 421), that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity (comp. Acts xiii. 2 ff.; Jost, 430, &c.). The nation was divided, and amidst the conflict of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the nobler hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous grandeur of a court.

The family relations of the Herods are singularly complicated from the frequent recurrence of the same names, and the several accounts of Josephus are not consistent in every detail. The following table, however, seems to offer a satisfactory sum-

a The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolaus Damascenus, op. Jos. Ant. xiv. 1, 3) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descendant from one of the noble families which returned from Babylon; and, on the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africanus has preserved a tradition (Routi, Ref. Stor. ii. p. 235), on the authority of "the natural kinsman of the Saviour," which makes /epiliptar, the father of Herod, the son of one Herod, of his statements. The members of the Herodian family who are mentioned in the N. T. are distinguished by capita.

Josephus is the one great authority for the history of the Herodian family. The scanty notices which occur in Hebrew and classic writers throw very little additional light upon the events which he narrates. Of modern writers Ewald has treated the whole subject with the widest and clearest view. Jost in his several works has added to the records of Josephus gleanings from later Jewish writers. Where the original sources are so accessible, monographs are of little use. The following are quoted by Winer: Nobilit. Hist. Jud. ... Francs. 1696. E. Spanheimii Stenae ... Herodii M., which are reprinted in Havercamp's Josephus (iii. 321 ff.; 402 ff.).

1. Herod the Great (Herod Agrippa I.) was the second son of Antipater, who was appointed procurator of Judaea by Julius Cæsar, B. C. 47, and Cyprian, an Arabian of noble descent (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7 § 3). At the time of his father's elevation, though only fifteen years old, he received the government of Galilee (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 9, § 2), and shortly afterwards of Coele-Syria. When Antony came to Syria, B. C. 41, he appointed Herod and his elder brother Phænelot tetrarch of Judæa (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 13, § 1). Herod was forced to abandon Judæa next year by an invasion of the Parthians, who supported the claims of Antigonus, the representative of the Hasmonæan dynasty, and fled to Rome (B. c. 40). At Rome he was well received by Antony and Octavian, and was appointed by the Senate of Rome to the exclusion of the Hasmonæan line (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 14 § 4; App. Bell. C. 39). In the course of a few years, by the help of the Romans, he took Jerusalem (B. C. 37), and completely established his authority throughout his dominions. An expedition which he was forced to make against Arabia saved him from taking an active part in the civil war, though he was devoted to the cause of Antony. After the battle of Actium he visited Octavian at Rhodes, and in his generous offering would have given him the favor of the conqueror, who confirmed him in the possession of the kingdom, B. C. 31, and in the next year increased it by the addition of several important cities (Joseph. Ant. xv. 10, § 1 ff.), and afterwards gave him the province of Trachonitis and the district of Paneas (Joseph. Ant. l. c.). The remainder of the reign of Herod was undisturbed by external troubles, but his domestic life was emblazoned by an almost uninterrupted series of injuries and cruel acts of vengeance. Hyrcanus, the grandfather of his wife Mariamne, was put to death shortly before his visit to Augustus. Mariamne herself, to whom he was passionately devoted, was next sacrificed to his jealousy. One execution followed another, till at last, in B. C. 6, he was persuaded to put to death the two sons of Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus, in whom the chief hope of the people lay. Two years afterwards he condemned to death An-

a slave attached to the service of a temple of Apollo at Aeqalon, whom he had taken prisoner by Idumean robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (cf. Philo, Leg. ad Caip. § 30) no less than the office, was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (cf. Routh, ad loc.). This story is repeated with great inaccuracy by Ephiphanes (Her. xx. 32).

* * * Diodorus ed. of Josephus (l. c.) reads twenty-five, A.
(1) Antipater (Antipas), governor of Idumea (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 1, 8)

(2) Antipater
- Cypres (an Arabian: Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, § 3)

(3) Joseph
- Pheroras
- Salome

(4) Herodes
- Doris = Mariamne, grandd. of Hyrcanus
- Mariamne, d. of Simon
- Malhace (a Samaritan)
- Cleopatra
- Pallas = Phedra = Elpis

(5) Joseph
- Castabarus
- Alexee

(6) Phasael
- Salamis = Herod
- Phasael = Antipater = Philip = d. of Arctebulas

(7) Phasael
- Antipater
- Alexander
- Cypres (33)

(8) Alexander
- Tigranes
- Salome

(9) Herodes
- Mariamne

(10) Antipater
- Aristobulus

(11) Aristobulus
- Jotape

(12) Jotape

(13) Hyrcanus = Berenice

(14) Aristobulus
- Salome

(15) Aristobulus
- Jotape

(16) Jotape

(17) Herodias
- Agrippa

(18) Agrippa
- Ammonia

(19) Ammonia
- Marianne

(20) Marianne

(21) Salome
- Olympias

(22) Olympias
- Herodias

(23) Herodias

(24) Herodias

(25) Herodias

(26) Herodias

(27) Herodias

(28) Herodias

(29) Herodias

(30) Herodias

(31) Herodias

(32) Herodias

(33) Cypres

(34) Aristobulus

(35) Aristobulus

(36) Aristobulus

(37) Aristobulus

(38) Aristobulus

(39) Aristobulus

(40) Aristobulus

(41) Aristobulus

(42) Aristobulus

(43) Aristobulus

(44) Aristobulus

(45) Aristobulus

(46) Aristobulus

(47) Aristobulus

(48) Aristobulus

(49) Aristobulus

(50) Aristobulus

Ant. xiv. 1, § 8.
B. J. ii. 28, § 4.

(4) Herod the King, Matt. ii. 147; Luke i. 5.
(7) Herod the King, Acts xii. 1.
(30) King Agrippa, Acts xxiv. 10.
pater, his eldest son, who had been their most active accuser, and the order for his execution was among the last acts of Herod's life, for he died himself five days after the death of his son, b. c. 4, in the same year which marks the true date of the Nativity of Christ. [See MARY.]

These terrible acts of bloodshed which Herod perpetrated in his own family were accompanied by others among his subjects equally terrible, from the numbers who fell victims to them. The infinities of his later years exaggerated him to yet greater cruelty; and, according to the well-known story, he ordered the nobles whom he had called to him in his last moments to be executed immediately after his death, that the least death might be atoned for by universal mourning (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 6, § 5). It was at the time of this fatal illness that he must have caused the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16-18); and from the comparative insignificance of the murder of a few young children in an unimportant village when contrasted with the deeds which he carried out or designed, it is not surprising that Josephus has passed it over in silence. The murder of infants in Bethlehem and "all the borders thereof" (BY παιδαν όριοι) may be estimated at about ten or twelve; and the language of the Evangelist leaves in complete uncertainty the method in which the deed was effected (ἀναστήλας άνελκες). The scene of open and undisguised violence which has been consecrated by Christian art is wholly at variance with what may be supposed to have been the historic reality. At a later time the murder of the children seems to have been connected with the death of Antipater. Thus, according to the anecdote preserved by Macrobius (c. A. d. 410), Augustus, cum audisset inter pueros suos in Syria Herodos, Ilex Judaeorum, intra biwatum (Matt. ii. 16; ib. Ving. a biwatu et infra) jussit interici, filium quoque eis occidere, ait: Melius est Herodis percorn esse quam filium " (Macrobr. Siv. ii. 4).

But Josephus has preserved two very remarkable references to a massacre which Herod caused to be made shortly before his death, which may throw an additional light upon the history. In this it is said that Herod did not spare "those who seemed most dear to him" (Ant. xvi. 11, § 7), but "slew all those of his own family who sided with the Pharisees (φάραγησι)" in refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the Roman emperor, while they looked forward to a change in the royal line (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 2, § 9; cf. Lardner, Credibility, etc., i. 278 ff., 332 f., 349 f.). How far this event may have been directly connected with the murder at Bethlehem it is impossible to say, from the obscurity of the details, but its occurrence and character throw a great light upon St. Matthew's narrative.

In dealing with the religious feelings or prejudices of the Jews, Herod showed as great contempt for public opinion as in the execution of his personal vengeance. He signalled his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenleben, i. 318), and surrounded his person by foreign mercenaries, some of whom had been formerly in the service of Cleopatra (Jos. Ant. xv. 7, § 3; xvii. i. 1: 8, § 3). His pius and those of his successors bore only Greek legends; and he introduced heathen games within the walls of Jerusalem (Jos. Ant. xv. 8, § 1). He displayed ostentatiously his favor towards foreigners (Jos. Ant. xvi. 5, § 3), and oppressed the old Jewish aristocracy (Jos. Ant. xv. 1, § 1). The latter Jewish writers describe him as successively the servant of the Romans, the Hasmonaeans and the Jews; and relate that one Rabbin only survived the persecution which he directed against them, purchasing his life by the loss of sight (Jost, i. 319, &c.).

While Herod alienated in this manner the affections of the Jews by his cruelty and disregard for the Law, he adorned Jerusalem with many splendid monuments of his taste and magnificence. The Temple, which he rebuilt with scrupulous care, so that it might seem to be a restoration of the old one rather than a new building (Jos. Ant. xv. § 11), was the greatest of these works. The restoration was begun b. c. 20, and the Temple itself was completed in a year and a half (Jos. Ant. xv. 11, § 6). The surrounding buildings occupied eight years moreover (Jos. Ant. xv. 11, § 5). But fresh additions were constantly made in succeeding years, so that the Temple was "the most beautiful in the whole of Jerusalem at the beginning of His ministry, it was said that the Temple was "built and fortified") in forty and six years" (John ii. 20), a phrase which expresses the whole period from the commencement of Herod's work to the completion of the latest addition then made, for the final completion of the whole building is placed by Josephus (Ant. xx. 8, § 7, § 96 ος της και τω λειων οτρασκοσκος) in the time of Herod Agrippa II. (c. A. d. 35).

Yet even this splendid work was not likely to mislead the Jews as to the real spirit of the King. While he rebuilt the Temple at Jerusalem, he rebuilt also the Temple at Samaria (Jos. Ant. xv. 8, § 5), and made provision in his new city Cesarea for the celebration of heathen worship (Jos. Ant. xv. 9, § 51); and it has been supposed (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenleben, i. 296) that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of records which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures (Jos. Ant. xvi. 7, § 1).

It is, perhaps, difficult to see in the character of Herod any of the true elements of greatness. Some have even supposed that the title — the great — is a mistranslation for the elder (ωναι, Jost, i. 319, note; δέ μεγας, Ewald, Gesch. iv. 473, &c.); and yet on the other hand he seems to have possessed the good qualities of our own Henry VIII. with his vices. He maintained peace at home during a long reign by the vigor and timely generosity of his administration. Abroad he conciliated the good-will of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostentation displayed and even his arbitrary tyranny was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Bold and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, he had many of the character traits which make a popular hero; and the title
which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.

Copper Coin of Herod the Great.

**H. HEROD**: Bunch of grapes. Rev. **EΩΝΑΡΩ**. Macedonian helmet: in the field caduceus.

1. **HEROD ANTIPAS** (Ἀρτάπαρος, Ἀρτίαμος) was the son of Herod the Great by Malthace, a Samaritan (Jos. Ant. xvii. 1, § 3). His father had originally destined him as his successor in the kingdom (cf. Matt. ii. 22; Archelaus), but by the last change of his will appointed him tetrarch of Galilee and Perea (Jos. Ant. xviii. 8, § 1, Ἡρως ὑπὲρ τῆς Αἰγύπτου Τετραρχῆς), which brought him a yearly revenue of 200 talents (Jos. Ant. xviii. 14, § 4; cf. Luke viii. 3, Χρυσῆ ὑπὲρ τῆς Αἰγύπτου Τετραρχῆς), but chiefly his father granted to him the title of king of Arabia Petraea, which he and his successors closely adhered to, and the environs of Agrippa; but he was opposed at the court of Caligula by the emissaries of Agrippa; and he was condemned to perpetual banishment at Lucullum, A. D. 39 (Jos. Ant. xviii. 7, § 2), whence he appears to have retired afterwards to Spain (B. J. ii. 9, § 6; but see note on p. 796). Herodias voluntarily shared his punishment, and he died in exile. (HBDONAS.)

Archelaus took occasion from our Lord's residence in Galilee to send Him for examination (Luke xxiii. 6 ff.) to Herod Antipas, who came up to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast (cf. Jos. Ant. xviii. 6, § 3), and thus heal the feud which had existed between the tetrarch and himself (Luke xxii. 12; cf. Luke xix. 1, ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν Γαλατίων διά τινος Πιλάτου τιμήν μετά τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν). The share which Antipas thus took in the Passion is specially noticed in the Acts (iv. 27) in connection with Ps. ii. 1, 2. His character, as it appears in the Gospels, answers to the general tenor of his life. He was unscrupulous (Luke iii. 19, μὴ παίνων ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ πνεύματι), tyrannical (Luke xiii. 31), and weak (Matt. xiv. 9). Yet his cruelty was marked by cunning (Luke xiii. 32, τοὺς ἄνωντας ταύτα), and followed by remorse (Mark vi. 14). In contrast with Pilate he presents the type of an Eastern despot, capricious, sensual, and superstitions. This last point of superstition is both natural and clearly marked. For a time "he heard John gladly" (Mark vi. 20), and was anxious to see Jesus (Luke ix. 9, xxiii. 8), in the expectation, as it is said, of witnessing some miracle wrought by Him (Luke xiii. 31, xxiii. 8).

The city of *Betheha*, which Antipas founded and named in honor of the emperor, was the most conspicuous monument of his long reign; but, like the rest of the Herodian family, he showed his passion for building cities in several places, restoring *Sepphoris*, near Tabor, which had been destroyed in the wars after the death of Herod the Great (Jos. Ant. xiii. 12, § 9; xvii. 2, § 1) and *Betharamphitha* (Beth-haram) in Perea, which he named *Julias*, "from the wife of the emperor" (Jos. Ant. xvii. 2, § 1; Hieron. Euseb. Chron. A. D. 21).

2. **ARCHELAUS** (Ἀρχάλαος [ruler of the people]) was, like Herod Antipas, the son of Herod the Great and Malthace. He was brought up with his brother at Rome (Joseph. Ant. xii. 1, § 3), and in consequence of the accusations of his eldest brother Antipater, the son of Doris, he was excluded by his father's will from any share in his dominions. Afterwards, however, by a second change, the "kingdom" was left to him, which had been designed for his brother Antipas (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 8, § 1), and it was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat of Joseph to Galilee (Matt. ii. 22). Archelaus did not enter on his power without strong opposition and bloodshed (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 9); but Augustus confirmed the will of Herod in its essential provisions, and gave Archelaus the government of Idumaea, Judea, and Samaria, with the cities of Cesarea, Sebaste,abeth-carmel, and Tiberias, which had been granted to his father Agrippa; and which produced a revenue of 400 (Joseph. H. J. ii. 6, § 3) or 600 talents (Ant. xviii. 13, 5). For the time he received the title of Ethnarch, with the promise of that of king, if he proved worthy of it (Joseph. l. c.). His conduct justified the fears which his character inspired. After violating the Mosaic law by the marriage with Golphyrus, his brother's widow (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 1, § 1), he raised his subjects by his tyranny and cruelty to appeal to Rome for redress. Augustus at once summoned him to his presence, and after his cause was heard he was banished to Vienne in Gaul (A. D. 7), where probably he died (Joseph. l. c.; cf. Strab. xvi. p. 765; Dio Cass. lv. 27); though in the time of Jerome, his tomb was shown near Bethlem (Onomastica).

3. **HEROD PHILIP I.** (Φιλίαπος, Mark vi. 17) was the son of Herod the Great, and Marianna the (as is often said) does not agree with the manifest anxiety of Pilate to release Jesus. (H.)

4. **Archelaus Matthew's Testament** (iii. 8, § 4), is the author of a spe- (Lev. xi. 19), when he was a significant influence. On returning from Egypt Joseph evidently meant to go directly to Bethlem; but hearing that Archelaus had succeeded Herod rather than some other one of his sons, he avoided that place and proceeded to Galilee.
Herod Philip II. (Φιλίππος) was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra (Ἰεροσολυμίτις). Like his half-brothers Antipas and Archelaus, he was brought up at Rome (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 1, § 9), and on the death of his father advocated the claims of Archelaus before Augustus (Joseph. B. J. ii. 6, § 1). He received as his own government “Batanaea, Trachonitis, Auranitis (Gaulonitis), and some parts about Jannina” (Joseph. B. J. ii. 6, § 3), with the title of tetrarch (Luke iii. 1, Φιλίππος ἐπὶ τετραρχάς τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰαλωσίου κυρίου). His rule was distinguished by justice and moderation (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 4, § 6), and he appears to have devoted himself entirely to the duties of his office without sharing in the intrigues which disgraced his family (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 5, § 6). He built a new city on the site of Panes, near the sources of the Jordan, which he called Caesarea (Καισαρεια ἡ Φιλίππος, Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27), and raised Bithynia (in lower Gaulonitis) to the rank of a city under the title of Julius (Joseph. Ant. ii. 8, § 1; xviii. 2, § 1), and died there A.D. 34 (xviii. 5, § 6). He married Salome, the daughter of Philip (L.) and Herodias (Ant. xviii. 6, § 4), but as he left no children at his death his dominions were added to the Roman province of Syria (xviii. 5, § 6).

VI. Herod Agrippa I. (Ἡρῴδης, Acts; Ἀργίππας, Joseph.) was the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and grandson of Herod the Great. He was brought up at Rome with Claudius and Drusus, and after a life of various vicissitudes (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 7), was thrown into prison by Tiberius for an unguarded speech, where he remained till the accession of Caligula (Caligula) A.D. 37. The new emperor gave him the governments formerly held by the tetrarchs Philip and Lysanias, and bestowed on him the ensigns of royalty and other marks of favor (Acts xii. 1, Ἡρ. δ. Βασιλεύς). The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by these distinctions, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting Agrippa in the emperor’s favor. Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a counter-charge against Antipas of treasonous correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusation, and was banished to Gaul (A.D. 39), and his dominions were added to those already held by Agrippa (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 7, § 2). Afterwards Agrippa rendered important services to Claudius (Joseph. B. J. ii. 11, §§ 2, 3), and received from him in return (A.D. 41) the government of Judaea and Samaria; so that his entire dominions equaled in extent the kingdom of Herod the Great. Unlike his predecessors, Agrippa was a strict observer of the Law (Joseph. Ant. xix. 7, § 3), and he sought with success the favor of the Jews. It is probable that it was with this view he put to death James the son of Zebedee, and further imprisoned Peter (Acts xi. 1 ff.). But his sudden death, which followed immediately afterwards, interrupted his ambitious projects.

In the fourth year of his reign over the whole of Judea (A.D. 44) Agrippa attended some games at Cæsarea, held in honor of the emperor. When he appeared in the theatre (Joseph. Ant. xix. 8, § 2, δευτέρα τῶν θεωρίων θηρία: Acts xlii. 21, ταχτή θηρία) in “a robe of silver stuff (ἐν ἀργίλῳ) of purple and white” (Peter Joseph. Ant. xvi. 21) which it might be supposed he wore in honor of the gods; and suddenly he was seized with terrible pains, and being carried from the theatre to the palace died after five days; and thus Agrippa died a kingly death, “πέντε τῶν γαστρῶν ἀκόμη μνήμης διερρέσθη τῶν βίων καταστρέφεται” (Joseph. Ant. xix. 8; γνωμένου σκαλωσιομαστοῦ εξείσεξε). His death was a great loss to the province, and it was at first thought that he had been seized with ague (ἐν ἀργίλῳ), and that his friends had thrown him into the temple and put him into “the angel,” the name of the emperor, whom the people believed to have been minister of the Divine Will (Acts xii. 23 ἐπέτατο φῶτον ἄγγελον Κυρίου; cf. 2 K. xii. 35, LXX.).

Various conjectures have been made as to the occasion of the festival at which the event took place. Josephus (l. c.) says that it was in “behalf of the emperor’s safety,” and it has been supposed that it might be in connection with his return from Britain; but this is at least very uncertain (cf. Wieseler, Chron. d. Apost. Zeit. p. 131 ff.). Josephus mentions also the concourse of “the chief men throughout the province” who were present on the occasion; and though he does not notice the embassy of the Tyrians and Agrippa’s speech, yet his narrative is perfectly consistent with both facts.

VII. Herod Agrippa II. (Ἁργίππας, N. T., Ἀργίππας, Joseph.) was the son of Herod Agrippa I. and Cypros, a grand-niece of Herod the Great. At the time of the death of his father, A.D. 44, he was at Rome, and his youth (he was 17 years old) prevented Claudius from carrying out his first intention of appointing him his father’s successor (Joseph. Ant. xix. 9, §§ 1, 2). Not long afterwards, however, the emperor gave him (A.D. 46) the kingdom of Chalcis, which had belonged to his uncle (who died A.D. 48; Joseph. Ant. xx. 4, § 2; B. J. ii. 12, § 11); and transferred himself (A.D. 52) to the tetrarchies formerly held by Philip and

In virtue, that is, of his half-descent from the Hasmonaean.

c. Just (p. 421, &c.), who objects that these acts are inconsistent with the known humanity of Agrippa entirely neglect the reason suggested by St. Luke (Acts xii. 3).
HERODIANS (Joseph. Ant. xx. 6, § 11; B. J. ii. 12, § 8), with the title of king (Acts xxv. 13, 'Αρχιππας δι Βασιλείας, xxvii. 2, 6c.).

Nero afterwards increased the dominions of Agrippa by the addition of several cities (Ant. xx. 6, § 4); and he displayed the lavish magnificence which marked his family by costly buildings at Jerusalem and other towns, in both of which he did such violence to the bequests of the Jews (Ant. xx. 7, § 11; 8, § 4). The relation in which he stood to his sister Berenice (Acts xxv. 13) was the cause of grave suspicion (Joseph. Ant. xx. 6, § 3), which was noticed by Juvenal (Sat. vi. 155 ff.). In the last Roman war Agrippa took part with the Romans, and after the fall of Jerusalem retired with Berenice to Rome, where he died in the third year of Trajan (A. D. 106), being the last prince of the house of Herod (Phot. Cod. 33).

Copper Coin of Herod Agrippa II. with Titus

Obv.: ΑΥΓΟΝΤΙΤΟΥ ΚΑΙΩΝΠΕΔΑ. Head laureate to the right. Rev.: ΕΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΡΙΠΙΑ (year 26). Victory advancing to the right: in the field a star.

The appearance of St. Paul before Agrippa (A. D. 60) offers several characteristic traits. Agrippa seems to have been intimate with Festus (Joseph. Ant. xx. 7, § 11); and it was natural that the Roman governor should avail himself of his judgment on a question of what seemed to be Jewish law (Acts xxv. 13 ff., 20; cf. Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, § 7). The "rump" (παλαις θεασεσι) with which the king came into the audience chamber (Acts xxv. 23) was accordant with his general bearing; and the cold irony with which he met the impassioned words of the Apostles (Acts xxvi. 27, 28) suits the temper of one who was contented to take part in the destruction of his nation. B. F. W.

VIII. BERENICE. [Berenice.]
IX. DEUSILLA. [Deusilla.]

HERODIANS (HERODIANS). In the account which is given by St. Matthew (xxii. 15 ff.) and St. Mark (xii. 13 ff.) of the last efforts made by different sections of the Jews to obtain from our Lord himself the materials for his accusation, a party under the name of Herodians is represented as acting in concert with the Pharisees (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 13). St.

Mark mentions the combination of the two parties for a similar object at an earlier period (Mark iii. 6), and in another place (viii. 15; cf. Luke xii. 1) he preserves a saying of our Lord, in which "the heaven of Herod" is placed in close connection with "the heaven of the Pharisees". In the Gospel of St. John (xix. 13) the Pharisees and Herodians are not brought forward at all by name.

These very scanty notices of the Evangelists as to the position of the Herodians are not compensated by other testimonies; yet it is not difficult to fix their characteristics by a reference to the condition of Jewish feeling in the Apostolic age. There were probably many who saw in the power of the Herodian family the pledge of the preservation of their national existence in the face of Roman ambition. In proportion as they regarded the independent nationality of the Jewish people as the first condition of the fulfilment of its future destiny, they would be willing to acquiesce in the domination of men who were themselves of foreign descent (Joseph.), and not rigid in the observance of the Mosaic ritual. Two distinct classes might thus unite in supporting what was a domestic tyranny so contrasted with absolute dependence on Rome. Indeed, those who saw in the Herods a protection against direct heathen rule, which was the one object of their fear (cf. Jacta, b. 19, ap. Lightfoot, Harem. Fr. p. 470, ed. Lescu), "Herodes etiam senem Hillel magnum in honore habuit: namque hi homines regem illum esse non aere ferebant," and those who were inclined to look with satisfaction upon such a compromise between the ancient faith and heathen civilization, as Herod the Great and his successors had endeavored to realize, as the true and highest consummation of Jewish hopes. On the one side the Herodians — partisans of Herod in the widest sense of the term — were thus brought into union with the Pharisees, on the other, with the Sadducees. Yet there is no reason to suppose that they endeavored to form any very systematic harmony of the conflicting doctrines of the two sects, but rather the conflicting doctrines themselves were thrown into the background by what appeared to be a paramount political necessity. Such coalitions have been frequent in every age; and the rarity of the allusions to the Herodians, as a marked body, seems to show that this, like similar coalitions, had no enduring influence as the foundation of party. The feelings which led to the coalition remained, but were incapable of animating the common action of a united body for any length of time.

On the occasion mentioned in Matt. xxii. 16 and Mark xii. 13, the Herodians appear as supporters of the claim of the Roman emperors to receive tribute-money from the Jews. This fact agrees

a Origen (Comm. in Matt. tom. xxvi. 29) regards this combination of the Herodians and Pharisees as a combination of antagonistic parties, the one favorable to the Roman government (κατά γαρ οὐκ ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ μὴν ἐκδικῶσιν τοὺς τῶν φημοῦ κατασκοπής τοὺς Παρισίους ὑπὸ τοῦ λαβέντων τὸν γεννήτωρ...), and the other opposed to it; but this view, which is only conjectural (κατά), does not offer a complete solution of the various relations of the Herodians to the other parties of the time. Jerome, following Origen, limits the meaning of the term yet more: "Cum Herodiani, i.e. multitudines Herodis, sec quos fuisse indicet Pharisaei, quis Romanes tribuntia sulpitant. Herodion vocant et non divinorum deitatum." (Hier. Comm. Matt. xxvi. 12).

b In this way the Herodians were said to regard Herod (Antipas) as "the Messiah": "Ἰησοῦν δὲ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τούς ὧν ἦσαν ἀποτίθεντος ἐπισκόπου ἡγούμενος, κατατεθήκατος ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τίμημα ἔργῳ τῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ οἰκεῖῳ τοῖς διάσωμεν, κατὰ τῇ ἢ ἔπεσον ταύτα τοίς κατατεθήκατος, διὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τοῦ ὕπαιθρος τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοῖς ἄγνωστοι κατατεθήκατος τοῖς διάσωμεν." (Ant. ap. Com. Cat. in Mar. p. 433). Philostratus (Her. xxvii.) applies the same belief to Herod Agrippa II: "Ἐπιλαθείτως (Her. xxix.) to Herod the Great. Johannes in one place (Matt. xxi. 15) calls the idea "a ridiculous notion of some Latin writers, which rests on no authority (quod nusquam legimus);" and again (Dial. c. Lucif. xxiii.) mentions it in a general summary of heretical notions without hesitation. The belief was, in fact, one of the most extraordinary and one of the most common general opinion, and not of distinct and pronounced confession.
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with the view that they were essentially a political and not a religious party, and hence in this respect stood at the very opposite pole from the Pharisees, for the latter denied the Roman right of government and resisted all foreign innovations. It is remarkable that we find two such hostile parties acting together in any instance. And especially in regard to that earlier combination (Mark iii. 6), it does not appear from the narrative how a coalition of the Pharisees with the Herodians was to enable them to accomplish the death of Jesus. We can only conjecture how this may have been. The influence of Christ among the people in Galilee at that period was very great, and therefore any open act of violence on the part of his enemies was out of the question. Means more covert must be employed. The Herodians, as the partisans of Herod, had influence with that ruler; and the Pharisees, intriguing with them and fixing upon some political accusation, may have hoped to secure Herod's interposition in arresting and putting to death the object of their malice. It is not without significance that the overture for this alliance came from the Pharisees and not from the Herodians (μετὰ τῶν Ἡρω- διάων συμβολῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ, Mark iii. 6). H.

HERODIAS (Ἡρώδιας, a female patronymic from Ἡρώδης; on patronymics and gentile names in ιας, see Matthie, Greek Gr, § 101 and 103), the name of a woman of notoriety in the N. T. daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Agrippa I.

She first married Herod, surronded Philip, another of the sons of Mariamne and the first Herod (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 5, § 4; comp. B. J. i. 29, § 4), and therefore her full uncle; then she eloped from him, during his lifetime (Ant. ibid.), to marry Herod Antipas, her step-uncle, who had been long married to, and was still living with, the daughter of Aeneas or Aretas—his assumed name—king of Arabia (ibid. xvii. 8, § 4). Thus she left her husband, who was still alive, to connect herself with a man whose wife was still alive. Her paramour was indeed less of a blood relation than her original husband; but being likewise the half-brother of that husband, he was already connected with her by affinity—so close that there was only one case contemplated in the Law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the married brother had died childless (Lev. xiv. 21, and for the exception Deut. xxv. 5 f.). Now Herodias had already had one child—Salome—by Philip (Ant. xviii. 5, § 4), and, as she was still alive, might have had more. Well, therefore, may she be charged by Josephus with the intention of confounding her country's institutions (ibid. xviii. 5, § 4); and well may St John the Baptist have denounced against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been a less hardened one (Matt. xiv. 9 says he was sorry " Mark vi. 20 that he " heared " St. John; and " heard him gladly ").

The consequences both of the crime, and of the reproof which it incurred, are well known. Aretas made war upon Herod for the injury done to his daughter, and routed him with the loss of his whole army (Ant. xviii. 5, § 1). The head of St John the Baptist was granted to the request of Herodias (Matt. xiv. 8–11; Mark vi. 24–28). According to Josephs the execution took place in a fortress called Machaerus, on the frontier between the dominions of Aretas and Herod, according to Pliny (v. 15), looking down upon the Dead Sea from the south (comp. Robinson, i. 570, note).

And it was to the iniquity of this act, rather than to the immodesty of that illicit connection that, the historian says, some of the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod. In the closing scene of her career, indeed, Herodias exhibited considerable magnanimity; as she preferred going with Antipas to Lugdunum, and there shared the exile and reverses of her brother Agrippa I, and partaking of his elevation (Ant. xviii. 7, § 2).

There are few episodes in the whole range of the N. T. more suggestive to the commentator than this one scene in the life of Herodias.

1. It exhibits one of the most remarkable of the undesigned coincidences between the N. T. and Josephus: that there are some discrepancies in the two accounts, only enhances their value. More than this, it has led the historian into a brief digression upon the life, death, and character of the Baptist, which speaks volumes in favor of the genuineness of that still more celebrated passage, in which he speaks of "Jesus," that "wised man, if man he may be called" (Ant. xviii. 3, § 3; comp. xx. 9, § 1, unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Joseph. H. E. i. 11).

2. It has been warmly debated whether it was the adulterous, or the incestuous connection, that drew down the reproof of the prophet. It has already been shown that, either way, the offense merited condemnation upon more grounds than one.

3. The birthday feast is another undesigned coincidence between Scripture and profane history. The Jews abhorred keeping birthdays as a pagan custom (Bland on Matt. xiv. 6). On the other hand, it was usual with the Egyptians (Gen. xii. 20; comp. Joseph. Ant. xii. 4, § 7), with the Persians (Herod. i. 132), with the Greeks, even in the case of the dead, whence the Christian custom of keeping anniversaries of the martyrs (Bähr, ad Herod. iv. 26), and with the Romans (Pers. Sat. i. 1–3) Now the Herodis may be said to have gone beyond Rome in the observance of all that was Roman. Herod the Great kept the day of his accession; Antipas—as we read here—and Agrippa I, as Josephus tells us (Ant. xix. 7, § 1), their
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J. among 341. termingled, proverb thah to hero, decided without favor Hippolytus, 1056 pears "after Dent. birds reality tion therefore ihi Alex. Hepher" fahe 5. is HERON quote HE'SED and Greeks to their favor. is of the Amorites (Num. xxi. 26). It stood on the western border of the high plain (Mishor, Josh. xiii. 17), and on the boundary-line between the tribes of Reuben and Gad. The ruins of Heshbon, 20 miles east of the Jordan, on the parallel of the northern end of the Dead Sea, mark the site, as they bear the name, of the ancient Heshbon. The city is chiefly celebrated from its connection with Sihon, who was the first to give battle to the invading Israelites. He marched against them to Jabbaz, which must have been situated a short distance south of Heshbon, and was there completely overthrown (Deut. ii. 32 ff.). Heshbon was rebuilt by the tribe of Reuben (Num. xxxii. 37), but was assigned to the Levites in connection with the tribe of Gad (Josh. xxi. 39). After the Captivity it fell into the hands of the Moabites, to whom it had originally belonged (Num. xxi. 25), and hence it is mentioned in the prophetical denunciations against Moab (Is. xv. 4; Jer. xlviii. 2, 34, 43). In the fourth century it was still a place of some note (Theoph. s. v. Echedam), but it has now been for many centuries wholly desolate.

The ruins of Heshbon stand on a low hill rising out of the great undulating plateau. They are more than a mile in circuit; but not a building remains entire. Towards the western part is a singular structure, whose crumbling ruins exhibit the workmanship of successive ages—the massive stones of the Jewish period, the sculptured cornice of the Roman era, and the light Saracenic arches, all grouped together. There are many cisterns among the ruins; and towards the south, a few yards from the base of the hill, is a large ancient reservoir, which calls to mind the passage in Cant. vii. 4. "Thine eyes are like the fish-pools of Heshbon by the gate of Bath-rabbīm." (See Barchhardt, Temp. in Sycr., p. 365; Ibray and Mangles, p. 472.)

HERON

The Hebrew anaphath appears as the name of an unclean bird in Lev. xi. 19, xvi. 18. From the addition of the words "after her kind," we may infer that it was a generic name for a well-known class of birds, and hence it is the more remarkable that the name does not occur elsewhere in the Bible. It is quite uncertain what bird is intended; the only point on which any two commentators seem to agree is, that it is not the heoron, for many suppose the preceding word, translated in the A. V. "shark," to apply in reality to the heron. The LXX. translates it χα ῳπρος, which may be regarded as applicable to all birds frequenting swampy ground (νερος), but more particularly to the plover. This explanation has what weight it might otherwise have had, from the probability that it originated in a false reading, namely, anaphath, which the translators connected with anaph, "a bank." The Talmudists evidently were at a loss, for they describe it indefinitely as a "high-flying bird of prey." (Chalda, 63 a.) The only ground on which an opinion can be formed, is the etymology of the word; it is connected by Gesenius (Thes. p. 127) with the root anaph, "to soot in anger," and is therefore applicable to some irritable bird, perhaps the goose. The parrot, swallow, and a kind of eagle have been suggested without any real reason.

HERSED [Kindness, favor]: Ezed: Alex. Ezra: Benjeseid, the son of Hesed, or Henechesed, was commissary for Solomon in the district of the Aruboth, Socoh, and all the land of Hepher "(1 K. iv. 10).

HESMON [Shining, fruitfulnes]: LXX. omits, both MSS.; [Comp. Adj. "Aretéastus" Hesmon], a place named, with others, as lying between Mokadah and Beer-sheba (Josh. xx. 27), and therefore in the extreme south of Judah. Nothing further is known of it; but may it not be another form of the name Azmon, given in Num. xxxiv. 4 as one of the landmarks of the southern boundary of Judah?
HESRON (הֶשְׁרֹן) [enclosed, as by a wall]: *'Aṣpōw; Alex. *Aṣpouw: *Hesron*. Heszron, the son of Reuben (Num. xxvi. 6, [21]). Our translators followed the Vulg. in adopting this form of the name. [In many modern editions of the A. V. however, it is spelt Hesron. A.] W. A. W.

HE'SRONITES, THE (הֶשְׁרֹונִים): δ Ἀσποωνι [Var.]; Alex. o Ἀσποωνι: *Hesroniti*). Descendants of Hesron, or Hesron, the son of Reuben (Num. xxvi. 6). [In many modern editions of the A. V. the word is spelt Hesronites. — A.] W. A. W.

HETH (הֵתָה). i. e. Cheth [terror, giant]: *Xē: Hethh*, the forefather of the nation of the Hittites. In the genealogical tables of Gen. x. and i Chr. i, Heth is stated as a son of Canaan, younger than Zidon the firstborn, but preceding the Jebusites, the Amorites, and the other Canaanite families. Heth and Zidon alone are named as persons; all the rest figure as tribes (Gen. x. 15; 1 Chr. i. 13; LXX. τῶν Χετταών: [Vulg. Heth- 

HITTITES. The Hittites were therefore a Hamite race, neither of the "country" nor the "kindred" of Abraham and Isaac (Gen. xxvii. 3, 4; xxviii. 1, 2). In the earliest historical mention of the nation — the beautiful narrative of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah — they are styled, not Hittites, but Bene-Ceth (A. V. "sons, and children of Heth," Gen. xxviii. 3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20; xxv. 19; xlix. 32). Once we hear of "daughters of Heth" (xxviii. 46), the "daughters of the land;" at that early period still called, after their less immediate progenitor, "daughters of Canaan" (xxviii. 1, 8, compared with xxv. 46, and xxvi. 34, 35).

In the Egyptian monuments the name Chot is said to stand for Palestine (Bosnow, *Egypten*, quoted by Ewald, Gesch. i. 317, note). G.

HETHILON (הֶתיָלוֹן), the way of Hethlon [i. e. the lurking-place or stronghold]: [LXX. translate the name: *Hethloun*], the "name of a place on the northern border of the "promised land." It is mentioned only twice in Scripture (Ex. xlv. 15, xxviii. 1). In all probability the "way of Hethlon" is the pass at the northern end of Lebanon, from the sea-coast of the Mediterranean to the great plain of Hanaith, and is thus identical with "the entrance of Hamath" in Num. xxxiv. 8, &c. (See *Fire Years in Deuter.-

HEZEKII (חֶזְקִיَاו, חֶזְקִיוֹן), i. e. Hizkia, a short form of Hizkiah, *strength of Jehovah = Hezekiah*: *Aqōξi: [Yat. Ακέξῆ]: *Hezeki*), a man in the genealogies of Benjamin, one of the Bene-Ephal [sons of E.], a descendant of Shairaim (1 Chr. vii. 17).

HEZEKIAH (חֶזְקִיָה), generally חֶזְקִיָה, Hizkia'nu, and also with initial "נחֶזְקִיָה: LXX. and Joseph. *Εξεκίας: Ezekias = strength of Jehovah*), king ofJudah from the year 727 to 687 (B.C. 704). He was the second king of Judah, son of the apostate Ahaz and Abi (or Abijah), ascended the throne at the age of 25 u. c. 726. Since, however, Ahaz died at the age of 36, some prefer to make Hezekiah only twenty years old at his accession (reading ד for ד), as otherwise he must have been born when Ahaz was a boy of 11 years old. This, indeed, is not impossible ([Herion Ep. ad Iulianem, 132, quoted by Bochart, Geogr. Sacr. p. 929; see Keil on 2 K. xvii. 1; Knobel, Jes. 22, &c.; but, if any change be desirable, it is better to suppose that Heziz was 23 and not 20 years old at his accession (LXX. Syr. Arab. 2 Chr. xxvii. 1), reading ד for ד in 2 K. xvi. 2).

Hezekiah was one of the three most perfect kings of Judah (2 K. xviii. 5; Exod. xlv. 4). His first act was to purify, and repair, and reunite with splendid sacrifices and perfect ceremonial, the Temple which had been despised and neglected during the careless and idolatrous reign of his father. This consecration was accompanied by a revival of the theocratic spirit, so strict as not even to spare "the high places," which, although tolerated by many well-intentioned kings, had naturally been profaned by the worship of images and Asherahs (2 K. xvi. 4). On the extreme ineptitudes and probable consequences of this measure, see *High Places*. A still more decisive act was the destruction of a brazen serpent, said to have been the one used by Moses in the miraculous healing of the Israelites (Num. xxxi. 9), which had been removed to Jerusalem, and had become, "down to those days," an object of adoration, partly in consequence of its venerable character as a reliqu, and partly perhaps from some dint tendencies to the idolatry of the Hebrews. (Prideaux, Conscript. i. 12, Oxf., ed.) When the kingdom of Israel had fallen, Hezekiah extended his pious endeavors to Ephraim and Manasseh, and by inviting the scattered inhabitants to a peculiar Passover kindled their indignation also against the idolatrous practices which still continued among them. This Passover was, from the necessities of the case, celebrated at an unusual, though not illegal (Num. ix. 10, 11) time, and by an excess of Levitical zeal, it was continued for the unprecedented period of fourteen days. For these latter facts the Chronicler (2 Chr. xxix. 3, xxx. xxxi) is our sole authority, and he characteristically narrates them at great length. It would appear at first sight that this Passover was celebrated immediately after the purification of the Temple (see Prideaux, l. c.), but careful consideration makes it almost certain that it could not have taken place before the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign, when the fall of Samaria had stricken such a mortful terror into the heart of Israel (2 Chr. xxxi. 1, xxx. 6, 9, and Keil on 2 K. xviii. 3). By a rare and happy providence the most pious of kings was confirmed in his faithfulness, and seconded in his endeavors by the powerful assistance of the noblest and most eloquent of prophets. The influence of Isaiah was, however, not gained without a struggle with the "scurrilous" remnant of the former royal counsellors (Is. xxvi. 11), who in all probability recommended to the king such a "serpent," possibly with a contemplative play on the word דְּשִׁרָה, "a brazen thing," and with a prophetic reference to the heart of Israel (2 Chr. xxxi. 1, xxxi, 6, 9, and Keil on 2 K. xviii. 3).
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alliances and con promises as would be in unison rather with the dictates of political expediency, than with that sole unhesitating trust in the arm of Jehovah which the prophets inculcated. The leading name of this cabinet was Shechem, who, from the outside of this story, is mentioned and the expression in Is. xxii. 16 (see Blunt, *Lects., Coincidences*), was probably a foreigner, perhaps a Syrian (Hitzig).

At the instance of Isaiah, he seems to have been subsequently degraded from the high post of preceptor of the palace (which office was given to Elkanim, Is. xxi. 21), to the inferior, though still honorable, station of state-secretary (Judg. ii. 18); the further punishment of exile with which Isaiah had threatened him (xxii. 18) being possibly forgiven on his amendment, of which we have some traces in Is. xxxvii. 2 E. (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii. 617).

At the head of a repentant and united people, Hezekiah ventured to assume the aggressive against the Philistines, and in a series of victories not only recovered the cities which his father had lost (2 Chr. xxvi. xxvii. 18), but even dispossessed them of their own cities except Gaza (2 K. xvii. 8) and Gath (Joseph. *Ant. ix. 13, § 3*). It was perhaps to the purposes of this war that he applied the money which would otherwise have been used to pay the tribute exacted by Shalmaneser, according to the agreement of Ahaz with his predecessor, Tiglath Pileser. When, after the capture of Samaria, the king of Assyria applied for this impost, Hezekiah refused it, and in open rebellion omitted to send even the usual presents (2 K. xviii. 7), a line of conduct to which he was doubtless encouraged by the splendid exhortation of his prophetic guide.

Instant war was averted by the heroic and long continued resistance of the Tyrians under their king Elukenos (Joseph. *Ant. ix. 14*), against a siege, which was abandoned only in the fifth year (Grote, *Greece*, iii. 559, 4th ed.), when it was found to be impracticable. This must have been a critical and intensely anxious period for Jerusalem, and Hezekiah used every available means to strengthen his position, and render his capital impregnable (2 K. xx. 20; 2 Chr. xxix. 3-5, 30; Is. xxi. 8-11, xxxii. 18; and to these events Ewald also refers Is. xlviii. 13). But while all Judaea trembled with anticipation of Assyrian invasion, and while Shechem and others were relying "in the shadow of Egypt," Isaiah's brave heart did not fail, and he even denounced the wrath of God against the proud and sinful merchant-city (Is. xxiii.), which now seemed to be the main bulwark of Judaea against immediate attack.

It was probably during the siege of Samaria that Shalmaneser died, and was succeeded by Sargon, who, jealous of Egyptian influence in Judaea, sent an army under a Taritan or general (Is. xx. 1), which penetrated Egypt (Nah. ii. 15-16) and destroyed Nu-anun; although it is clear from Hezekiah's rebellion (2 K. xvii. 7) that it can have produced but little permanent impression. Sargon, in the tenth year of his reign (which is the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), made an expedition to Palestine; but his annals make no mention of any conquests from Hezekiah on this occasion, and he seems to have occupied himself in the siege of Ashdod, and in the inspection of mines (Rossmüller, *Eld., Geogr.*, ix.). This must therefore be the expedition alluded to in 2 K. xxi. 13; Is. xxxi. 1; an expedition which is nearly alluded to, as it led to no result. But if the Scripture narrative is to be reconciled with the records of Assyrian history it seems necessary to make a transposition in the text of Isaiah (and therefore of the book of Kings). That some such expedition must be inferred is, if the Assyrian history is correct, maintained by Dr. Hincks in a paper *On the restoration of Choromyth*, which the newly discovered Apis-stela render necessary. "The text," he says, "as it originally stood, was probably to this effect: 2 K. xviii. 13. New in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah the king of Assyria came up [alluding to the attack mentioned in Sargon's Assur. xxi. xx. 1-19. In those days was king Hezekiah sick of a deadly disease, the king of Assyria, king of Assur, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, etc., xxii. 13, xiii. 37] (Dr. Hincks, in *Journ. of Soc. Lit.* Oct. 1858). Perhaps some later transcriber, unaware of the earlier and unimportant invasion, confused the mission to Sargon in 2 K. xxi. 13 with the detailed story of Semacheri's attack (2 K. xviii. 14 to xxi. 37), and, considering that the account of the former begins after the latter, broke the continuity of the narrative, removed it to the end.

According to this scheme, Hezekiah's dangerous illness (2 K. xx.; Is. xxxviiii.; 2 Chr. xxiii. 24) nearly synchronized with Sargon's futile invasion, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, eleven years before Semacheri's invasion. That it must have preceded the attack of Semacheri is nearly obvious from the promise in 2 K. xx. 6, as well as from modern discoveries (Layard, *Nim. and Bab.* i. 145); and such is the view adopted by the Bibles (Schnor Olom, cap. xxiii.), Ussher, and by most commentators, except Vitringa and Gesenius (Keil, *Ad loc.*; Pridaux, i. 22). There seems to be no ground whatever for the vague conjecture so confidently advanced (Winers, s. v. *Hisban*; John, *Hebr. Common.* § 6f.), that the king's illness was the same plague which had destroyed the Assyrian army. The word *נְבֵית* is not elsewhere applied to the plague, but to carbuncles and inflammatory ulcers (Ex. ix. 9; Job ii. 7, &c.). Hezekiah, whose kingdom was in a dangerous crisis, who had at that time no heir (for Manasseh was not born till long afterwards, 2 K. xx. 1), and who regarded death as the end of existence (Is. xxxvi. 1.), "turned his face to the wall and wept sore at the threatened approach of dissolution. God had compassion on his anguish, and heard his prayer. Isaiah had hardly left the palace when he was ordered to promise the king immediate recovery, and a fresh lease of life, ratifying the promise by a sign, and earing the boil by a plaster of figs, which were often used medicinally in similar cases (Ges. *Theor.* i. 311; Celsius, *Mevor.* ii. 377; Barthdams, *De Medic. Biblic. x. 47*). What was the exact nature of the disease we cannot say; according to Monle it was fever terminating in abscesses. For some account of the retrogression of the shadow on the sundial of Ahaz, see *Dial.*. On this remarkable passage we must be content to refer the reader to Carpop., *App. Crit.* p. 351 f.; Winers, s. v. *Hisban* and *Vulgar*; Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii. 532 f.; the elaborate notes of Keil on 2 K. xx.; Rosenmuller and Gesenius on Is. xxxviiii., and especially Ewald, *Gesch.*, i. 658.

Various ambassadors came with letters and gifts to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery (2 Chr. xxiii. 23), and among them an embassy from Merc-
Eosenmiuller, Layaid, So although ambassadors. Assyrian treasures of Ptolemy’s canon. The ostensible object of this mission was to compliment Hezekiah on his convalescence (2 K. xx. 12; Is. xxxix. 1), and “to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land” (2 Chr. xxxii. 31), a rumor of which could not fail to interest a people devoted to astrology. But its real purpose was to discover how far an alliance between the two powers was possible or desirable, for Marodonopads, no less than Hezekiah, was in apprehension of the Assyrians. In fact Sargon expelled him from the throne of Babylon in the following year (the 16th of Hezekiah), although after a time he seems to have returned and re-established himself for six months, at the end of which he was murdered by Belblos (Dr. Hincks, l. c.; Rosenmuller, Bibl. Geogr. ch. viii.; Layard, Nin. and Bab. i. 141). Community of interest made Hezekiah receive the overtures of Babylon with unexclusive gratification; and, perhaps, to enhance the opinion of his own importance as an ally, he displayed to the messengers the princely treasures which he and his predecessors had accumulated. The mention of such rich stores is an additional argument for supposing these events to have happened before Semachibar’s invasion (see 2 K. xviii. 14-16), although they are related after them in the Scripture historians. If ostentation were his motive it received a terrible rebuke, and he was informed by Isaiah that from the then tottering and subordinate province of Babylon, and not from the mighty Assyria, would come the ruin and captivity of Judah (Is. xxxix. 5). This prophecy and the one of Micah (Mic. iv. 10) are the earliest definition of the locality of that hostile power, where the clouds of exile so long threatened (Lev. xxvi. 35; Deut. iv. 27, xxx. 2) were beginning to gather. It is an impressive and fearful circumstance that the moment of exultation was chosen as the opportunity for warning, and that the prophecies of the Assyrian deliverance are set side by side with those of the Babylonish captivity (Davidson On Prophecy, p. 256). The weak friend was to accomplish that which was impossible to the powerful foe. But, although pride was the sin thus venenously checked by the prophet, Isaiah was certainly not blind to the political motives (Joseph. Ant. x. 2, § 2), which made Hezekiah so complaisant to the Babylonian ambassadors. Into those motives he had inquired in vain, for the king met that portion of his question (“What said these men?”) by emphatic silence. Hezekiah’s meek answer to the stern denunciation of future woe has been most unjustly censured as “a false rejection which combines sickness with sullenness” (Newman, Hebr. Mon. p. 274). But a careful study now would disclose a conviction that God’s decree could not be otherwise than just and right, and a natural thankfulness for even a temporary suspension of its inevitable fulfillment.

Sargon was succeeded (b. c. 702) by his son Semachibar, whose two invasions occupy the greater part of the Scripture records concerning the reign of Hezekiah. The first of these took place in the third year of Semachibar (b. c. 700), and comprises only three verses (2 K. xviii. 13-16), though the route of the advancing Assyrians may be traced in Is. x. 3-5. The rumor of the invasion redoubled Hezekiah’s exertions, and he prepared for a siege by providing offensive and defensive armor, stopping up the wells, and diverting the water of Gihon into the city by a subterranean canal (Ezech. xlvii. 17). For a similar precaution taken by the Maccabees, see Will. Tyr. viii. 7, Keil). But the main hope of the political faction was the alliance with Egypt, and they seem to have sought it by presents and private entreaties (Is. xxx. 6), especially with a view to obtaining chariots and cavalry (Is. xxxi. 1-3), which was the weakest arm of the Jewish service, as we see from the decision which it excised (2 K. xviii. 23). Such overtures kindled Isaiah’s indignation, and Selauna may have lost his high office by recommending them. The prophet clearly saw that Egypt was too weak and faithless to be serviceable, and the applications to Pharaoh (who is compared by Rabshakeh to one of the weak reeds of his own river), implied a want of trust in the help of God. But Isaiah did not disapprove of the spontaneously proffered assistance of the tall and warlike Ethiopians (Is. xviii. 2, 7, acc. to Ewald’s trans.); because he may have regarded it as a providential aid.

The account given of this first invasion in the Annals of Semachibar is that he attacked Hezekiah, because the Ekronites had sent their king Puliyia (or “Hadiyya” acc. to Col. Rawlinson) as a prisoner to Jerusalem (cf. 2 K. xviii. 8); that he defeated them with forty thousand men; and that in the 20th year of Hezekiah (Is. xiii. 14) is apparently a general expression, cf. xix. 8) and 290,000 prisoners: that he besieged Jerusalem with mounds (cf. 2 K. xix. 32); and although Hezekiah promised to pay 800 talents of silver (of which perhaps 300 only were ever paid) and 30 of gold (2 K. xvii. 14; but see Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 145), yet not content with this he mulcted him of a part of his dominions, and gave them to the kings of Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza (Rawlinson, Hebr. x. 475 B). So important was this expedition that Demetrius, the Jewish historian, even attributes to Semachibar the Great Captivity (Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 146, ed. Syr.).

In almost every particular this account agrees with the notice in Scripture, and we may see a reason for so great a sacrifice on the part of Hezekiah in the glimpse which Isaiah gives us of his capital city driven by desperation into licentious and impious conduct. This can hardly be reconciled with the events which have had the one good result of proving the worthlessness of the Egyptian alliance; for at a place called Altagn (the Eltekon of Josh. xv. 59?) Semachibar inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia, which had come to the assistance of Ekron. But Isaiah regarded the purchased treaty as a cowardly defection, and the sight of his fellow-citizens gazing peacefully from the horse-steps on the bright array of the enemy and quivered Assyrians, filled him with indignation and despair (Is. xxv. 1-7, if the latest explanations of this chapter be correct).

Hezekiah’s bridle (or fine) brought a temporary release, for the Assyrians marched into Egypt, where, if Herodotus (ii. 141) and Josephus (Ant. x. 1-3) are to be trusted, they advanced without resistance to Pelusium, owing to the hatred of the warlike people. The queen of Thoth, who had, in her priestly predilections, interfered with their prerogatives. In spite of this advantage, Semachibar was forced to make the siege of Pelusium, by the advance of Tarchakah or Tarakos, the ally of Sethos and Hezekiah, who afterwards united the crowns of Egypt and Ethiopia. This magnificent Ethiopian hero, who had extended
his conquests to the pillars of Hercules (Strab. xv. 472), was indeed a formidable antagonist. His death is recorded in a temple at Medainel Habool, but the jealousy of the Memphites (Wilkinson, Ant. Egypt. i. 141) concealed his assistance, and attributed the deliverance of Sesostris to the miraculous interposition of an army of mice (Herod. ii. 141). This story may have had its source, however, not in jealousy, but in the use of the mouse as the emblem of destruction (Herzfeld. Hierogly. i. 59; Rawlinson, Herod. ad loc.), and of some sort of disease of plagues (2 Sam. xxiii. 18; John, Arch. Ebd. § 185). The legend doubtless gained ground from the extraordinary circumstances which afterwards ruined the army of Semmacherib. We say afterwards, because, however much the details of the two occurrences may have been confused, we cannot agree with the majority of writers (Prideaux, Bechart, Michaelis, Jahn, Keil, Newman, etc.) in identifying the flight of Semmacherib from Pelusium with the event described in 2 K. xix. We prefer to follow Josephus in making them allude to distinct events.

Returning from his futile expedition (παρηγορητός ἀνέχετος, Joseph. Ant. x. 1, § 4), Semmacherib dealt treacherously with Hezekiah (Is. xxxix. 1) by attacking the stronghold of Lachish. This was the commencement of that second invasion, respecting which we have such full details in 2 K. xviii. 17 ff.; 2 Chr. xxxix. 9 ff.; Is. xxxvii. That there were two invasion (contrary to the opinion of Layard, Bonnet, Vince Smith, etc.) is clearly proved by the details of the first given in the Assyrian annals (see Rawlinson, Herod. i. p. 477).

Although the annals of Semmacherib on the great cylinder in the Brit. Museum reach to the end of his eighth year, and this second invasion belongs to his fifth year (n. c. 698, the twenty-eighth year of Hezekiah), yet no allusion to it has been found. So shameful a disaster was naturally concealed by national vanity. From Lachish he sent against Jerusalem an army under two officers and his embassador the orator Ralshakhe, with a blasphemous and insulting summons to surrender, dedicating Hezekiah's hopes of Egyptian succor, and apparently endeavoring to inspire the people with distrust of his religious innovations (2 K. xviii. 22, 25, 30). The reiteration and increasement of the latter arguments together with Ralshakhe's fluent mastery of Hebrew (which he used to tempt the people from their allegiance by a glowing promise, v. 31, 32), give countenance to the supposition that he was an apostate Jew. Hezekiah's ministers were thrown into anguish and dismay; but the unbaptized Isaiah hurled back threatening for threatening with unrivalled eloquence and force. He even prophesied that the fires of Tophet were already burning in expectation of the Assyrian corpses which were destined to feed their flame. Meanwhile Semmacherib, having taken Lachish (an event possibly depicted on a series of reliefs at Mosul, Layard, V. and B. 148-152), was besetting Lachish when,

alarmed by a "rumor" of Tirhakah's advance (to avenge the defeat at Altah?), he was forced to relinquish once more his immediate designs, and content himself with a defiant letter to Hezekiah. Whether on this occasion he encountered and defeated the Ethiopians (as Prideaux precariously infers from Is. xx. Connect. i. p. 26), or not, we cannot tell. The next event of the campaign, about which we are informed, is that the Jewish king, with simple piety prayed to God with Semmacherib's letter outspread before him (cf. 1 Macc. iii. 48), and received a prophecy of immediate deliverance. Accordingly "that night the Angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000 men."

There is no doubt that some secondary cause was employed in the accomplishment of this event. We are certainly "not to suppose," as Dr. Johnson observed, that the angel went about with a sword in his hand stabbing them one by one, but that some powerful natural agent was employed. The Babylonian Talmud and some of the Targums attribute it to storms of lightning (Vitrunga, Vergel, etc.); Prideaux, Heine (de causa Strag. Assy.), and Faber to the Simon; R. Jose, Ussher, Press (de causa idol. Assy.), etc., to a nocturnal attack by Tirhakah: Paulus to a poisoning of the waters; and finally Josephus, followed by an immense majority of ancient and modern commentators, including even Keil, to the Pestilence. This would be a cause not only adequate (Justin, xix. 11; Diodor. xip. p. 434: see the other instances quoted by Rosenmuller, Winner, Keil, Jahn, etc.), but most probable in itself from the crowded and terrified state of the camp. There is therefore no necessity to adopt the ingenious conjectures by which Bedier, Koppe, and Weseler endeavor to get rid of the large number 185,000."

After this reverse Semmacherib fled precipitately to Nineveh, where he revenged himself on as many Jews as were in his power (Tob. i. 18), and after many years (not fifty-five days, as Tobit says, i. 21), was murdered by two of his sons as he drank himself drunk in the house of Nisroch (Assaraz?) his god. He certainly lived till n. c. 680, for his 220th year is mentioned on a clay tablet (c.) he must therefore have survived Hezekiah by some seventeen years. It is probable that several of the Psalms (e. g. xvi.-xlvii., lxxvi.) allude to his discomfiture.

Hezekiah only lived to enjoy for about one year more his well-earned peace and glory. He slept with his fathers after a reign of twenty-nine years, in the 56th year of his age (n. c. 697), and was buried with great honor and universal mourning in the chiefest of the sepulchres (or 'the road leading up to the sepulchres,' εἰς ἀναβάσεις τάφων, LXX., because, as Theophrastus conjectures, the actual sepulchres were full) of the sons of David" (2 Chr. xxxii. 33). He had found time for many works of peace in the noble and almost blameless course of his troubled life, and to his pious labors we are indebted for seven months at Cairo (Gesenski, ad loc.). It might be accomplished by a storm. So Vitrunga understood it, and this would best suit the words in Is. xxx. 20 (History of the Jewish Church, ii. 590). A mutilated account of this wonder was current among the Egyptians. They ascribed it, as a matter of course, to their own divinities, but unquestionably had in view the same occurrence (see Rawlinson, Herod. ii. 111).
HEZEKIAH

Hezekiah had for at least one portion of the present canon (Prov. xxv. 1; Eccles. xviii. 17 ff.) He can have no finer panegyric than the words of the son of Siraeh, "even the kings of Judah failed, for they就越过 the law of the Most High; all except Dia-
ked, and Ezechias, and Judas failed."

"Besides the many authors and commentators who have written on this period of Jewish history (on which much light has been recently thrown by Mr. Layard, Sir G. Wilkinson, Sir H. Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, and other scholars who have studied the Ninveh remains), see for continuous lives of Hezekiah, Josephus (Ant. ix. 13-x. 2), Prideaux (Connect. i. 11-49), John (Hebr. Comm. § xii.), Winer (s. v. Hezkia), and Ewald (Gesch. iii. 614-
614, 3d ed.)."—E. W. F.

* Dean Stanley devotes a long lecture (History of the Jewish Church, i. 503-549) to the character of Hezekiah, and the events with which he was connected. "The reign of Hezekiah is the cul-
minating point of interest in the history of the kings of Judah." Yet the interest of his personal history is mainly which arises from the con-
templation of his example as one of faith and piety, and of the wonderful deliverance vouchsafed to the nation for his sake. Though both these and his earliest efforts for the reformation of the people served only to delay, but not to avert, the lastening ruin of the commonwealth. The sketch drawn by Mr. Stanley of Hezekiah's repairing to the temple with the defunct letter of Sennacherib, to spread it before Jehovah and to implore his help, brings out the monarch's character at that most critical juncture in its best light. The Assyrian conqueror had sent from Lachish, demand his submission of Heze-
kiah and the surrender of Jerusalem into the hands of his general. On hearing this summons, Eli-
akin, Shebna, and Joah, Hezekiah's three highest officers, tore their garments in horror, and ap-
peared in that state before the king. He, too, gave way to the same uncontrolled burst of grief. He and they both dressed themselves in sackcloth, and the king took refuge in the Temple. The minis-
ters felt it became them to hail him as the king. The suc-
ting embassy returned to Sennacherib. The army was moved from Lachish and lay in front of the fortress of Libnah. A letter conched in terms like those already used by his envoys, was sent direct from the king of Assyria to the king of Ju-
dah. What would be their fate if they were taken, they might know from the fate of Lachish, which we still see on the sculptured monuments, where the inhabitants are lying before the king, stripped in order to be flayed alive. Hezekiah took the letter, and penetrating, as it would seem, into the Most Holy Place, laid it before the Divine Presence enthroned above the cherubs, and called upon him whose name it insulted, to look down and see with his own eyes the outrage that was offered to him. From that dark recess no direct answer was vouch- safed. The answer came through the mouth of Isaiah. From the first moment that Sennacherib's army had appeared, he had held the same language of unbroken hope and confidence,clothed in every variety of imagery. . . . It was a day of awful suspcnsor. In proportion to the strenug of Isaiah's confidence and of Hezekiah's devotion, would have been the ruin of the Jewish church and faith, if they hcad been disappointed of their hope. It was a day of suspense also for the two great armies which were drawing near to their encounter on the boundaries of Palestine. Like Antius in the siege

of Orleans, Hezekiah must have looked southward and westward with ever keener and keener eager-
ness. For already there was a rumor that Tiria-
kah, the king of Egypt, was on his way to the rescue. Already Semmacherib had heard the rumor, and it was this which precipitated his endeavor to in-
timidate Jerusalem into submission. The evening was closed in on what seemed to be the devoted city. The morning dawned, and with the morning came the tidings from the camp at Libnah, that they were delivered. . . . It came to pass that night (2
K. xix. 35) that the Angel of Jehovah went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand." . . . The As-
syrian king at once returned, and, according to the Jewish tradition, wreaked his vengeance on the Is-
raelite exiles whom he found in Mesopotamia. He was the last of the great Assyrian conquerors. No Assyrian host again ever crossed the Jordan. Within a few years from that time . . . the As-
syrian power suddenly vanished from the earth."

It was in all probability at the time of Sem-
macherib's first invasion of Palestine that Hezekiah pur chased his exemption from submission to the Assyrian yoke by the payment of a fine. If the Assyrian conquerors were right, that is, if the Annals of Sennacherib furnish an important confirmation of the Biblical account of this expedition, and of its results as re-
gards Hezekiah and the Jews. The boastful record on one of the cylinders is said to read as follows: "And because Hezekiah, king of Judah, says Semmacherib, I would not submit to my yoke, I came up against him, and by force of arms and by the might of my power, I took forty-six of his strong 
fortified cities; and I took away the best of his horses . . . and my hand . . . in the gates, so as to prevent escape . . . Then upon this Hezekiah fell the fear of the power of my arms, and he sent out to me the chiefs and the elders of Jerusalem with 30 talents of gold and 800 talents of silver, and divers treasures, a rich and immense booty. (See 2 K. xviii. 13-16). . . All these things were brought to me at Nineveh, the seat of my government, Hezekiah having sent them by way of tribute, and as a token of his sub-
mission to my power." (See Rawlinson's Bemp-
ta Lectures for 1850, p. 316 f., Amer. ed.) Dean Milman also calls attention to this coincidence (History of the Jews, i. 427, Amer. ed.).

The chronological order of some of the events in Hezekiah's life is not easily adjusted. The events are related in different books (Kings, Chroni-
cles, Micah, Isaiah), and not with many notations of time. M. von Niebuhr treats of some of the questions relating to the synchronism of Hezekiah's history with that of the Babylonians and Egyp-
tians (Geschichte Assur's u. Babels, pp. 71, 76, 88, 100 f., 179). For valuable articles on Heze-
kiah, see Winer's Bibl. Real-Encyc. i. 496-499; Her-
zogg's Real-Encycl. vi. 151-157; and Zeller's Bibl. Wörterb. i. 612-615, 2te Aufl. For information on related subjects, the reader is referred to this Dictionary to Dial. ; Isaiah ; Sargon ; Sex-
achemri ; Lachish; and Micah.
HEZION [חיזון] [sight; vision]: A’gav: [Vat. A’gav]: Alex. A’gav: Hez’mion], a king of Aram (Syria) father of Fabrimen, and grandfather of Benhadad I. He and his father are mentioned only in 1 K. xv. 18, and their names are omitted by Josephus. In the absence of all information, the authority of some editors that he is identical with Rezon, the contemporary of Solomon, in 1 K. xi. 23: the two names being very similar in Hebrew, and still more so in other versions (compare Arabs, and Peshito on the latter passage); and indeed this conclusion has been adopted by some translators and commentators (Johann, Kleiner, Duthe, Ewald). Against it are (r), that the number of generations of the Syrian kings would then be one less than those of the contemporary kings of Judah. But the reign of Abij am was only three years, and in fact Jeroboam outlived both Roboam and his son. (b) The statement of Nicolaus of Damascus (Joseph. Ant. vii. 5, § 2), that from the time of David for ten generations the kings of Syria were one dynasty, each king taking the name of Judah, "as did the Polybius in Egypt." But this would exclude, not only Hezir and Fabrimen, but Rezon, unless we may interpret the last sentence to mean that the official title of Hadad was held in addition to the ordinary name of the king. [Rezon: Fabrimen.]

HEZIR [חזר] [scire]: Xogp: [Vat. Xogp]: Alex. Xogp: Hez’ir]: 1. A priest in the time of David, leader of the 17th monthly course in the service (1 Chr. xxiv. 15). 2. [Xogp]: [Vat. Alex. FA. Xogp: Hez’ir]. One of the heads of the people (heaven) who sealed the solemn covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 20). 3. [Xogp]: [Vat. Alex. FA. Xogp: Hez’ir].

HEZR’AI [חזר’ai] [Hezron, which see], according to the Keri of the Masorets, but the original reading of the text, Celah, has הזר’ai = Hezron: A’resai: [Alex. A’resai: Hearon], a native of Carmel, perhaps of the southern race. He was the first of a tribe or a clan of priests once a slave of Nehor: one of the 30 heroes of David’s guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 35). In the parallel list the name appears as —

HEZ’RO [חזרו] [see infera]: [Hespor]: Alex. A’resai: [Vat. Alex. A’resai: Comp. Espor]: Hearon], in 1 Chr. xli. 37. Kennicott, however (DISCUSSION, pp. 207, 239), decides, on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient versions, that Hezra is the original form of the name.

HEZRON’I [חזרון] [unwoning, Fürst; but well, as a garden, Ges.]: A’resai: [Alex. in Num. A’resai: Hearon]. 1. A son of Reuben (Gen. xlii. 9: Ex. vi. 14), who founded the family of the Hezronites (Num. xxvi. 6). 2. A son of Pharez, and one of the direct ancestors of David (Gen. xliii. 12; Ruth ii. 18): in LXX. A’resai (once var. lect. Grap. A’resai), and A’resai, which is followed in Matt. i. 3. [Vat. in Ruth: Aresai, in 1 Chr. ii. 9, 18, 21, 25: Eresai: i. 5, 1-14, Aresai: Vulg. Hearon, in Ruth Eresai.]

HIEL [חיאל], perhaps for HIEL [חיאל] [God lives, Ges.]: [Alex. A’hian]: [Vat. Alex. A’hian: Comp. Xhian]: Heli, a native of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho in the reign of Abah (1 K. xvi. 31); and in whom was fulfilled the curse pronounced by Joshua.

HEZRONITES, THE [חזרון] [i. e. Adarai]: [Vat. -xra]: Hezromite. A branch of the tribe of Judah, descendants of Hezron, son of Pharez (Num. xxvi. 21). [In the A. V. ed. 1611 the word is spelt Hezronites. — A.] W. A. W.

HIDDAI [הידדai] [2 slbl. [mightly chief]: Alex. A’dai: [Vat. A’dai: Abd. Ophai]: Vat. on Moses’ side, one of the thirty-seven guards of David’s guard (2 Sam. xxii. 30), described as "of the torrents of Gaash." In the parallel list of 1 Chr. (xi. 32) the name is given as Huru. Kennicott (DISCUSSION, p. 194) decides in favor of "Hamni" on grounds for which the reader must be referred to his work.

HIDDEKEL [חדרק] [sharp, swift, Dietr. in Ges. 6te Aufld.: Typos: [In Dan. (Theodol.)]: Typos E’dhekel: [Alex. E’dhekel]: Tygrias, Tigris, one of the rivers of Eden, the river which "goeth eastward to Assyria" (Gen. ii. 14), and which Daniel calls "the great river" (Dan. x. 4), seems to have been rightly identified by the LXX. with the Tigris. It is difficult to account for the initial π, unless it be for τπ, "lively," which is used of running water in Gen. xxvi. 19. Dekel (דקל) is clearly an equivalent of Diggah or Diggath, a name borne by the Tigris in all ages. The form Diggah occurs in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, in Josephus (Ant. i. 1), in the Armenian Eczues (Chron. Con. pars i. c. 2), in Zonaras (Anna. i. 2), and in the Armenian version of the nP. It is hardened to Diggah (Diggah) by Pliny (H. N. vi. 27). The name now in use among the inhabitants of Mesopotamia is Dijjah. It has generally been supposed that Diggah is a mere Semitic corruption of Tigris, and that this latter is the true name of the stream. Strabo (xi. 14, § 8, Pliny (loc. cit.) and other writers tell us that the river received its designation from its rapidity, the word Tigris (Tygrias) meaning in the Medo-Persian language "an arrow." This seems probable enough; but it must be observed that the two forms are found side by side in the Babylonian transcript of the Behistun inscription, and that the original name of the stream in the inscriptions of Assyria is Tygrias. Moreover, if we allow the Dekel of Hobebkel, to mean the Tigris, it would seem probable that this was the more ancient of the two appellations. Perhaps, therefore, it is best to suppose that there was in early Babylonian a root *dik*, equivalent in meaning, and no doubt heeded in origin, with the Aramaic *tig* or *tj*, and that from these two roots were formed independently the two names, Dikel, Dikkil, or Diggah, or Tygrias, Tigris, or Tigris. The stream was known by either name indifferently; but on the whole the Aramaic appellation predominated in ancient times, and was that most commonly used even by Semitic races. The Aramaic, however, when they conquered Mesopotamia, revived the true Semitic title, and this (Dijk’h) continues to be the name by which the river is known to the natives down to the present day. The course of the river is described under Tigris.

HIEL [חיאל], perhaps for HIEL [חיאל] [God lives, Ges.]: [Alex. A’hian]: [Vat. Alex. A’hian: Comp. Xhian]: Heli, a native of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho in the reign of Abah (1 K. xvi. 31); and in whom was fulfilled the curse pronounced by Joshua
Hierapolis (Ἱέραπόλις; sacred city). This place is mentioned only once in Scripture, and that incidentally, namely, in Col. iv. 13, where its church is associated with those of Coloss. and Laodicea. Such association is just what we should expect, for the three towns were all in the basin of the Meander, and within a few miles of one another. It is probable that Hierapolis was one of the "inustres Asiae urbes" (Tac. Ann. xiv. 27) which, with Laodicea, were simultaneously desolated by an earthquake about the time when Christianity was established in this district. There is little doubt that the church of Hierapolis was founded at the same time with that of Coloss., and that its characteristics in the apostolic period were the same. Its modern name is Pamukkale.

The most remarkable feature of the neighborhood consists of the hot calcareous springs, which have deposited the vast and singular incrustations noticed by travellers. See, for instance, Chandler, Travel in Asia Minor (1817), i. 254–272; Hamilton, Res. in Asia Minor (1842), i. 507–522.

The situation of Hierapolis is extremely beautiful; and its ruins are considerable, the theatre and gymnasium being the most conspicuous.

Arundel passed within sight of Hierapolis, which he describes as high up on the mountain side, on a terrace extending several miles (Discoveries in Asia Minor, ii. 200). Richter (Wolffarthten, p. 533 ff.) states that Hierapolis and Laodicea (mentioned together, Col. iv. 13) lie within view of each other on opposite sides of the Lyceus. For notices by still other travellers, see Pococke's Description of the East, etc., ii. pt. ii. 75; Fellow's Asia Minor, p. 283 ff.; and Schulte's Reise in das Morgenland, p. 283. The various observations are brought concisely together in Lewin's sketch (Life and Epistles of St. Paul, i. 204 ff.).

Epaphras may have founded the church at Hierapolis; and at all events, that city was one of the places where he manifested zeal for the truth accredited to him by the Apostle (Col. iv. 13).

The celebrated Stoic philosopher, Epictetus, was a native of Hierapolis, and nearly contemporary with Paul and Epaphras.

High Places (בֵית־חָצִים; in the historical books, תֵּאֵמָה, תֵּאֶמֶת; in the Prophets, בְּנֵים; in the Pentateuch, שם; Lev. xxvi. 30, &c.; and once שבאה, Ex. xvi. 16: excedit, finis). From the earliest times it was the custom among all nations to erect altars and places of worship on lofty and conspicuous spots. We find that the Trojans sacrificed to Zeus on Mount Ida (Il. x. 171), and we are repeatedly told that such was the custom of the Persians, Greeks, Germans, etc.
because they fancied that the hill-tops were nearer heaven, and therefore the most favorable places for prayer and incense (Herod. i. 131; Xen. Cyrop. viii. 7; Mom. iii. 8, § 10; Strab. xv. p. 732; Luc. de Sorceri. i. 4; Creuzer, Symô, i. 159; Winer, s. v. Bergüter). To this general custom we find con-
stant allusion in the Bible (Is. xvi. 7; Jer. iii. 6; Ez. vi. 13, xiii. 6; Hos. iv. 13), and it is espe-
cially attributed to the Moabites (Is. xx. 21; 21; 12; Jer. xliii. 35). Even Abraham lay an altar to
the Lord on a mountain near Bethel (Gen. xii. 7, 8; cf. xxii. 2-4, xxxi. 54) which shows that the
practice was then as innocent as it was natural; and although it afterwards became mingled with idol-
ators observances (Num. xxii. 3), it was in itself far less likely to be abused than the consecration
of groves (Hos. iv. 13). The external religion of the patriarchs was in some outward observances
different from that subsequently established by the Mosaic law, and therefore they should not be con-
demned for actions which afterwards became sinful
only because they were forbidden (Heidelger, Hist. Patr. ii. iii. § 53). [BAMAH.]

It is, however, quite obvious that if every grove
and eminence had been suffered to become a place
to legitimate worship, especially in a country where
they had already been defiled with the sins of
people, the whole country, instead of being dedicated,
as to the pure worship of the one true God (Haver-
nick, Einl. i. p. 502). It would infallibly have led
to the adoption of nature-goddesses, and "gods of
the hills" (1 K. xx. 23). It was therefore implica-
tly forbidden by the law of Moses (Deut. xii. 11-
14), which also gave the strictest injunction to
destroy those monuments of Cannanish idolatry
(Lev. xxvii. 30; Num. xxxi. 62; Deut. xxviii. 49,
and LXX. περίγορος), without stating any general
reason for this command, beyond the fact that they
had been connected with such associations. It
seems, however, to be assumed that every Israelite
would perfectly understand why groves and high
places were prohibited, and therefore they are only
condemned by virtue of the injunction to use but
one altar for the purposes of sacrifice (Lev. xvii. 3,
4; Deut. xii. proemii, xvi. 21; John iv. 20).

The same idea was expressed in the proem
and was not to come into force until such time as the tribes
were settled in the promised land, and "had rest
from all their enemies round about." Thus we
find that both Gideon and Manasseh built altars on
high places by Divine command (Judg. vi. 25, 26,
xiii. 16-21), and it is quite clear from the tone of
the book of Judges that the law on the subject
was either totally forgotten or practically obsolete.
Nor could the unsettled state of the country have
been pleaded as an excuse, since it seems to have
been most fully understood, even during the life of
Joshua, that burnt-offerings could be legally offered
on one altar only (Josh. xxii. 24). It is more sur-
prising to find this law absolutely ignored at a
much later period, when there was no intelligible
reason for its violation — as by Samuel at Mizpeh
(1 Sam. vii. 10) and at Bethelhem (xvi. 5); by
Saul at Gilgal (xiii. 9) and at Ajalon (2 Sam. xiv. 35)
by David (1 Chr. xxi. 26); by Elijah on Mount
Varmel (1 K. xviii. 30); and by other prophets
(1 Sam. x. 5). To suppose that in all these cases
the rule was superseded by a Divine intimation
appears to us an unwarrantable expedient, the
more so as the actors in the transactions do not
appear to be aware of anything extraordinary in
their conduct. The Rabbinists have invented elaborate
methods to account for the anomaly: thus they
say that high places were allowed until the build-
ing of the Tabernacle; that they were then illegal
until the arrival at Gilgal, and then during the
period while the Tabernacle was at Shiloh; that
they were once more permitted whilst it was at
Nob and Gilgal (cf. 2 Chr. 3. 5), until the build-
ing of the Temple at Jerusalem rendered them
finally unlawful (R. Sol. Jarchi, Abu lahian, etc.,
Horob. i. 8 f.). Others content themselves
with saying that until Solomon's time all Palestine
was considered holy ground, or that there existed
a recognized exemption in favor of high places for
private and spontaneous, though not for the stated
and public sacrifices.

Such explanations are sufficiently unsatisfactory;
but it is at any rate certain that, whether from the
obvious temptations to the disobedience, or from the
example of other nations, or from ignorance of
any definite law against it, the worship in high
places was organized and all but universal through-
out Judæa, not only during (1 K. iii. 2-4), but
even after the time of Solomon. The convenience
of them was obvious, because, as local centres of
religious worship, they obviated the unpleasant
and dangerous necessity of visiting Jerusalem for the
celebration of the yearly feasts (2 K. xxii. 9).
The tendency was ingrained in the national mind;
and although it was severely repressed by the
later historians, we have no proof that it was known
to be sinful during the earlier periods of the mon-
archy, except of course where it was directly con-
ected with idolatrious abominations (1 K. xi. 7;
2 K. xxiii. 13). In fact the high places seem to
have supplied the need of synagogues (Ps. lxxiv. 8),
and to have obviated the extreme self-denial in-
volved in having but one legalized locality for the
highest forms of worship. Thus we find that
Jehoshua established a definite worship at the
high places, with its own peculiar and separated
priesthood (2 Chr. xi. 12; 2 K. xxii. 9), the mem-
bers of which were still considered to be priests of
Jehovah (although in 2 K. xxiii. 5 they are called
by the opprobrious term הבכש). It was there-
fore no wonder that Jehoshua found it so easy to
seduce the people into his symbolic worship at the
high places of Dan and Bethel, at each of which he
built a chapel for his golden calves. Such chapes
were of course frequently added to the mere altars
on the hills, as appears from the expressions in 1 K.
xi. 7; 2 K. xii. 9, &c. Indeed, the word הבכש
became so common that it was used for any idol-
atrious shrine even in a valley (Jer. vii. 31), or
in the streets of cities (2 K. xii. 9; Ez. xxxi. 31).
These chapels were probably not structures of stone,
but more tabernacles hung with colored tapestry
(Ez. xvi. 16; יבכשאש, Apoc. Thud.; Jer. ad
loc. i. 6; אבכשאש, בדשאש, 1 IX.), like the אוֹן כֹּלָא of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. xx. 65; Creuzer,
Symô, v. 176, quoted by Ges. Thes. i. 188), and
like those mentioned in 2 K. xiiii. 7; Am. v. 26.

Many of the pious kings of Judah were either
too weak or too ill informed to repress the worship
of Jehovah at these local sanctuaries, while they of
course endeavored to prevent it from being contami-
nated with polytheism. It is therefore appended
as a matter of blame or a (perhaps venial) drawback
to the character of some of the most pious princes,
that they tolerated this disobedience to the provi-
HIGH-PRIEST

ON OF DEUTERONOMY AND LEVITICS. ON THE OTHER HAND IT IS MENTIONED AS AN AGGRAVATION OF THE SIN-FULNESS OF OTHER KINGS THAT THEY BUILT OR RAISED HIGH PLACES (2 CHRON. XXII. 11, XXVIII. 25), WHICH ARE GENERALLY SAID TO HAVE BEEN DEDICATED TO IDOLATROUS PURPOSES. IT IS AS IF THERE WERE AN ALMOST INCONSCIOUS BELIEF THAT A VIOLATION OF THE THEOCRATIC PRINCIPLE AS THE PERMITTED EXISTENCE OF FALSE WORSHIP SHOULD HAVE BEEN TOLERATED BY KINGS OF EVEN ORDINARY PIETY, MUCH LESS BY THE HIGHEST SACERDOTAL AUTHORITIES (2 K. XII. 3). WHEN THEREFORE WE FIND THE RECOGNIZING PHRASE, "ONLY THE HIGH PLACES WERE NOT TAKEN AWAY; AS YET THE PEOPLE DID SACRIFICE AND BURN INCENSE ON THE HIGH PLACES" (2 K. XIV. 4, XV. 4, 85; 2 CHRON. XV. 7), WE ARE FORCED TO LIMIT IT (AS ABOVE) TO PLACES DEDICATED TO JEHOWAH ONLY. THE SUBJECT, HOWEVER, IS MADE MORE DIFFICULT BY A DOUBLE DISCREPANCY, FOR THE ASSERTION, THAT ASA "TOOK AWAY THE HIGH PLACES" (2 CHRON. XIV. 3), IS OPPOSED TO WHAT IS STATED IN THE FIRST BOOK OF KINGS (XV. 14), AND A SIMILAR DISCREPANCY IS FOUND IN THE CASE OF JEHOSHAPHAT (2 CHRON. XVII. 6, XX. 33). MOREOVER IN BOTH INSTANCES THE CHRONICLER IS APPARENTLY AT ISSUE WITH, "AND YET" (2 CHRON. XVII. 17, XX. 33). IT IS INCREDIBLE THAT THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN THE RESULT OF CARELESSNESS OR OVERSIGHT, AND WE MUST THEREFORE SUPPOSE, EITHER THAT THE EARLIER NOTICES EXPRESSED THE WILL AND ENDORSEMENT OF THESE MONARCHS TO REMOVE THE HIGH PLACES, AND THAT THE LATER ONES RECORDED THEIR FAILURE IN THE ATTEMPT (I. W. VAL., GEEGH. III. 408). KELL, APOL. VERS. P. 230; WINTER, S. RR. ASSA. JEWJ. HIST.; OR THAT THE STATEMENTS REFER RESPECTIVELY TO BAMOTH, DEDICATED TO JEHOWAH AND TO IDOLS (MICHAELIS, SCHULZ, BERTHOM ON 2 CHRON. XVII. 6, 6, ETC.). "THOSE DEVOTED TO FALSE GODS WERE REMOVED, THOSE MISLED TO THE TRUE GOD WERE LEFT TO REMAIN. THE KINGS OPPOSED IMPiETY, BUT WINKED AT ERROR" (BISHOP HALL).

AT LAST HEZEKIAH SET HIMSELF IN GOOD EARNEST TO THE SUPPRESSION OF THIS PREVALENT CORRUPTION (2 K. XXVIII. 4, 22), BOTH IN JUDAH AND ISRAEL (2 CHRON. XXXI. 1), ALTHOUGH, SO RAPID WAS THE GROWTH OF THE EVIL, THAT EVEN HIS SPEECH REFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FINALLY CONSUMMATED BY JOSIAH (2 CHRON. XXXII.), AND THAT TOO IN THE JERUSALEM AND ITS IMPEDE NEIGHBOURHOOD (2 CHRON. XXXIV. 3). THE MEASURE MUST HAVE CAUSED A VERY VIOLENT SHOCK TO THE RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES OF A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE, AND WE HAVE A CURIOUS AND ALMOST UNNOTICED TRACE OF THIS RESENTMENT IN THE FACT THAT RABSHAKH APPEARS TO THE DISCONTENTED FACTION, AND REPRESENTS HEZEKIAH AS A DANGEROUS INNOVATOR WHO HAD PROVOKED GOD'S ANGER BY HIS ARBITRARY IMPiETY (2 K. XXVIII. 22; 2 CHRON. XXXII. 12). AFTER THE TIME OF JOSIAH WE FIND NO FURTHER MENTION OF THESE JEHOSCHAH HIGH PLACES.

F. W. F.


In treating of the office of high-priest among the Israelites it will be convenient to consider it—

1. LEGALLY. 2. THEOCRATICALLY. 3. HISTORICALLY.

The legal view of the high-priest's office comprises all that the law of Moses ordained respecting it. The first distinct separation of Aaron to the office of the priesthood, which previously belonged to the firstborn, was that recorded Ex. xxviii. A partial anticipation of this call occurred at the gathering of the seventy (ch. xvi.), when Moses bid Aaron take a pot of manna, and lay it up before the Lord: which implied that the ark of the testimony would thenceforth lie under Aaron's charge, though it was not at that time in existence. The taking up of Nadab and Abihu with their father Aaron to the Mount, where they beheld the glory of the God of Israel, seems also to have been intended as a preparatory intimation of Aaron's hereditary priesthood. See also xxviii. 21. But it was not till the completion of the directions for making the tabernacle and its furniture that the distinct order was given to Moses, "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons" (Ex. xxviii. 1). And after the order for the priestly garments to be made "for Aaron and his sons," it is added, "and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons, and "I will sanctify both Aaron and his sons to minister to me in the priest's office," xxxix. 9, 14.

We find from the very first the following characteristic attributes of Aaron and the high-priests his successors, as distinguished from the other priests.

(1.) Aaron alone was anointed. "He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him" (Lev. viii. 12); whence one of the distinctive epithets of the high-priest was מִבְּיָהוּ מִבְּיָהוּ מִבְּיָהוּ, "the anointed priest" (Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16, xxi. 10; see Num. xxv. 22). This also appears from Ex. xxix. 29, 30, where it is ordered that the one of the sons of Aaron who succeeds him in the priest's office shall wear the holy garments that were Aaron's for seven days, to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them. Hence Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. vi. 6; Dion. Euseb. viii.) understands the Anointed (A. V. "Messiah," or, as the LXX. read, υἱὸς Μωυσέου) in Dan. ix. 26, the anointing of the Jewish high-priests: "IT MEANeth nothing else than the succession of high-priests, whom the Scripture commonly calls υἱὸς Μωυσέου, anointed," and so too Tertullian and Theodoret (Rosenn. ad 1. c.). The anointing of the sons of Aaron: i.e., the common priests, seems to have been confined to sprinkling their garments with the anointing oil (Ex. xxix. 21, xxviii. 41, &c.), though according to Kalisch on Ex. xxix. 8, and Lightfoot, following the Rabbinical interpretation, the difference consists in the abundant pouring of oil (בָּיָהוּ) on the head of the high-priest, from whence it was drawn with the finger into two streams, in the
shape of a Grecian X, while the priests were merely marked with the finger dipped in oil on the forehead (πεταλις). But this is probably a late invention of the Rabbins. The anointing of the high-priest is alluded to in Ps. cxxxiii. 2: "It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments." The composition of this anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, cassia, and olive oil, is prescribed Ex. xxv. 22-25, and its use for any other purpose but that of anointing the priests, the tabernacle, and the vessels, was strictly prohibited on pain of being "cut off from his people." The manufacture of it was intrusted to certain priests, called apothecaries (Neh. iii. 8). But this oil is said to have been wanting under the second Temple (Yrideux, i. 131; Selden, cap. ix.).

(2.) The high-priest had a peculiar dress, which we have seen passed to his successor at his death. This dress consisted of eight parts, as the Rabbins constantly note, the breastplate, the ephod with its curious girdle, the robe of the ephod, the miter, the headdress coat or diapher tunic, and the girdle, the materials being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine (white) linen (Ex. xxviii. 3). To the above are added, in ver. 42, the breeches or drawers (Lev. xvi. 4) of linen; and to make up the number 8, some reckon the high-priest's miter, or the plate separately from the benem; while others reckon the curious girdle of the ephod separately from the ephod. Of these 8 articles of attire, 4, namely, the coat or tunic, the girdle, the breeches, and the benem or

a In Lev. viii. 12 there is a complete account of the putting on of these garments by Aaron, and the whole ceremony of his consecration and that of his sons. It there appears distinctly that, besides the girdle common to all the priests, the high-priest also wore the curious girdle of the ephod.

b Josephus, however, whom Rühr follows, calls the

turban, ἠρωμένον, instead of the mitre, Ἀριστήρ, belonged to the common priests.

It is well known how, in the Assyrian sculpture, the king is in like manner distinguished by the shape of his head-dress; and how in Persia none but the king wore the cidaris or erect tiara. Taking the articles of the high-priest's dress in the order in which they are enumerated above, we have (c) the breastplate, or, as it is further named (Ex. xxviii. 19, 29, 30), the breastplate of judgment, λαγγείον τῶν κρίσεων (or τίς κρίσεως) in the LXX., and only in ver. 4, περιτήμων. It was, like the inner curtains of the tabernacle, the veil, and the ephod, of "cunning work," ἐξ ἀρμόσεως, "opus plattarum," and "arte plattaria," Vulg. [See Emendation.]

The breastplate was originally 8 spans long, and 1 span broad, but when doubled it was square, the shape in which it was worn. It was fastened at the top by rings and chains of wreathen gold to the two cupyx stones on the shoulders, and beneath with two other rings and a lace of blue to two corresponding rings in the ephod, to keep it fixed in its place, above the curious girdle. But the most remarkable and most important parts of this breastplate, were the 12 precious stones, set in 4 rows, 3 in a row, thus corresponding to the 12 tribes, and divided in the same manner as their camps were; each stone having the name of one of the children of Israel engraved upon it. Whether the order followed the ages of the sons of Israel, or, as seems most probable, the order of the encampment, may be doubted; but unless any appropriate distinct symbolism of the different tribes be found in the names of the precious stones, the question can scarcely be decided. According to the LXX. and Josephus, and in accordance with the language of Scripture, it was these stones which constituted the Urim and Thummim, nor does the notion advanced by Gesenius after Spencer and others, that these names designated two little images placed between the folds of the breastplate, seem to rest on any sufficient ground, in spite of the Egyptian analogy of brought to bear upon it. Josephus's opinion, on the other hand, improved upon the Rabbins, as to the manner in which the stones gave out the oracular answer, by preternatural illumination, appears equally destitute of probability. It seems to be far simplest and most in agreement with the different accounts of inquiries made by Urim and Thummim (1 Sam. iv. 3, 18, xxi. 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, xviii. 6; Judg. xx. 28; 2 Sam. v. 23, &c.), to suppose that the answer was given simply by the Word of the Lord to the high-priest (comp. John xi. 51), when he had inquired of the Lord clothed with the ephod and breastplate. Such a view agrees with the true notion of the breastplate, of which it was not the leading characteristic to be oracular (as the term λαγγείον supposes, and as is by many thought to be intimated by the descriptive addition "of judgment," i. e., as they

bunners of the priests by the name of ἀριστήρ. See below.

c Rühl compares also the spices of the flamen Dialis.

For an account of the image of Thmeni worn by the Egyptian judge and priest, see Kalsch's note of Ex. xxviii.: Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses; Wilkinson's Egyptians, ii. 27, &c.
will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones, ver. 11, 12; comp. also ver. 14 and 17 (Heb.). It is obvious to add how entirely this view accords with the blessing of Levi in Dent. xxxiii. 8, where Levi is called God's holy one, and God's Thummim and Urim are said to be given to him, because he came out of the trial so clear in his integrity. (See also Bar. v. 2.)

(b.) The Ephod (אֵפַּדָּה). This consisted of two parts, of which one covered the back, and the other the front, i.e., the breast and upper part of the body, like the έμάκρυς of the Greeks (see Dict. of Antiquities, art. Tunic, p. 1172). These were clasped together on the shoulder with two large onyx stones, each having engraved on it 6 of the names of the tribes of Israel. It was further united by a "curious girdle" of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen round the waist. Upon it was placed the breastplate of judgment, which in fact was a part of the ephod, and included in the term in such passages as 1 Sam. ii. 28, xv. 3, xxiii. 9, and was fastened to it just above the curious girdle of the ephod. Linen ephods were also worn by other priests (1 Sam. xxii. 18), by Samuel, who was the first Levite (1 Sam. ii. 18), and by David when bringing up the ark (2 Sam. vi. 14). The expression for wearing an ephod is "girded with a linen ephod." The ephod was also frequently used in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites. See Judg. viii. 27, xviii. 5, &c. (Ephod; Girdle.)

(c.) The Robe of the ephod (אֵפַּדָּה). This was of inferior material to the ephod itself, being all of blue (Ex. xxviii. 31), which implied its being only of "woven work" (אֵפַּדָּה וְאֶפֶלֵדָה, xxxix. 22). It was worn immediately under the ephod, and was longer than it, though not so long as the brodered coat or tunic (אֵפַּדָּה וְאֶפֶלֵדָה), according to some statements (Bähr, Winer, Kalisch, &c.).

The Greek rendering, however, of אֵפַּדָּה וְאֶפֶלֵדָה, ἀνείφης, and Josephus's description of it (B. J. v. 5, § 7) seem to outweigh the reasons given by Bähr for thinking the robe only came down to the knees, and to make it improbable that the tunic should have been seen below the robe. It seems likely therefore that the sleeves of the tunic, of white diaper linen, were the only parts of it which were visible, in the case of the high-priest, when he wore the blue robe over it. For the blue robe had no sleeves, but only sids in the sides for the arms to come through. It had a hole for the head to pass through, with a border round it of woven work, to prevent its being rent. The skirt of this robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high-priest went in and came out of the Holy Place. Josephus in the Antiquities gives no explanation of the use of the bells, but merely speaks of the studied beauty of their appearance. In his Jewish War, however, he tells us that the bells signified thunder, and the pomegranates lightning. For Philo's very curious observations see Lightfoot's Works, i. p. 27.

Neither does the son of Sirach very distinctly explain it (Eccles. xlvi), who in his description of
the high-priest’s attire seems chiefly impressed with its beauty and magnificence, and says of this trimming, “He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might he heard in the temple, for a memorial to the children of his people.” Perhaps, however, he means to intimate that the use of the bells was to give notice to the people outside, when the high-priest went in and came out of the sanctuary, as Whiston, Vatahlius, and many others have supposed.

(4.) The fourth article peculiar to the high-priest is the mitre or upper turban, with its gold plate, engraved with HOLINESS TO THE LORD, fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. Josephus applies the term Λευκώσας (μακροευθυγόνως) to the turbans of the common priests as well, but says that in addition to this, and sewn on to the top of it, the high-priest had another turban of blue: that beside this he had outside the turban a triple crown of gold, consisting, that is, of 3 rings one above the other, and termed a pteron, or top in a kind of conical calyx, like the inverted calyx of the herb hyssopus. Josephus doubtless gives a true account of the high-priest’s turban as worn in his day. It may be fairly conjectured that the crown was appended when the Asmonaean united the temporal monarchy with the priesthood, and that this was continued, though in a modified shape,2 after the sovereignty was taken from them. Josephus also describes the πέταλος, the hvosima or gold plate, which he says covered the forehead of the high-priest. In Ant. vii. 3, § 8, he says that the identical gold plate made in the days of Moses existed in his time; and Whiston adds in a note that it was still preserved in the time of Origen, and that the inscription on it was engraved in Samaritan characters (Ant. iii. 3, § 6). It is certain that R. Eliezer, who flourished in Hasidim’s reign, saw it at Rome. It was double- tioned, with other spoils of the Temple, in the Temple of Peace, which was burnt down in the reign of Commodus. These spoils, however, are expressly mentioned as part of Abiezer’s plunder when he took Rome. They were carried by Genseric into Africa, and brought by Felixarius to Byzantium, where they adorned his triumph. On the warning of a Jew the emperor ordered them back to Jerusalem, but what became of them is not known (Rabbin. de Sylilis Temp.);

(c.) The brodered coat, Βαλινσίδαι Κοραλικά, was a tunic or long shirt of linen with a tessellated or diaper pattern, like the setting of a stone. The girdle, Στεργόσα, also of linen, was wound round the body several times from the breast downwards, and the ends hung down to the ankles. The breeches or drawers, Στεργόσα, of linen, covered the loins and thighs: and the bonnet or Στεργόσα was a turban of linen, partially covering the head, but not in the form of a cone like that of the high-priest when the mitre was added to it. These four last were common to all priests; Josephus speaks of the robes (ούρλοισις) of the chief priests, and the tunics and girdles of the priests, as forming part of the spoil of the Temple, (R. J. vi. 8, § 3).

and at his death Eleazar (Num. xx. 26, 28), and their successors in the high-priesthood, were solemnly inaugurated into their office by being clad in these eight articles of dress on seven successive days. From the time of the second Temple, when the sacred oil (said to have been hid by Josiah, and lost) was wanted, this putting on of the garments was deemed the official investiture of the office. Hence the robes, which had to be kept in one of the chambers of the Temple, and were by Hyrcanus deposited in the Baris, which he built on purpose, were kept by Herod in the same tower, which he called Antonia, so that they might be at his absolute disposal. The Romans did the same till the government of Vitellius in the reign of Tiberius, when the custody of the robes was restored to the Jews. (Ant. xx. 11, § 4; xviii. 4, § 2).

(5.) Aaron had peculiar functions. To him alone it appertained, and he alone was permitted, to enter the Holy of Holies, where he stood once a year, on the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and burnt incense within the veil (Lev. xvi.). He is said by the Talmudists, with whom agree Lightfoot, Selden, Grotonis, Winer, Ithier, and many others, not to have worn his full pontifical roles on this occasion, but to have been clad entirely in white linen (Lev. xvi. 4, 32). It is singular, however, that on the other hand Josephus says that the great fast day was the chief, if not the only day in the year, when the high-priest wore all his robes (R. J. v. 5, § 7), and in spite of the alleged impropriety of his wearing his splendid apparel on a day of humiliation, it seems far more probable that on the one occasion when he performed functions peculiar to the high-priest, he should have worn his full dress. Josephus too could not have been mistaken as to the fact, which he repeats (cont. Ap. lib. ii. § 7), where he says the high-priests alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, “proprīa stoli circumambicilti.” For although Selden, who strenuously supports the rabbinical statement that the high-priest only wore the 4 linen garments when he entered the Holy of Holies, endeavors to prove that this was one and the same thing, it is not possible to twist his words into this meaning. It is true on the other hand, that Lev. xvi. distinctly prescribes that Aaron should wear the 4 priestly garments of linen when he entered into the Holy of Holies, and put them off immediately he came out, and leave them in the Temple: no one being present in the Temple while Aaron made the atonement (ver. 17). Either therefore in the time of Josephus this law was not kept in practice, or else we must reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that in consequence of the great jealousy with which the high-priest’s roles were kept by the civil power at this time, the custom had arisen for him to wear them, not even always on the 3 great festivals (Ant. xviii. 4, § 3), but only on the great day of expiation. If in this gorgeous attire he would enter the Temple in presence of all the people, and after having performed in secret, as the law requires, the rites of expiation in the linen dress, he would resume his pontifical roles and so appear again in public. Thus his wearing the roles would easily come to be identified chiefly with the day of atonement; and this is perhaps the most probable ex-

1 Josephus (i. J. xx. 10) says that Pompey would not allow him to wear the diadem, when he restored him to the high-priesthood.

2 Selden himself remarks (cap. viii. in fin.) that Josephus and others always describe the pontificial roles by the name of Τοίαν ὑφαίνεσθαι.
There is a controversy as to whether the deputy high-priest was the same as the sagan. Lightfoot thinks not.
set, both from the Jewish and Christian point of view. [See end of the article.]

III. T: pass to the historical view of the subject.

The history of the high-priests embraces a period of about 1470 years, according to the opinion of the present writer, and a succession of about 80 high-priests, beginning with Aaron, and ending with Phinehas. The number of all the high-priests (says Josephus, Ant. xx. 110) from Aaron . . . until Phinehas . . . was 83," where he gives a comprehensive account of them. They naturally arrange themselves into three groups: (a) those before David; (b) those from David to the Captivity; (c) those from the return from the Babylonian Captivity till the cessation of the office at the destruction of Jerusalem. The two former have come down to us in the canonical books of Scripture, and so have a few of the earliest and the latest of the latter; but for by far the larger portion of the latter group we have only the authority of Josephus, the Talmud, and some other profane writers.

(a.) The high-priests of the first group who are distinctively made known to us, such as: (1) Aaron; (2) Eleazar; (3) Phinehas; (4) Eli; (5) Abiathub (1 Chr. ix. 11; Neh. xi. 11; 1 Sam. xiv. 3); (6) Abiathar (1 Sam. v. 21; vi. 3; xi. 14, 18; xv. 24, 25; 2 Sam. v. 23, 24; Ps. lxxviii. 60). This strong influence and interference of the secular power is manifest throughout the subsequent history. This first period was also marked by the calamity which Hell Pel the high-priests as the guardians of the ark, in its capture by the Philistines. This probably suspended all inquiries by Urim and Thummim, which were made before the ark (1 Chr. xiii. 3; comp. Judg. xx. 27; 1 Sam. vii. 2; xiv. 18), and must have greatly diminished the influence of the high-priests, on whom the largest share of the humiliation of the name involved would naturally fall. The rise of Samuel as a prophet at this very time, and his paramount influence and importance in the state, to the entire eclipsing of Abiah the priest, coincides remarkably with the absence of the ark, and the means of inquiring by Urim and Thummim.

(b.) Passing to the second group, we begin with the unexplained circumstance of there being two high-priests in the reign of David, apparently of nearly equal authority, namely, Zadok and Abiaheath (1 Chr. xv. 11; 2 Sam. viii. 17). Indeed, it is only from the deposition of Abiaheath, and the placing of Zadok in his room, by Solomon (1 K. ii. 32), that we learn certainly that Abiaheath was the high-priest, and Zadok the second. Zadok was son of Abiathub, of the line of Eleazar (1 Chr. vi. 8), and the first mention of him is in 1 Chr. vii. 28, as "the Levite" who joined David in Hebron after Saul's death, with 22 captains of his father's house. It is therefore not unlikely that after the death of Abiaheath and the succession of Abiaheath to David, Saul may have made Zadok priest, as far as it was possible for him to do so in the absence of the ark and the high-priest's robes, and that David may have avoided the difficulty of deciding between the claims of his faithful friend Abiaheath, and his new and important ally Zadok (who perhaps was the means of attaching to David's cause the 4000 Levites and the 3700 priests who came under Jehoiada their captain, vv. 26, 27), by appointing them to a joint priesthood: the first place, with the Ephod, and Urim and Thummim, commingled with Abiaheath, who was in actual possession of them. A certain it is that from this time Zadok and Abiathur are constantly named together, and singularly Zadok always first, both in the book of Samuel and that of Kings. We can, however, trace very clearly up to a certain point the division of the priestly offices and dignities between them, coinciding, as it did, with the divided state of the Levitical worship in David's time. For we learn from 1 Chr. vi. 1-7, 37, compared with 29, 46 and yet more distinctly from 2 Chr. i. 3, 4, 5, that the tabernacle and the brazen altar made by Moses
and B.C. deked in the wilderness were at this time at Gib- ene, where the ark was at Jerusalem, in the separate manner (as K. vii. 4. 11. and David [2 Sam. xvi. 14; x. 94]. Now Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were left "before the tabernacle at Gibeon" to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord (1 Chr. xvi. 39, 40). It is therefore obvious to conclude that Abiathar had special charge of the ark and the services connected with it, which agrees exactly with the possession of the ark by Abiathar, and his previous position with David before the priesthood of Isaiiah; as well as with what we are told 1 Chr. xxvii. 34, that Jehoiada and Abiathar were the king's counsellors next to Ahitophel. Residence at Jerusalem with the ark, and the privilege of inquiring of the Lord before the ark, both well suit his office of counselor. Abiathar, however, forfeited his place by taking part with Adonijah against Solomon, and Zadok was made high-priest in his place. The priesthood was thus again consolidated and transferred permanently from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar. This is the only instance recorded of the deposition of a high-priest (which became common in later times, especially under Herod and the Romans) during this second period. It was the fulfillment of the prophetical depositions of the sin of Elie's sons (1 Sam. ii. 11.).

The first considerable difficulty that meets in the historical survey of the high-priests of the second group is to ascertain who was high-priest at the dedication of Solomon's Temple - Josephus (Ant. x. 8, § 6) asserts that Zadok was, and that Shemaiah makes him the high-priest in the reign of Solomon. But first it is very improbable that Zadok, who must have been very old at Solomon's accession (being David's contemporary), should have lived to the 11th year of his reign; and next, 1 K. iv. 2 distinctly asserts that Azariah the son of Zadok was priest under Solomon, and 1 Chr. vi. 10 tells us of Azariah, "he it is that executed the priest's office in the Temple that Solomon built in Jerusalem," obviously meaning at its first completion. We can hardly therefore be wrong in saying that Azariah the son of Ahimeaz was the first high-priest of Solomon's Temple. The nonmention of him in the account of the dedication of the Temple, even where one would most have expected it (1 K. vi. 18, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12; 2 Chr. v. 7, 11, x. 16), and the prominence given to Solomon - the civil power - are certainly remarkable. Compare also 2 Chr. viii. 14, 15. The probable inference is that Azariah had no great personal qualities or energy. In constructing the list of the succession of priests of this group, our method must be to compare the genealogical list in 1 Chr. vi. 8-15 (A. V.) with the notices of high-priests in the sacred history, and with the list given by Josephus, who, it must be remembered, had access to the lists preserved in the archives at Jerusalem: testing the whole by the application of the ordinary rules of genealogical succession. Now as regards the genealogy, it is seen at once that there is something defective; for whereas from David to Jeconiah there are 20 kings, from Zadok to Jehozadak there are but 13 priests. Moreover the passage in ques-

* Its transfer by David was not immediate, for the ark, after its capture by the Philistines at the time of Eli's death, was kept at several other places before its ultimate removal to Jerusalem. [SULLO: TABELLA].
from the dynasty of David and from the worship at Jerusalem, and the setting up of a theocratic priesthood at Dan and Beer-sheba (1 K. xii. 31; 2 Chr. xiii. 9, xii.). (4.) The overthrow of the hyphen, the dynasty of Ahaz, by Jehoada, the high-priest, whose near relationship to king Josiah, added to his zeal against the idolatries of the house of Ahaz, stimulated him to head the revolution with the force of priests and Levites at his command. (5.) The boldness and success with which the high-priest Azariah withstood the encroachments of the king Uzziah upon the office and functions of the priesthood. (6.) The disregard of the temple by the high-priest, in the reign of Josiah, the restoration of the temple services by Azariah in the reign of Hezekiah, and the discovery of the book of the law, and the religious reformation by Hilkiah in the reign of Josiah. [Hilkiah.] (7.) In all these great religious movements, however, excepting the one headed by Jehoada, it is remarkable how the civil power took the lead. It was David who arranged all the temple service. Solomon who directed the building and dedication of the temple, the high-priest being not so much as named; Jehoshaphat who sent the priests about to teach the people, and assigned to the high-priest Amariah his share in the work; Hezekiah who headed the reformation, and urged on Azariah and the priests and Levites; Josiah who encouraged the priests in the service of the house of the Lord. On the other hand we read of no opposition to the idolatries of Manasseh by the high-priest, and we know how shamefully subservient Uriah the high-priest was to king Ahaz, actually building an altar according to the pattern of one at Danannas, to displace the brazen altar, and joining the king in his profane worship before it (2 K. xvi. 10-16). The preponderance of the civil over the ecclesiastical power, as an historical fact, in the kingdom of Judah, although kept within bounds by the hereditary succession of the high-priests, seems to be proved from these circumstances.

The priests of this series ended with Seraiah, who was taken prisoner by Nebuzar-adan, and slain at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar, together with Zephaniah the second priest or scribe, after the burning of the temple and the plunder of all the sacred vessels (2 K. xxv. 18). His son Jehozachak or Josebach was at the same time carried captive (1 Chr. vi. 15).

The time occupied by these (say) eighteen high-priests who ministered at Jerusalem, was about 454 years, which gives an average of something more than twenty-five years to each high-priest. It is remarkable that not a single instance is recorded after the time of David of an inquiry by Uri and Thummim as a means of inquiring of the Lord. The ministry of the prophets seems to have superseded that of the high-priests (see c. g. 2 Chr. xv., xviii., xx. 14, 15; 2 K. xix. 1, 2, xxii. 12-14; Jer. xxxi. 2). Some think that Uri and Thummim ceased with the theocracy; others with the division of Israel into two kingdoms. Nebuchadnezzar seems to have expected the restoration of it (Neh. vii. 65), and so perhaps did Judas Maccabeus, 1 Macc. iv. 46; comp. xiv. 41, while Josephus affirms that it had been possessed of the Jews from the last year before the destruction, namely, by John Hyrcanus (Whiston, Note on Ant. iii. 8, and Prud. Connect. i. 130, 151). It seems therefore scarcely true to reckon Uri and Thummim as one of the marks of God's presence with Solomon's Temple, which was wanting to the second Temple (Prid. i. 138, 144 ff.); this early cessation of answers by Uri and Thummim, therefore, and the high-priests of the time the bringing of the last stock enclosed in force during so many centuries, seems to confirm the notion that such answers were not the fundamental, but only the necessary uses of the breastplate of judgment.

(c) An interval of about fifty two years elapsed between the high-priests of the second and third group, during which there was neither temple, nor altar, nor ark, nor priest. Jehozachak, or Josebach, as it is written in Haggai (1 K. iv. 14, xvi.), who should have succeeded Seraiah, lived and died a captive at Babylon. The pontifical office revived in his son Jeshua, of whom such frequent mention is made in Ezra and Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah, 1 Esdr. and Eccles.; and he therefore stands at the head of this third and last series, honorably distinguished for his zealous co-operation with Zerubbabel in rebuilding the temple; and restoring the disestablished commonwealth of Israel. His successors, as far as the O. T. guides us, were Jeshakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan (or Jonathan), and Jaddua. Of these we find Eliashib hindering rather than seconding the zeal of the devout Tishthatha Nehemiah for the observance of God's law in Israel (Neh. xiii. 4, 7); and Johanan, Josephus tells us, murdered his own brother Jesus or Jeshua in the Temple, which led to its further profanation by Bagoes, the general of Artaxerxes Mætanes' army. Jeshua was high-priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Concerning him Josephus relates the story that he went out to meet Alexander at Sapha (probably the ancient Mizpeh) at the head of a procession of priests; and that when Alexander saw the multitude clothed in white, and the priests in their linen garments, and the high-priest in blue and gold, with the mitre on his head, and the gold plate, on which was the name of God, he stepped forward alone and adored the Name, and hastened to enhance the high-priest (Ant. xii. 8, § 5). Josephus adds among other things that the king entered Jerusalem with the high-priest, and went up to the Temple to worship and offer sacrifice; that he was shown the prophecies of Daniel concerning himself, and at the high-priest's intercession granted the Jews liberty to live according to their own laws, and freedom for fifty years. The story, however, has not obtained credit. It was the brother of this Jeshua, Manasseh, who, according to the same authority, was at the request of Sandalkat made the first high-priest of the Samaritan temple by Alexander the Great.

Jeshua was succeeded by Onias I., his son, and he again by Simon the Just, the last of the men of the great synagogue, as the Jews whom is usually ascribed the completion of the Canon of the O. T. (Prideaux, Conn. i. 545). Of him Jesus, the son of Sirach, speaks in terms of most glowing eulogy in Eccles. i., and ascribing to him the repair and fortification of the Temple, with other works. The passage (1-21) contains an interesting account of the ministries of the high-priest. Upon Simon's death, his son and successor under same Eleazar, Simon's brother, succeeded him. The high-priesthood of Eleazar is memorable as being that under which the LXX. version of the Scriptures was made at Alexandria for Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to the account of Josephus taken from Aristea (Ant. xii. 2). This translation
HIGH-PRIEST

At the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, valuable as it was with reference to the wider interests of religion, and marked as was the Providence which gave it to the world at this time as a preparation for the approaching advent of Christ, yet viewed in its relation to Judaism and the high-priesthood, was a sign, and perhaps a helping cause of their decay. It marked a growing tendency to Hellenize, utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Mosaic economy. Accordingly in the high-priesthood of Eleazar's rival nephews, Jesus and Onias, we find their very names changed into the Greek ones of Jason and Menelaus, and with the introduction of this new feature of rival high-priests we find one of them, Menelaus, strengthening himself and seeking support from the Syro-Greek kings against the Jewish party, by offering to forsake their national laws and customs, and to adopt those of the Greeks. The building of a gymnasium at Jerusalem for the use of these apostate Jews, and their endeavor to conceal their circumcision when stripped for the games (1 Macc. i. 14, 15; 2 Macc. iv. 12-13; Jos. Ant. xii. 5, § 1), show the length to which this spirit was carried. The acceptance of the spurious priesthood of the temple of Onias from Ptolemy Philometor by Onias (the son of Onias the high-priest), who would have been the legitimate high-priest on the death of Menelaus, his uncle, is another striking indication of the same degeneracy. By this flight of Onias into Egypt the succession of high-priests in the family of Jozadak ceased; for although the Syro-Greek kings had introduced much uncertainty into the succession, by depositing at their will obnoxious persons, and appointing whom they pleased, yet the dignity had never gone out of the one family, Alexinus, whose Hebrew name was Jaxim (1 Chr. xxiv. 12), or perhaps Jacbin (1 Chr. ix. 10, xxiv. 17), or, according to Rufinus (ap. Selden), Joachim, and who was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator on Menelaus being put to death by him, was the first who was of a different family. One, says Josephus, that "was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of this family" of Jozadak.

What, however, for a time saved the Jewish institutions from the new life and consistency into the priesthood and the national religion, and enabled them to fulfill their destined course till the advent of Christ, was the cruel and impolitic persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. This thoroughly aroused the piety and national spirit of the Jews, and drew together in defense of their temple and country all who feared God and were attached to their national institutions. The result was that after the high-priesthood had been brought to the lowest degradation by the apostasy and crimes of the last Onias or Menelaus, and after a vacancy of seven years had followed the brief pontificate of Alexinus, his no less infamous successor, a new and glorious succession of high-priests arose in the Asmonean family, which united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot, Selden, and others, calls Judas, the first of this series, "the high-priest of Judah" (Ant. xii. 10, § 6; but, according to the far better authority of 1 Macc. x. 20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabaeus that Alexi- 

HAGRIPPA FOR THE PART HE TOOK IN CAUSING "JAMES THE BROTHER OF JESUS WHO WAS CALLED CHRIST" TO BE CRIMED (ACTS XX. 9, § 1).
and instructed him how to act on the occasion. This shock-}

This shocking impetu, which to them was a subject of most poignant and awful grief, drew tears from the other priests, who beheld from a distance their law turned into ridicule, and groaned over the subversion of the sacred honors" (B. J. iv. 3 § 8).

Thus ignominiously ended the series of high-priests which had stretched in a scarcely broken line, through nearly fourteen, or, according to the common chronology, sixteen centuries. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman empires, which the Jewish high-priests had seen in turn overshadowing the world, had each, except the last, one by one withered away and died—and now the last successor of Aaron was stripped of his sacerdotal robes, and the temple which he served laid level with the ground to rise no more. But this did not happen till the true High-priest and King of Israel, the minister of the sanctuary and of the true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, had offered His one sacrifice, once for all, and had taken His place at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, bearing on His breast the judgment of His redeemed people, and continuing a Priest forever, in the Sanctuary which shall never be taken down!

The subjoined table shows the succession of high-priests, as far as it can be ascertained, and of the contemporary civil rulers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIL RULES</th>
<th>HIGH-PRIESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Eleazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel</td>
<td>Phinehas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abishua</td>
<td>Abihu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>Ele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Abihu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>Abihu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Zadok and Abiathar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td>Johanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehozadak</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasiah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joatham</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>Uziah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>Shallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>Hilkiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>Azariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>Seriah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliezer</td>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerubbabel</td>
<td>Cyrus and Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>Antigonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra and Nehemiah</td>
<td>Elieazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes</td>
<td>Elieazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menecon</td>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander the Great</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onias I. (Ptolemy Soter)</td>
<td>Onias I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonus</td>
<td>Simon the Just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Soter</td>
<td>Simon the Just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philadelphus</td>
<td>Eleazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Euergetes</td>
<td>Onias II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philopator</td>
<td>Onias II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Epiphantes and Onias III</td>
<td>Antigonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus</td>
<td>Simon, or Jason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus Epiphanes</td>
<td>Onias, or Menelaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIL RULES</th>
<th>HIGH-PRIESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>Jason, or Seleucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Balas</td>
<td>Jonathan, brother of Judas Maccabeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (Asmonean)</td>
<td>Simon (Asmonean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hyrcanus (Asm.)</td>
<td>John Hyrcanus (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Aristobulus (Asm.)</td>
<td>Aristobulus (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Alexander Januarius (Asmonean)</td>
<td>Alexander Januarius (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Hellen (Asm.)</td>
<td>Hellen (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Aristobulus II. (Asmonean)</td>
<td>Aristobulus II. (Asmonean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompey the Great and Hyrcanus, or rather, towards the end of his pontificate, Antipater</td>
<td>Hyrcanus II. (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy the Parthian</td>
<td>Antigonus (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod, K. of Judaea</td>
<td>Antigonus (Asm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Antigonus (last of Asmonean) murdered by Herod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Antigonus restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jesus, son of Phasael.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Simon, son of Boethus, father-in-law to Herod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Matthias, son of Theophilus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jozabath, son of Simon (rather, Boethus, Joseph. Ant. xvi. 1, § 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archelaus, K. of Judaea</td>
<td>Eulamias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jesus, son of Zeruiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joseph (second time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Antigonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Simon, son of Phasael.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Eleazar, son of Ananus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Simon, son of Koniah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Caiphas, called also Joseph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Theophilus, brother of Jonathan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Simon, son of Antonius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Matthias, brother of Jonathan, son of Ananus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Eunice, son of Cantharos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Herod Agrippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joseph, son of Cantharos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Simon, son of Nicanor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Antigonus, son of Nicanor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jesus, son of Chaleah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joseph, son of Camel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Ananus, son of Nebedaeus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jonathan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Ishmael, son of Phabib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Joseph, son of Simon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Ananus, son of Ananus, or Ananias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Jesus, son of Domnianus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointed by the people Do. (Whiston on B. J. iv. 3 § 6). |

Chosen by lot | Phannias, son of Samuel |

The latter part of the above list is taken partly from Lightfoot, vol. ix. p. 26 ff.—also in part from Josephus directly, and in part from Whiston's note on Ant. xx. 8, § 5.

A. C. H.

* The subject of the preceding article and that of Priests are so related to each other, that writers have usually discussed them under the same head. For a list of some of the writers who have treated of the topics more or less in connection with each other, see under PRIESTS. II.

II.

* HIGHWAY. [Hedges; Way.]

HILEN [perh. fortress, Furst]: 4
HILKIAH (9$|\eta\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu| and מִּלְכִּיָּה, the Lord [Jehovah] is my portion: Ἐξαλίας: [in 2 K. xviii. 18, Alex. Ἐξαλίας; 29, 37, Vulg. Ἐξαλίας].
1. HILKIAH, father of Eliakim (2 K. xviii. 18, 29, 37; 1 Esd. xxii. 20, xxxvi. 23). [Eliakim.]

2. [Vat. gen. Ἐξαλίας: in Ear. vii. 1. Vat. Ἐξαλίας, Alex. Ἐξαλίας: in Neh. xi. 11, Bomo. Ἐξαλία, Vat. F.A. Ἐξαλία.] High-priest in the reign of Josiah (2 K. xxii. 4 f.; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9 f.; 1 Esdr. i. 8). According to the genealogy in 1 Chr. vi. 13 (A. V.) he was son of Shallum, and from Ezr. vii. 1, apparently the ancestor of Ezra the scribe. His high-priesthood was rendered particularly illustrious by the great reformation effected under it by king Josiah, by the solemn Passover kept at Jerusalem in the 18th year of that king's reign, and above all by the discovery which he made of the book of the law in the Temple. With regard to the latter, Kennicott (Heb. Text. ii. 299) is of opinion that it was the original autograph copy of the Pentateuch written by Moses which Hilkiah found. He argues from the peculiar form of expression in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 14, מִּלְכִּיָּה, the book of the law of Jehovah by the hand of Moses: whereas in the fourteenth other places in the O. T. where the law of Moses or the book of Moses are mentioned, it is either "the book of Moses," or "the law of Moses," or "the book of the law of Moses." But the argument is far from conclusive, because the phrase in question may quite as properly signify "the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses." Compare the expression τὸν ἑαυτῷ μενιστρὸν (Gal. iii. 19), and מִלְכִּיָּה (Ex. ix. 33, xxxv. 29; Neh. x. 29; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6; Jer. 1. 1). Though, however, the copy cannot be proved to have been Moses' autograph from the words in question, it seems probable that it was, from the place where it was found, namely, in the Temple: and, from its not having been discovered before, but being only brought to light on the occasion of the repairs which were necessary, and from the discovering being the high-priest himself, it seems natural to conclude that the particular part of the Temple where it was found was one not usually frequented, or ever by any but the high-priest. Such a place exactly was the one where we know the original copy of the law was deposited by command of Moses, namely, by the side of the ark of the covenant within the vail, as we learn from Deut. xxxii. 9, 26. A difficult and interesting question arises. What was the book found by Hilkiah? Was it the whole Pentateuch, as Le Clerc, Keil, Ewald, etc., suppose, or the three middle books, as Bertheau, or the book of Deuteron- mony alone, as De Wette, Gesenius, Rosenmüller, etc.? Our means of answering this question seem to be limited, (1) to an examination of the terms in which the depositing of the book of the law by the ark was originally enjoined; (2) to an examination of the contents of the book discovered by Hilkiah, as far as they transpire; (3) to any indications which may be gathered from the contemporary writings of Jeremiah, or from any other portions of Scripture. As regards the first, a comparison of Deut. i. 5 with xxxii. 9: the consideration how exactly suited Deuteronomy is for the purpose of a public recital, as commanded Deut. xxxii. 10-13, whereas the passages of the whole of the law or portions of it are scarcely conceivable: and perhaps even the smaller bulk of a copy of Deuteronomy compared with that of the whole law, considered with reference to its place by the ark, point strongly to the conclusion that the book of the law " ordered to be put " in the side of the ark of the covenant " was the book of Deuteronomy alone, whether or no exactly in its present form is a further question. As regards the second, the 28th and 29th chapters of Deut. seem to be those especially referred to in 2 K. xiii. 16, 17, and 2 K. xxiii. 2, 3 seem to point directly to Deut. xxxix. 1, in the mention of the covenant, and ver. 3 of the former to Deut. xxx. 2, in the expression with all their heart and all their soul. The words in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3, "The Levites that taught all Israel," see also to refer to Deut. xxxiii. 10. All the actions of Josiah which followed the finding of the book found in the destruction of all idolatrous symbols, the putting away of wizards and workers with familiar spirits, and the keeping of the Passover, were such as would follow from hearing the 16th, 18th, and other chapters of Deuteronomy, while there is not one that points to any precept contained in the other books, and not in Deuter- onomy. If there is any exception to this statement it is to be found in the description of the Passover in ch. xxxix. The phrases, "on the fourteenth day of the first month," in ver. 1: "Sanctify yourself, and prepare your brethren, that they may do according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Moses," ver. 6: "The priests sprinkled the blood," ver. 11: and perhaps the allusion in ver. 12, may be thought to point to Lev. xxii. 5, or Num. ix. 3; to Lev. xxii. and Num. viii. 20-22; to Lev. i. 5; iii. 2, &c.; and to Lev. iii. 3-5, &c. respectively. But the allusions are not marked, and it must be remembered that the Levitical institutions existed in practice, and that the other books of Moses were certainly extant, though they were not kept by the side of the ark. As regards the third, it is well known how full the writings of Jeremiah are of direct references and of points of resemblance to the book of Deuteronomy. Now this is at once accounted for on the supposition of the text found by Hilkiah being that book, which would thus naturally be an object of special curiosity and study to the prophet, and as naturally influence his own writings. Moreover, in an undated prophecy of Jeremiah's (ch. xi. ?), which seems to have been occasioned by the finding of this covenant — for he introduces the mention of the words of this covenant " quite abruptly — he quotes word for word from Deut. xxvii. 26, answering Amen himself, as the people are there directed to do, with reference to the curse for disobedience (see ver. 3, 5); a very strong confirmation of the proceeding arguments which tend to prove that Deuter- onomy was the book found by Hilkiah. But again: in Josh. viii. we have the account of the first execution by Joshua and the Israelites of that which Moses had commanded relative to writing the law

6 Hitzig, on Jer. xi., also supposes the expressions in this chapter to have been occasioned by the finding of the book of the law.
upon stones to be set upon Mount Ebal; and it is added, ver. 34, and afterwards he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law." In ver. 32 he had said "he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses." Now not only is it impossible to imagine that the whole Pentateuch was transcribed on these stones, but all the references which transpire are to the book of Deuteronomy. The altar of whole stones untouched by iron tool, the peace-offerings, the blessings and the cursings, as well as the act itself of writing the law on stones and setting them on Mount Ebal, and placing half the tribes on Mount Ebal, and the other half on Mount Gerizim, all belong to Deuteronomy. And therefore when it is added in ver. 35, "There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel," we seem constrained to accept the words with the limitation to the Book of Deuteronomy, as that which alone was ordered by Moses to be thus publicly read. And this increases the probability that here too the expression is limited to the same book.

The only discordant evidence is that of the book of Nehemiah. In the 8th chapter of that book, and ix. 3, we have the public reading by Ezra of "the book of the law of Moses" to the whole congregation at the feast of Tabernacles, in evident obedience to Deut. xxi. 10-15. But it is quite certain, from Neh. viii. 14-17, that on the second day they read out of Leviticus, because the directions about dwelling in booths are found there only, in ch. xxii. Moreover in the prayer of the Levites which follows Neh. ix. 5, and which is apparently based upon the previous reading of the law, reference is freely made to all the books of Moses, and indeed to the later books also. It is, however, perhaps not an improbable inference that, Ezra having lately completed his edition of the Holy Scriptures, more was read on this occasion than was strictly enjoined by Deut. xxxi., and that therefore this transaction does not really weaken the foregoing evidence.

But no little surprise has been expressed by critics at the previous non-acquaintance with this book on the part of Hilkiah, Josiah, and the people generally, which their manner of receiving it plainly evidences; and some have argued from hence that the book of Moses is not of the same age as the reign of Josiah; in fact that Josiah and Hilkiah invented it, and pretended to have found a copy in the Temple in order to give sanction to the reformation which they had in hand. The following remarks are intended to point out the true inferences which be drawn from the narrative of this remarkable discovery in the books of Kings and Chronicles. The direction in Deut. xxxi. 10-13 for the public reading of the law at the feast of Tabernacles on each seventh year, or year of release, to the whole congregation, as the means of perpetuating the knowledge of the law, sufficiently shows that at that time a multiplication of copies and a multitude of readers was not contemplated. The same thing seems to be implied also in the direction given in Deut. xvii. 18, 19, concerning the copy of the law to be made, for the special use of the king, and in the direction from that in the keeping of the priests and Levites. And this paucity of copies and of readers is just what one would have expected in an age when the art of reading and writing was confined to the professional scribes, and the very few others who, like Moses had learnt the art in Egypt (Acts vii. 22).

The 'troubled times of the Judges were obviously more likely to obliterate than to promote the study of letters. And whatever of sacred learning may have taken place under such kings as David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Uziah, Jotham, and Hezekiah, yet on the other hand such reigns as that of Athaliah, the last years of Joash, that of Ahaz, and above all the long reign of Manasseh, with their idolatries and national calamities, must have been most unfavorable to the study of "the sacred letters." On the whole, in the days of Josiah's vigilance and ignorance had overlooked all the dykes erected to stay their progress. In spite of such occasional acts as the public reading of the law to the people, enjoined by Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii. 9), and such insulated evidences of the king's reading the law, as commanded by Moses, as the action recorded of Amanaziah affords (2 K. xiv. 6)—where by the way the reference is still to the book of Deuteronomy—and the yet more marked acquaintance with the law attributed to Hezekiah (2 K. xviii. 5, 6) [GENEVIEVE], everything in Josiah's reign indicates a very low state of knowledge. There were indeed still professional scribes among the Levites (2 Chr. xxxiv. 13), and Shaphan was the king's scribe. But judging from the narrative, 2 K. xxii. 8, 10; 2 Chr. xxxiv., it seems probable that neither Hilkiah nor Josiah could read. The same may perhaps be said of Jeremiah, who was always attended by Baruch the scribe, who wrote down the words of Jeremiah from his mouth (Jer. xxxvii. 1, 4, 6, 8, 18, 28, 32 xlv., &c.). How then can we wonder that under such circumstances the knowledge of the law had fallen into desuetude? or fail to see in the incident of the startling discovery of the copy of it by Hilkiah one of those many instances of simple truthfulness which impress on the narrative such an unimpeachable stamp of authenticity, when it is read in the same guileless spirit in which it is written? In fact, the ignorance of the law of Moses which this history reveals is in most striking harmony with the prevalent idletiy disclosed by the previous history of Judah, especially since its connection with the house of Ahab, as well as with the low state of education which is apparent from so many incidental notices.

The story of Hilkiah's discovery throws no light whatever upon the mode in which other portions of the Scriptures were preserved, and therefore this is not the place to consider it. But Theism truly observes that the expression in 2 K. xxii. 8 clearly implies that the existence of the law of Moses was a thing well known to the Jews. It is interesting to notice the concurrence of the king with the high-priest in the restoration of the Temple, as well as the analogy of the circumstances with what took place at the reign of Joash, when Jehoichin was high-priest, as related 2 Chr. xxiv. (Bertheau, 2 k.), (Beza, &c.; Trudeaux, connect. i. 43, 315, Lewis, Orig. Heb. ii. viii. ch. 8, &c.) [CHEVALIER].

A. C. H.

3. HILKIAH (LXX. [Rom. Vat. omit; [Alex. XEKAIR; comp. AH. XEKAIR or -EACHES], a Merarite Levite, son of Amzi, one of the ancestors of Jesus. [Rom. Vat. omit])

4. [Vat. omits; [Alex. XEKAIRI] HILKIAKH, another Merarite Levi, son of Hosah, among the deacons of the tabernacle in the time of King David (1 Chr. xxvii. 11).]

5. [In Neh. viii. 4, XEKAIR, Vat. EKAKIR, Alex. XEKAIR, in xii. 7, Rom. Vat. Alex. E. A. omit]
HILKIAH; one of those who stood on the right hand of Ezra when he read the law to the people. Doubtless a Levite, and probably a priest (Neh. viii. 4). He may be identified with the Hilkiah who came up in the expedition with Joshua and Zerubbabel (xii. 7), and whose descendant Hashabiah is commemorated as living in the days of Joiakim (xiv. 21).

6. HILKIAH; a priest, of Anathoth, father of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. I. 1).

7. HILKIAH, father of Gemariah, who was one of Zedekiah's envoys to Babylon (Jer. xxxix. 3).

HILLS. The structure and characteristics of the hills of Palestine will be most conveniently noticed in the general description of the features of the country. [PALESTINE.]. But it may not be unprofitable to call attention here to the various Hebrew terms for which the word "hill" has been employed in the Authorized Version.

1. Gilbeth, גלבע, from a root akin to גבע, which seems to have the force of curvature or humappiness. A word involving this idea is peculiarly applicable to the rounded hills of Palestine, and from it are derived, as has been pointed out under Gereab, the names of several places situated on hills. Our translators have been consistent in rendering gilbeth by "hill:" in four passages only qualifying it as "little hill," doubtless for the more complete antithesis to "mountain" (Ps. lxxv. 3, xviii. 3, xxv. 6, 4). But they have also employed the same English word for the very different term הור, הר, which has a much more extended sense than gilbeth, meaning a whole district rather than an individual eminence, and to which our word "mountain" answers with tolerable accuracy. This exchange is always undesirable, but it sometimes occurs so as to confuse the meaning of a passage where it is desirable that the topography should be unmistakable. For instance, in Ex. xxiv. 4, the "hill" is the same which is elsewhere in the same chapter (12, 13, 18, &c.) and book, consistently and accurately rendered "mount" and "mountain." In Num. xxxiv. 44, 45, the "hill" is the "mountain" of verse 40, as also in Deut. i. 41, 43, compared with 34, 44. In Josh. xv. 9, the allusion is to the Mount of Olives, correctly called "mountain" in the preceding verse; and so also in 2 Sam. xvi. 13. The country of the "hills," in Deut. i. 7; Josh. iv. 1, x. 49, xii. 16, is the elevated district of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, which is correctly called "the mountain" in the earliest descriptions of Palestine (Num. xiii. 23), and in many subsequent passages.

The "holy hill" (Ps. iii. 4), the "hill of Jehovah" (xxiv. 3), the "hill of God" (lxv. 15), are nothing else than "Mount Zion." In 2 K. i. 9 and vi. 27, the use of the word "hill" obscures the illusion to Carmel, which in other passages of the 36th of the prophet (i.e. 1 K. xviii. 19; 2 E. iv. 25) has the term "mount" correctly attached to it. Other places in the historical books in which the same substitution weakens the force of the narrative, are as follows: Gen. vii. 19; Deut. viii. 7; Josh. xii. 8, xiii. 14; Judg. xvi. 3; 1 Sam. xiiii. 14: xxv. 20; xxvi. 13; 2 Sam. xiii. 34; 1 K. xx. 28, xxviii. 17, &c.

3. On one occasion the word מָלַא ד. מָלַא is rendered "hill," namely, 1 Sam. ix. 11, where it would be better to employ "ascent" or some similar term.

4. In the N. T. the word "hill" is employed to render the Greek word βουράς: but on one occasion it is used for ἔσορας, elsewhere "mountain," so as to obscure the connection between the two parts of the same narrative. The "hill" from which Jesus was coming down in Luke ix. 37, is the same as "the mountain" into which He had gone for His transfiguration the day before (comp. ver. 28). In Matt. xiv. 14, and Luke iv. 29, ἔσορας is also rendered "hill," but not with the inexactness just noticed. In Luke i. 39 [and 65] the "hill country" (בּוֹרַע) is the same "mountain of Judah" [sing. = collective] to which frequent reference is made in the O. T.

G.

HIN. [MEASURES.]

HIND (חֵיתָן: אֶבֶן: כֶּבֶשׁ: כְּבֵשׁ), the female of the common stag or cervus elaphus. It is frequently noticed in the poetical parts of Scripture as emblematic of activity (Gen. xlix. 21; 2 Sam. xxii. 34; Ps. xviii. 33; Hab. iii. 19), gentleness (Prov. v. 19), feminine modesty (Cant. ii. 7, iii. 5), earnest longing (Ps. xlix. 1), and maternal affection (Jer. iv. 5). Its shyness and remissness from the haunts of men are also noticed (Job xxxix. 1), and its timidity, causing it to cast its young at the sound of thunder (Ps. xxix. 9). The conclusion which some have drawn from the passage last quoted that the hind produces her young with great difficulty, is not in reality deducible from the words, and is expressly contradicted by Job xxxix. 3. The LXX. reads ἡνίδα in Gen. xlix. 21, rendering it στάλαγμομένα, "a luxuriant terebinth:" Luke has proposed a similar change in Ps. xxix., but in neither ease can the emendation be accepted: Naphthali verified the comparison of himself to a "graceful or tall hind" by the events recorded in Judg. iv. 6-9, v. 18. The insertion of Ps. xxix., "the kind of the morning," probably refers to a tune of that name. [ALLELIOTH-SHAIKH].

W. L. B.

HINGE. 1. הָנֵג, הָנֵג, הָנֵג, with the notion of turning (Gen. p. 1165). 2. הָנֵג, חֵיתָן, הָנֵג, כֶּבֶשׁ, with the notion of insertion (Gen. p. 1096). Both ancient Egyptian and modern Oriental doors were and are hung by means of pivots turning in sockets both on the upper and lower sides. In Syria, and especially the Hauran, there are many ancient doors consisting of stone slabs with pivots carved out of the same piece, inserted in slots above and below, and fixed during the building of the house. The allusion in Prov. xxvi. 14 is thus clearly explained. The hinges mentioned in 1 K. vii. 50 were probably of the Egyptian kind, attached to the upper and lower sides of the door (Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 177; Porter, Damascus, ii. 22, 192; Maundrell, Early Travels, pp. 447, 448 (Bohn); Shaw, Travels, p. 219; Lord Lindsay, Letters, p. 292; Wilkinson, Anc. Egy. Archæol. (15).)

H. W. P.

HINNOM, VALLEY OF [more strictly Ra-VAIIXE] OF, otherwise called "the valley of the son or "children [sons] of Hinnom" (הָנֵג, הָנֵג, הָנֵג).
HINNOM, VALLEY OF

The name by which it is now known is (it ignorance of the meaning of the initial syllable) Wa‘id, Jehemmon, or Wady er Rechob (Williams, Holy City, i. 56, suppl.), though in Mohammedan traditions the name Gehenna is applied to the Valley of Kidron (Ibn Batutah, 12, 4; Stanley, ut sup.).

The valley commences in a broad sloping basin to the W. of the city, S. of the Jaffa road (extending nearly to the brow of the great Wady, on the W.), in the centre of which, 700 yards from the Jaffa gate, is the large reservoir, supposed to be the ‘upper pool,’ or ‘Gillon’ [Gittos] (Is. vii. 3, xxxii. 2; 2 Chr. xxxii. 30), now known as Birket es-Sultan. From this point the ravine narrows and deepens, and descends with great rapidity between broken cliffs, rising in successive terraces, honeycombed with innumerable sepulchral recesses, forming the northern face of the ‘Hill of Exile’ (Jer. vii. 31; 2 Chr. xxix. 10), Birket-es-Sultan. From this point the ravine narrows and deepens, and descends with much greater rapidity towards the ‘valley of Jehoshaphat,’ or ‘of the Brook Kidron,’ before joining which it opens out again, forming an oblong plot, the site of Tophet, devoted to gardens irrigated by the waters of Siloam. Towards the eastern extremity of the valley is the traditional site of ‘Aclethana,’ authenticated by a bed of white clay still worked by potters (Williams, Holy City, ii. 453), opposite to which, where the cliff is thirty or forty feet high, the tree on which the adored images was hanged himself was placed during the Frankish kingdom (Barclay, City of Great King, p. 208).

Not far from Aclethana is aconspicuously situated tomb with a Poric pediment, sometimes known as the ‘whited sepulchre,’ near which a large sepulchral recess with a Poric portal hewn in the native rock is known as the ‘L직함 apostle,’ where the Twelve are said to have concealed themselves during the time between the crucifixion and the resurrection. The tombs continue quite down to the corner of the mountain, where it bends off to the S. along the valley of Jehoshaphat. None of the sepulchral recesses in the vicinity of Jerusalem are so well preserved; most of them are very old [see infra]—small gloomy caves, with narrow, rock-hewn doorways.

Robinson places ‘the valley gate,’ [which had

*Some of the variations of the Vatican MS. are not noticed here, being mere corruptions. A.

*The clay used in the potteries at Jerusalem near the church of St. Anne is said to be obtained from E-

John Gittos. See Ordinary Survey of Jerusalem, p 59 (1853). Compare the note under Hinnom, p 109, where the note relates. The testimony at present indicates different opinions. H.
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its name from this ravine], Neh. ii. 13 15; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9, at the N. W. corner of Mount Zion in the upper part of this valley (Robinson, i. 229, 339, 274, 320, 353; Williams, Holy City, i. suppl. p. 493; Barclay, City of Great King, 205, 208).

[But see Jerusalem.]

E. V.

 yönetim, namely, above.

of ferred of connected in and on the southern hill-side above the ravine are somewhat fully described in the Ordinance Survey of Jerusalem, pp. 67, 68 (1865). They are regarded as having been made or modified at a later period than those on the north side of the city. Many of them have an inscription or scattered letters, but nothing that can be well deciphered. Closer inspection shows some of these to be much more elaborate than those here mentioned supposed. "Close to the building of Acclama the rock is perforated by seven loculi, through one of which a chamber containing several more loculi is reached; and one of these again, on the right-hand side, gives access to a second chamber with loculi; from that there is an opening to a third, and thence down a flight of steps to a fourth and last one, all the chambers having loculi: most of them are filled with rubbish, and many have the appearance of leading to other chambers." Sketches were taken of some of the appurtenances of these tombs, which accompany the text of the work referred to. Tolver states the results of a special examination of these rock sepulchres in Himmon (Dritte Wanderung, p. 438 ff).

A very noticeable feature of this ravine is the precipitous wall of rocks which overhangs the gorge in its deepest part, on the left, as one goes westward and nearly opposite to Acclama on the height above. The rocks here are almost perpendicular, and are found to be at different points forty, thirty-six, thirty-three, thirty, and twenty feet high. A few trees still grow along the margin of the overhanging brow, and trees here must antedate have been still more numerous when the land was better cultivated. Aside from this peculiaritiy of the valley, regarded as one of its aspects, it has some additional interest from its having been connected with the death of Judas. It has been thought that he may have hung himself on the limb of a tree near the edge of one of these precipices, and that the rope or limb breaking, he fell to the bottom and was dashed to pieces. This latter result would have been the more certain, in the event of his having so fallen, on account of the sharp edges projecting from the sides of the cliff, as well as the rocky ground below. Dr. Robinson (Harmony of the Greek Gospels, § 151) supposes that some such relation as this may have existed between the traitor's "bursting asunder" and the suicide, though he does not assign the occurrence to any particular place. Tholuck (MS. Notes) is one of those who think of Himmon as the scene of the event. See on this point the Life of our Lord, by Andrews, p. 510 ff. (1867). We cannot indeed rely very much on such minute specifications, because so little being related, so little is really known respecting the manner of Judas's death. [JEDAS.]

It may not be useless to correct more distinctly a somewhat prevalent idea that the Valley of Himmon lies wholly on the south of Jerusalem. This name belongs also to the valley on the west of the city, though the latter is often called from the reservoirs there the Valley of Gihon. They are both parts of one and the same valley, which sweeps around the city on two sides. As a topographical description, the reader will find Robinson's concise account of this locality (Phys. Geogr., pp. 97-100) very distinct and accurate.

H.

HIPPOPOTAMUS. There is hardly a doubt that the Hebrew behemoth (בְּהוֹמָה) describes the hippopotamus: the word itself bears the strongest resemblance to the Coptic name pe-hemout, "the water-ox," and at the same time expresses in its Hebrew form, as the plural of בְּהוֹמָה, the idea of a very large beast. Though now no longer found in the lower Nile, it was formerly common there (Wilkinson, i. 230). The association of it with the crocodile in the passage in which it is described (Job. xl. 15 ff.), and most of the particulars in that passage are more appropriate to the hippopotamus than to any other animal. Behemoth = extinct grass as an ox" (Job. xl. 15) — a circumstance which is noticed as peculiar in an animal of aquatic habits: this is strictly true of the hippopotamus, which leaves the water by night, and feeds on vegetables and green plants. Its strength is enormous, vv. 16, 18, and the notice of the power of the muscles of the belly, "his force is in the navel of his belly," appears to be strictly correct. The tail, however, is short, and it must be conceded that the first part of ver. 17, "he moveth his tail like a cedar," seems not altogether applicable. A mode of attack is with his mouth, which is armed with a formidable array of teeth, projecting incisors, and enormous curved canines; thus "his creator offers him a sword," for so the words in ver. 19 may be rendered. But the use of his sword is mainly for pacific purposes, "the beasts of the field playing about him as he feeds; the hippopotamus being a remarkably inoffensive animal. His retreat is among the lotuses (izclea; A. V. "shady trees") which are abundant about the Nile, and amid the reeds of the river. Thoroughly at home in the water, "if the river riseth, he doth not take to flight; and he cares not if a Jordan (here an appellative for a "stream") press on his mouth." Ordinary means of capture were ineffectual against the great strength of this animal. "Will any take him before his eyes?" (i. e. openly, and without cunning), "will any bore his nose with a gin?" as was usual with large fish. The method of killing it in Egypt was with a spear, the animal being in the first instance secured by a lasso, and repeatedly struck until it became exhausted (Wilkinson, i. 240); the very same method is pursued by the natives of South Africa at the present day (Livingstone, p. 73; instances of its great strength are noticed by the same writer, pp. 231, 232, 497).

W. L. B.

HIRAH (חִירָה) [nobility, noble birth] :

a * That depends on the explanation. Dr. Conant marks on the passage: Like a cedar; namely, as a cedar is bent, which is not easily done. The allusion is to the strength and stiffness of the tail, the smallest and weakest of all the members of the animal's body (Book of Job, with a Revised Version, p. 139).

See also Hirah's Heb ekkitur, p. 249. There are several expressions in this celebrated description of the water-ox of the Nile which the present philology represents somewhat differently from the A. V. See the versions of Ewald, De Wette, Umbreit, Conant, Nos., and others.
Hiram, the friend (יִירָם) of Judah (Gen. xxxviii. 1, 12; and see 20). For 'friend' the LXX. and Vulg. have 'shepherd,' probably reading מִשְׂמָה.

**Hiram or Huram** (רָמָא, or הָרָמָא) [noble born = הָרָמָא Ges.]: [Rom. Xvi. 23, exc. 2

Sam. v. 11, 1 Chr. xiv. 1, Xerxes: Vat. Alex. Xerxes: Hiram. See different forms of the name see Hiram]. 1. The King of Tyre who sent workmen and materials to Jerusalem, first (2 Sam. v. 11, 1 Chr. xiv. 1) to build a palace for David whom he ever loved (1 K. v. 1), and again (1 K. v. 10, vii. 13, 2 Chr. ii. 14, 16) to build the Temple for Solomon, under whom he had a treaty of peace and commerce (1 K. v. 11, 12). The contempt with which he received Solomon's present of Carat. (1 K. iv. 12) does not appear to have caused any breach between the two kings. He admitted Solomon's ships, issuing from Joppa, to a share in the profitable trade of the Mediterranean (1 K. x. 22); and Jewish sailors, under the guidance of Tyrians, were taught to bring the gold of India (1 K. ix. 26) to Solomon's two harbors on the Red Sea (see Ewald, Gesch. III. 345-347). 3. The Philistine historian, and Mercenier of Ephesians (op. Joseph. c. Ap. i. 17, 18) assign to Hiram a prosperous reign of 44 years; and relate that his father was Abial, his son and successor Balearz; that he re-still various idol-temples, and dedicated some splendid offerings; that he was successful in war; that he enlarged and fortified his city; that he and Solomon had a contest with riddles or dark sayings (compare Solomos and his friends, Judg. xiv. 12), in which Solomon, after winning a large sum of money from the king of Tyre, was eventually outwitted by Abdonos, one of his subjects. The intercourse of these great and kindred-minded kings was much celebrated by local historians. Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, § 8) states that the correspondence between them with respect to the building of the Temple was preserved among the Tyrian archives in his day. With the letters in this v. and 2 Chr. ii. may be compared not only his copies of the letters, but also the still less authentic letters between Solomon and Hiram, and between Solomon and Vaphres (Apries?), which are preserved by Eusebius (op. Euseb. Prep. Evang. ix. 39), and mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor (op. Eum. Alex. Str. ii. 21, p. 532). Some Phoenician historians (op. Tatian. cont. Grec. § 37) relate that Hiram, besides supplying timber for the Temple, gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon. Jewish writers, in less ancient times cannot overlook Hiram's unceasing aid in his services towards the building of the Temple. Their legends relate (op. Euseb. Eccl. i. 858) that because he was a God-bearing man and built the Temple he was received alive into Paradise; but that, after he had been there a thousand years, he sinned by pride, and was thrust down into hell. 2. [Xerxes: Vat. Alex. Xerxes: Hiram] Hiram was the name of a man of mixed race (1 K. vii. 13, 40, 45), the principal architect and engineer sent by king Hiram to Solomon; also called Huram in the Chronicles. On the title of הָרָמָא = master, or father, given to him in 2 Chr. ii. 13 iv. 16, see Hiram, No. 3. W. T. B.

* At the distance of 11 hours on the hill-side east of Tyre, is a remarkable tomb known as Kadhar Hiraun, i.e. Tomb of Hiram. It stands all alone, apart alike from human habitation and ancient ruin—a solitary, venerable relic of remote antiquity. In fact it is one of the most singular monuments in the land. It is an immense sarcophagus of limestone hewn out of a single block—12 feet long, 8 wide, and 6 high.; covered by a lid slightly pyramidal, and 5 feet in thickness;—the whole resting on a massive pedestal, about 10 feet high, composed of three layers of large hewn stones, the upper layer projecting a few inches. The monument is perfect, though weather-beaten. The only entrance to it is an aperture broken through the eastern face of the tomb. A tradition, now received by all classes and sects in the surrounding country, makes this the tomb of Hiram, Solomon's friend and ally; and the tradition may have come down unbroken from the days of Tyre's grandeur. We have at least no just ground for rejecting it. Port: Handbook, ii. 359.)

The people there also connect Hiram's name with a cupola fountain over which a massive stone structure has been raised, which the traveller passes on his way down the partly burnt coming to the site of Tyre (see Tristram's Land of Israel, p. 55, 2d ed.). Such traditions, whether they cleave rightfully or not to these particular places, have their interest. They come down to us through Phoenician channels, and indirectly authenticate the history of Hiram as recorded by the Hebrew writers. H.

**Hircanus** (Ἱρκανός, [Hircam from Ἰρκανός, a province on the Caspian Sea; Hircanus, a son of Tobias), who had a large treasure placed for security in the treasury of the Temple at the time of the visit of Hezbudoros (r. 187 b.c.; 2 Macc. iii. 11). Josephus also mentions "children of Tobias" (Ant. xii. 5, § 1, ταύτας Ταβίου, who, however, belonged to the fiction of Menelaus, and notice especially a son of one of them (Joseph) who was named Hircamus (Ant. xii. 4, § 2 ff.). But there is no sufficient reason for identifying the Hircamus of 2 Macc. with this grandson of Tobias either by supposing that the ellipse (τὸν Ταβίου) is to be so filled in as to suit the sons of Joseph were popularly named after their grandfather (Ewald, Gesch. iv. 309), which could scarcely have been the case in consequence of the great eminence of their father.

The name appears to be simply a local appellation, and became illustrious afterwards in the Macedonian dynasty, though the circumstances which led to its adoption are unknown (yet comp. Joseph. Ant. xii. 8, § 4.)

**His** is used throughout the A. V. instead of its, which does not occur in the original edition of 1611, though it has been introduced in one place in later editions. [Fr. This use sometimes occasions ambiguity, as in Matt. vi. 33, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, where Eastwood and Wright (Bible Word-Book, p. 252) erroneously refer the "his" to "kingdom" instead of to "God," the Greek being Θεσαυρος, not Θεσαυρος." His righteousness" here means "the righteousness which He requires." A.

**Hittites, the**, the nation descended from Cheth (A. V. "Heath"), the second son of...
HITTITES, THE

Canaan (1) With five exceptions, noticed below, the word is Καναάν = the Chichit [♂ Χέτταιοι, Χέτταιοι: Herod., Hethai: in Ex. ix. 1, δ Εβί, Vat. Ebe, Alex. ΑΛΩΝ], in the singular number, according to the common Hebrew idiom. It is occasionally rendered in the A. V. in the singular number, "the Hittite" (Ex. xxii. 28, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 11; Jos. ix. 7; Josh. xi. 20, etc.) plural (Gen. xv. 29); Ex. iii. 8, 17, xii. 5, xxii. 23; Num. xxii. 29; Deut. v. 1. xxviii, 17. Josh. iii. 10, xxiii. 8, xxv. 11; Judg. iii. 5; 1 K. ix. 29; 2 Chr. viii. 7; Ex. ix. 1: Neh. ix. 8; 1 Esdr. viii. 69, Χετταιοι). (2) The plural form of the word is Καναάνι, οι Χέτταιοι, Χέτταιοι (Val. Tav., Alex. Χετταιοι; Χετταιοι (Val. -xv.), οι Χέτταιοι: Herod., Hethai) (Josh. i. 4; Judg. i. 26; 1 K. x. 2); 2 K. vii. 6; 2 Chr. i. 17. (3) A Hittite [woman] is Χέτταια [Χετταιοι: Κθεταιοι] (Ex. xvi. 4, 5). In 1 K. xi. 1, the same word is rendered "Hittites." 1. Our first introduction to the Hittites is in the time of Abraham, when he bought from the Bene-Cheth, "Children of Heth" — such was then their title — the field and the cave of Machpelah, belonging to Ephron the Hittite. They were then settled at the town which was afterwards, under its new name of Hebron, to become one of the most famous cities of Palestine, then bearing the name of Kirjath-arba, and perhaps also of Mamre (Gen. xxiii. 19, xxvii. 9). The propensities of the tribe appear at that time to have been rather commercial than military. "The money current with the merchant," and the process of weighing it, were familiar to them; the peaceful assembly in the "gate of the city" was their manner of receiving the stranger who was desirous of having a "possession," "secured" to him among them. The dignity and courtesy of their demeanour also come out strongly in this narrative. As Ewald well says, Abraham chose his allies in warfare from the Amorites, but he goes to the Hittites for his grave. But the tribe was evidently as yet but small, not important enough to be noticed beside "the Canaanite and the Perizzite" who shared the bulk of the land between them (Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 7). In the southern part of the country they remained for a considerable period after this, possibly extending as far as Gera and Beer-sheba, a good deal below Hebron (xxvi. 17, xxviii. 10). From their families Esau married his first two wives; and her fear lest Jacob should take the same course is the motive given by Rebekah for sending Jacob away to Haran. It was the same feeling that had urged Abram to send to Mesopotamia for a wife for Isaac. The descendant of Shem could not well have had "daughters of Anar" if he was not acquainted with the Canaanites among whom I dwell . . . wherein I am a stranger," but "go to my country and thy kindred" is his father's command, "to the house of thy mother's father, and take thee a wife from thence" (Gen. xxviii. 2, xxiv. 4). 2. Throughout the book of Exodus the name of the Hittites occurs only in the usual formula for the occupants of the Promised Land. Changes occur in the mode of stating this formula [Canaan, p. 354 a], but the Hittites are never omitted (see Ex. xxiii. 28). In the report of the spies, however, we have again a real historical notice of them: "the Hittite, the Jebusite, and the Amorite dwell in the land" (Num. xiii. 29). Whatever temporary circumstances may have attracted them so far to the south as Beer-sheba, a people having the quiet commercial tastes of Ephron the Hittite and his companions can have had no call for the raving, skirmishing life of the country bordering on the desert: and thus, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, they had withdrawn themselves from these districts, retiring before Amalek (Num. xiii. 21). If there were some mountain fortress in the centre of the land. Perhaps the words of Ezekiel (xvi. 3, 45) may imply that they helped to found the city of Jehosh. From this time, however, their quiet habits vanish, and they take their part against the invader, in equal alliance with the other Canaanite tribes (Josh. i. 1, xiii. 3, &c.). 3. Henceforward the notices of the Hittites are very few and faint. We meet with two individuals, both attached to the person of David. (1) "Abimelech, the Hittite," who was with him in the hill of Hachilah, and with Abishai accompanied him by night to the tent of Saul (2 Sam. xxvi. 6). He is nowhere else mentioned, and was possibly killed in one of David's expeditions, before the list in 2 Sam. xxiii. was drawn up. (2) "Uriah the Hittite," one of "the thirty" of David's body-guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 39; 1 Chr. xi. 41), the deep tragedy of wilful wrongs forms the one blot in the life of his master. In both these persons, though warriors by profession, we can perhaps detect traces of those qualities which we have noticed as characteristic of the tribe. In the case of the first, it was Abiashai, the practical, unscrupulous "son of Zeruiah," who pressed David to allow him to kill the sleeping king. Abimelech is clear from that stain. In the case of Uriah, the absence from suspicion and the generous self-denial which he displayed are too well known to need more than a reference (2 Sam. xi. 11, 12). 4. The Egyptian annals tell us of a very powerful confederacy of Hittites in the valley of the Orontes, with whom Soter I., or Sethos, waged war about B. C. 1340, and whose capital, Ketesh, situate near Emesa, he conquered. [E.G.R., p. 511.] 5. In the Assyrian inscriptions, as lately deciphered, there are frequent references to a nation of Khatti, who "formed a great confederacy ruled by a number of petty chiefs," whose territory also lay in the valley of the Orontes, and who were sometimes assisted by the people of the sea-coast, probably the Phoenicians (Rawlinson's Herodotus, i. 463). "Twelve kings of the Southern Khatti are mentioned in several places." If the identification of these people with the Hittites should prove to be correct, it agrees with the name Chatu, as noticed under Heth, and affords a clue to the meaning of some passages which are otherwise puzzling. These are (a) Josh. i. 4, where the expression "all the land of the Hittites" appears to mean all the land of Canaan, or at least the northern part thereof. (b) Judg. i. 26. Here nearly the same expression recurs: [LIT.] (a) 1 K. x. 28; 2 Chr. i. 17; the kings of the Hittites and kings of Aram (probably identical with the "kings on this side Eniphatus," 1 K. iv. 24) are mentioned as purchasing chariots and horses from Egypt, for the possession of which they were so notorious, that

"Canaanite," has in many places the force of "merchant" or "trafficker." See among others the examples in vol. i. p. 354 b.
HIVITES, THE

(dj) it would seem to have become at a later date almost proverbial in allusion to an alarm of an attack by chariots (2 K. vii. 6).

6. Nothing is said of the religion or worship of the Hittites. Even in the enumeration of Solomon's idolatrous worship of the gods of his wives — among whom were Hittite women (1 K. xi. 1) — no Hittitish

diligence is alluded to. (See 1 K. xi. 3, 7; 2 K. xxiii. 15.)

7. The names of the individual Hittites mentioned in the Bible are as follow. They are all susceptible of interpretation as Hebrew words, which would lead to the belief either that the Hittites spoke a dialect of the Aramaic or Hebrew language, or that the words were Hebraized in their transference to the Bible records.

ADAI (woman), Gen. xxxvi. 2.
Abimelech, 1 Sam. xxvi. 6.
Bashemath, secon. BASHMATH (woman), possibly a second name of Adah, Gen. xxvi. 34.
Beer (father of Judith, below), Gen. xxxvi. 34.
Elox (father of Bashan), Gen. xxvi. 34.
Ephron, Gen. xxiii. 10, 13, 14, &c.
Judith (woman), Gen. xxxvi. 34.
Uriah, 2 Sam. xi. 3, &c., xxxii. 39, &c.
Zohar (father of Ephron), Gen. xxxii. 8.
In addition to the above, SIBUECHAI, who in the Hebrew text is always denominated a Hushathite, is by Josephus (Ant. vii. 12, § 2) styled a Hittite.

HIVITES, THE (םיתות) [perh. the village],
Ges.], i.e. the Chethite: ö *Ebaiai: (in Josh. ix. 7, Xoppaios, and so Alex. in Gen. xxxiv. 2.) here Cyc.
The name is, in the original, uniformly found in the singular number. It never has, like that of the Hittites, a plural, nor does it appear in any other form. Perhaps we may assume from this that it originated in some peculiarity of locality or circumstance, as in the case of the Amorites — "mountainiers;" and not in a progenitor, as did that of the Ammonites, who are also styled Bene-Amon — children of Amnon — or the Hittites, Bene- Ceth — children of Ceth. The name is explained by Exah (Josh. i. 318) as Binnehfinder, that is, "Hittite finders," by Gesenius (Thes. i. 454) as peqayim, "villagers." In the following passages the name is given in the A. V. in the singular — THE HIVITES: — Gen. x. 17; Ex. xxii. 28, xxviii. 2; xxvi. 11; Josh. ix. 1, xi. 3; 1 Chr. i. 15; also Gen. xxxiv. 2, xxxvi. 2. In all the rest it is plural.

1. In the genealogical tables of Genesis, "the Hittite" is named as one of the descendants — the sixth in order — of Canaan, the son of Ham (Gen. x. 17; 1 Chr. i. 15.) In the first enumeration of the nations who, at the time of the call of Abraham, occupied the promised land (Gen. xviii. 21), the Hivites are omitted from the Hebrew text (though in the Samaritan and LXX. their name is inserted.). This has led to the conjecture, amongst others, that they are identical with the Kadmonites whose name is found there and there only (Echen, Pal. 140; Kochart, Pal. iv. 56; Gen. i. 19). But are not the Kadmonites rather, as their name implies, the representatives of the Bene-kedem, or "children of the East?" The name commonly occurs in the formula by which the country is designated in the earlier books (Ex. iii. 8, 17, xiiii. 5, xxiii. 23, 28, xlviii. 2, xxiv. 11; Deut. vii. 1, x. 17; Josh. iii. 10, ix. 1, xii. 8, xlviii. 11), and also in the later ones (1 K. ix. 20; 2 Chr. viii. 7; but comp. Ex. ix. 1, and Neh. ix. 8). It is, however, absent in the report of the spies (Num. xili. 29), a document which fixes the localities occupied by the Canaanite nations at that time. Perhaps this is owing to the then insignificance of the Hittites, or perhaps to the fact that they were indifferent to the special locality of their settlements.

2. We first encounter the actual people of the Hittite, when the name of Jacob's return to Canaan. The Shechem was then (according to the current Hebrew text) in their possession, Hamor the Hivite being the "prince (נֵבְרִי) of the land" (Gen. xxiv. 2). They were at this time, to judge of their appearance, a warlike and conquered people, freeloaders, and easily deceived by the crafty and cruel sons of Jacob. The narrative further exhibits them as peaceful and commercial, given to "trade" (10, 21), and to the acquiring of "pos sessions" of cattle and other "wealth" (10, 23, 28, 29). Like the Hittites they held their assemblies or conferences in the gate of their city (20). We may also see a testimony to their peaceful habits in the fact of any attempt at revenge by Jacob for the massacre of the Shechemites. Perhaps a similar indication is furnished by the name of the god of the Shechemites some generations after this — Haal-berith — Bad of the league, or the alliance (Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4, 46); by the way in which the Shechemites were beaten by Abimelech (40); and by the military character, both of the weapon which caused Abimelech's death and of the person who discharged it (ix. 50).

The Alex. MS., and several other MSS. of the LXX., in the above narrative (Gen. xxxiv. 2) substitute "Horite" for "Hittite." The change is remarkable from the usually close adherence of the Alex. Codex to the Hebrew text, but it is not corroborated by any other of the ancient versions, nor is it recommended by other considerations. No instances occur of Horites in this part of Palestine, while we know, from a later narrative, that there was an important colony of Hivites on the highland of Benjamin at Gilbon, etc., no very great distance from Shechem. On the other hand, in Gen. xxxvi. 2, where Abdalnaim, one of Esau's wives, is said to have been the daughter of [Anah] the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, all considerations are in favor of reading "Horite" for "Hittite." In this ease we fortunately possess a detailed genealogy of the family, by comparison of which little doubt is left of the propriety of the change (comp. verses 29, 31, 32, 30, with 2), although no ancient version has suggested it here.

3. We next meet with the Hivites during the conquest of Canaan (Josh. ix. 7, xi. 19). Their character is now in some respects materially altered. They are still evidently averse to fighting, but they have acquired — possibly by long experience in traffic — an amount of craft which they did not before possess, and which enables them to turn the tables on the Israelites in a highly successful manner (Josh. ix. 3-27). The colony of Hivites, who made Joshua and the heads of the tribes their dupes on this occasion, had four cities — Gilbon, Tephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jeerim — situated, if our present knowledge is accurate, at considerable distances asunder. It is not certain whether the three last were destroyed by Joshua or not (xi. 19);
HIZKI'AH (חיזקיה), an ancestor of Zeplianiah the prophet (Zeph. i. 1).

HIZKJ'AH (חזקיה) [as above]: E'zikia: Hezekeias, according to the punctuation of the A.V. a man who sealed the covenant of reformation with Ezra and Neboeniah (Neh. x. 17). But there is no doubt that the name should be taken with that preceding it, as "Ater-Hizkijah," a name given in the lists of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubabel. It appears also extremely likely that the two names following these in x. 17, 18 (Azeer, Hodjiah) are only corrupt repetitions of these.

This and the preceding name are identical, and are the same with that given in the A.V. as Hezekiah.

HO'BACH (הובך) [love, beloved]: 6' Oabba', Alex. Ooba, Oba; in Judg. 'Oabba' (Hobab). This name is found in two places only (Num. x. 29; Judg. iv. 11), and it seems doubtful whether it denotes the father-in-law of Moses, or his son. (1.) In favor of the latter are (a.) the express statement that Hobab was "the son of Raguel" (Num. x. 29); Raguel or Renel—the Hebrew word in both cases is the same—being identified with Jethro, not only in Ex. ii. 18 (comp. iii. 1, et.), but also by Josephus, who constantly gives that name. (b.) The fact that Jethro had some time previously left the Israelite camp to return to his own country (Ex. xviii. 27). The words "the father-in-law of Moses" in Num. x. 29, though in most of the ancient versions connected with Hobab, will in the original read either way, so that no argument can be founded on them. (2.) In favor of Hobab's identity with Jethro are (a.) the words of Judg. iv. 11; but it should be remembered that this is (ostensibly) of later date than the other, and altogether a more casual statement. (b.) Josephus as speaking of Raguel remarks once (Ant. ii. 12, § 1) that he "had Lotbor, i. e. Jethro) for a surname (τούτο γάρ ἦν ἐπικλήμα τῷ Ραγούλῃ). From the absence of the article here, it is inferred by Whiston and others that Josephus intends that he had more than one surname, but this seems hardly the case.

The Mohammediun traditions are certainly in favor of the identity of Hobab with Jethro. He is known in the Koran and elsewhere, and in the East at the present day, by the name of Sho 'eb (شعبة), doubtless a corruption of Hobab. According to those traditions he was the prophet of God to the idolaters of Medina (Midian), who not believing his message were destroyed (Lane's Koran, 179-181); he was blind (ib. 180 note); the rod of Moses was his gift, it had once been the rod of Adam, and was of the myrtle of Paradise, etc. (ib. 139; Well's Biblical Legends, 107-109). The name of Sho'eb still remains attached to one of the wadies on the east side of the Jordan, opposite Jericho, through which, according to the tradition of the locality (Seetzen, Reisen, 1854, ii. 319, 376), the children of Israel descended to the Jordan. [Beth-Nimra]. According to this tradition, therefore, he accompanied the people as far as the Promised Land, though whatever weight that may possess is, when the statement of Ex. xviii. 27 is taken into account, against his identity with Jethro. Other places bearing his name and those of his two daughters are shown at Sinai and on the Gulf of Akaba (Stanley, S. & P. p. 33).

But whether Hobab was the father-in-law of Moses or not, the notice of him in Num. x. 29-32, though brief, is full of point and interest. While Jethro is preserved to us as the wise and practiced administrator, Hobab appears as the experienced Bedouin sheikh, to whom Moses looked for the material safety of his cumbrous caravan in the new and difficult ground before them. The tracks and posses of that "waste howling wilderness" were all familiar to him, and his practiced sight would be to them "instead of eyes" in discerning the distant clumps of verdure which betokened the wells or springs for the daily encampment, and in giving timely warning of the approach of Amalekites or other spoilers of the desert. [Jethro].

HOBAB [or HO'BA, A. V. ed. 1611] (הובא) [concealed, Ges.; looking-hole, Fürst]: Xob'd: Hobo), the place to which Abraham pursued the kings who had pillaged Sodom (Gen. xiv. 15). It was situated "to the north of Damascus" (יובא [נפשה}). Josephus mentions a tradition concerning Abraham which he takes from Nicolaus of Damascus: — "Abraham reigned at Damascus, being a foreigner . . . and his name is still famous in the country, and there is a village called from him The Habitation of Abraham." (Ant. i. 7, § 2). It is remarkable that in the village of Buseh, three miles north of Damascus, there is a cleft in high veneration by the Mohammdeans, and called after the name of the patriarch, Marjed Ibrahim, "the prayer-place of Abram." The tradition attached to it is that here Abraham offered thanks to God after the total discomfiture of the eastern kings. Behind the cleft is a rock in which another tradition represents the patriarch as taking refuge on one occasion from the giant Ninnor. It is remarkable that the word Hobah signifies "a hiding-place."

The Jews of Damascus affirm that the village of
Hod, not far from Burzeh, is the Holah of Scripture. 

HOD (םֹד) [spleen, organment]:景色 [Val.] 

HODIAH (םֹדְיָה) [spleen, organment]:景色 [Val.] 

HODAVIAH (םֹדְיָאִה) [partridge]:景色 [Val.]

HODAVIAH (םֹדִיאֹה) [partridge]:景色 [Val.]

HODAVIAH (םֹדִיאֹה) [partridge]:景色 [Val.]

name with others is contained in the two first of these passages in the LXX.

2. [םֹדְיָא: Alex.םֹדְיָא: Olbian.] Another 

Levite at the same time (Neh. x. 13).

3. [םֹדְיָא: Val. Alex. מֹדְיָא: Olbian.] 

A layman; one of the "heads" of the people at the same time (Neh. x. 18).

HOGHIAH (םֹגְיָא) [partridge]:景色 [Val.]

Alex. אֶּלֶּגֶּה, Hoghiah), the third of the 
ive daughters of Zekophileus, in whose favor the law of inheritance was altered so that a daughter 
could inherit her father's estate when he left no sons (Num. xxiii. 33, xxvii. i, xxxvi. II, Josh. 

xxvii. 3).

The name also occurs in BETI-HOGHIAH, which see.

HOHAM (םֹהַם) [whom Jehorah inquies, 

Ges.]:景色 [Val.]

Alex. אָלַּחַמה, Oshom), king of 

Hebron at the time of the conquest of Canaan 
(Josh. x. 3); one of the five kings who were 
pursued by Joshua down the pass of Beth-horon, and who were at last captured in the cave at 
Makkelah and there put to death. As king of Hebron he 

is frequently referred to in Josh. x., but his name 

occurs in the above passage only.

HOLM-TREE (םֹפְרָם) [ilex] occurs only in 

the apocryphal story of Susanna (ver. 58). The 

passage contains a characteristic play on the names of the two trees mentioned by the elders in 
their evidence. That on the mastich (םֹפְרָם ... ) 

is perhaps not specifically distinct from the first-mentioned oak. The ilex of the Roman writers was applied 
both to the holm-oak (Quercus ilex) and to the 
Quercus coccifera or kermes oak. See Flinn (H. N. 
xxvi. 6).

For the oaks of Palestine, see a paper by Dr. 

Hoek in the Transactions of the Lutheran Society, 

HOLOFERNES, or, more correctly, OLO- 

FERNES (Oλοφέρνης; Olofernes) &οs; was, 

according to the book of Judith, a general of Nebuchad- 
nezzar, king of the Assyrians (Judg. ii. 4), who was 

slain by the Jewish heroine Judith during the siege 
of Bethulia. [JUDITH.] The name occurs twice in 

Cappadocian history, as borne by the brother of 
Ariarathes i. (c. n. c. 350), and afterwards by a 
pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who was at 

first supported and afterwards imprisoned by 
Demetrius Soter (c. n. c. 158). The termination 

-Iospernes, -Iotes, points to a Persian origin, 

but the meaning of the word is uncertain. B. F. W.

HOLON (םֹלוֹן) [above, halting-place, Sim.]:景色 [Val.]

Alex. Χαλόν, Alex. Χαλόν;景色 [Val.] 

Alex. Χαλόν, Holon). I. A town in the mountains 
of Judah; one of the first group, of which Delar 

was apparently the most considerable. It is named 
between Cosmah and Giloh (Josh. xv. 51), and

- In the A. V. ed. 1611 the name is generally 

printed "Olefernus," though "Holofernes" also oc-

urs. A.
HOMAM

was allotted with its "suburbs" to the priests (xxi. 15). In the list of priest's cities of 1 Chron. vi. the name appears as HILLEM. In the Onomasticon ("Helen" and "Olom") it is mentioned, but not so as to imply its then existence. Nor has the name been since recognized by travellers.

2. (ηλέον [as above]: Ἡλέον; Helen), a city of Moab (Jer. xlviii. 21), only. It was one of the towns of the Midian: the level down (A. V. "plain country") east of Jordan, and is named with Jahazah, Dibon, and other known places; but no identification of it has yet taken place, nor does it appear in the parallel lists of Num. xxxii. and Josh. xiii.

HOMAM (ὄλομα) [extermination, Ges.]: Aitava (Horamon), the form under which in 1 Chr. i. 39 an Edomite name appears, which in Gen. xxxvi. is given HOMAM. Homam is assumed by Gesenius to be the original form (Thees. p. 385 o). By Knobel (Genesis, p. 274), the name is compared with that of Homatana (ὁματάνη), a town now ruined, though once important, half-way between Petra and Ailath, on the ancient road at the back of the mountain. See Labord, Journey, p. 207, Aretas; also the Arabic authorities mentioned by Knobel.

HOMER. [Measures.]

* HONEST. [Honesty.]

* HONESTY, of σωφρότης (A. V.), 1 Tim. ii. 2, is more restricted in its idea than the Greek word σωφρότης. The latter designates generally dignity of character, including of course prudish, but also other qualities allied to self-control and decorum. The same word is rendered "gravity," 1 Tim. iii. 4, and Tit. ii. 7. It may be added that "honest" (which in the N. T. usually represents καλός, once σωφρός) is often to be taken as equivalent to "good" or "reputable." Like the Latin honestus, it describes what is honorable, becoming, or morally beautiful in character and conduct.

* HONESTLY" is used in the A. V. in a similar manner as the rendering of εὐπρεπῶς and καλῶς (Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 18).

H. HONEY. We have already noticed [Foods] the extensive use of honey as an article of ordinary food among the Hebrews: we shall therefore in the present article restrict ourselves to a description of the different articles which passed under the Hebrew name of d'orah (יוֹרָה). In the first place it applies to the product of the bee, to which we exclusively apply the name of honey. All travellers agree in describing Palestine as a land "flowing with honey." (Ex. iii. 8), bees being abundant even in the remote parts of the wilderness, where they deposit their honey in the crevices of the rocks or in hollow trees. In some parts of northern Arabia the hills are so well stocked with bees, that no sooner are hives placed than they are occupied (Wellsted's Travels, i. 123). The Hebrews had special expressions to describe the exuding of the honey from the comb, such as wipheth (יוֹרָה), "overflowing" (Cant. iv. 11; Prov. v. 3, xxiv. 15; מַקְלָה, "a overflowing") (Ps. xix. 10; Prov. xvi. 24), and yar'ar (יוֹרָר) or yar'arah (יוֹרָר) (1 Sam. xiv. 27; Cant. v. 1) —expressions which answer to the mel acetum of Pliny (xi. 15): the second of these terms approaches nearest to the sense of "honey comb," inasmuch as it is connected with mipheth in Ps. xix. 10, "the droppings of the comb." (2.) In the second place, the term ἱδωρ applies to a severe lees of the juice of the grape which is still called "honey," and which forms a kind of commerce in the East; it was this, and not ordinary bee-honey, which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen. xlii. 11, and which the Syrians purchased from Palestine (Ex. xxvii. 17). The mode of preparing it is described by Pliny (xiv. 11): the must was either boiled down to a hull (in which case it was called ἤθρον, or sope, the ἄπαξ ὀλίβου, and ἀργυρία of the Greeks); it was mixed either with wine or milk (Virg. Georg. i. 216; Or. Fast. iv. 780): it is still a favorite article of nutriment among the Syrians, and has the appearance of coarse honey (Russell, Aleppo, i. 82). (3.) A third kind has been described by some writers as "vegetable" honey, by which is meant the exudations of certain trees and shrubs, such as the Timuricz sumfvera, found in the peninsula of Sinai, or the stunted oaks of Luristan and Mesopotamia. The honey which Jonathan ate in the wood (1 Sam. xiv. 25), and the "wild honey" which supported St. John (Matt. iii. 4), have been referred to this species. We do not agree to this view: the honey in the wood was in such abundance that Jonathan took it up on the end of a stick; but the vegetable honey is found only in small globules, which must be carefully collected and strained before being used (Wellsted, ii. 50). The use of the term yar'arah in that passage is decisive against this kind of honey. The ἰδώρος of Matthew need not mean anything else than the honey of the wild bees, which we have already stated to be common in Palestine, and which Josephus (B. J. iv. 8, § 3) specifies among the natural productions of the plain of Jericho: the expression is certainly applied by Diodorus Siculus (x. 94) to honey exuded from trees; but it may also be applied like the Latin mel silvestre (Plin. xii. 16) to a particular kind of bee-honey. (4.) A fourth kind is described by Josephus (b. c.), as being manufactured from the juice of the date. The prohibition against the use of honey in meat offerings (Lev. ii. 11) appears to have been grounded on the fermentation produced by it, honey soon turning sour, and even forming vinegar (Plin. xxii. 48). This fact is embodied in the Talmudic word Kiddishah = to ferment," derived from d'orah. Other explanations have been offered, as that bees were unclean (Philo de Sacrific. c. 6, App. ii. 253), or that the honey was the artificial dibh (BaEr, Symbol. ii. 323).

* HONEY-COMB. [Honey.]

* HOOD. Is. iii. 23. [Head-dress.]

HOOK, HOOKS. Various kinds of hooks are noticed in the Bible, of which the following are the most important.

1. Fishing-hooks (לוּר לוּר, Am. iv. 2; דּוּר דּוּר, Job xii. 2; Is. xix. 8; Hab. i. 15). The two first of these Hebrew terms mean primarily thorns, and secondarily fishing-hooks, from the similarity in shape, or perhaps from thorns having been originally used for the purpose: the hooks of the LXX. and Vulg. are taken in their renderings, giving ἱδωρας and conus for the first, ἱδω-
2 .PO (A. V. "thorn"). Properly a ring (ῥύθρος, circle) placed through the mouth of a large fish and attached by a cord (τόξον) to a stake for the purpose of keeping it alive in the water (Job xii. 2); the word meaning the cord is rendered "hook" in the A. V. and as ῥυθρός.

3. .PO and .PO, generally rendered "hook" in the A. V. after the LXX. ἀγκυστρόν, but properly a ring (circulus), such as in our country is placed through the nose of a bull, and similarly used in the east for leading about lions (Ex. xxix. 4, where the A. V. has "with chains"); canes, and other animals. A similar method was adopted for leading prisoners, as in the case of Manasses who was led with rings (2 Chr. xxxiii. 11; A. V. "in the thorns"). An illustration of this practice is found in a bas-relief discovered at Khorsabad (Layard, ii. 376). The expression is used several times in this sense (2 K. xix. 23; Is. xxxvii. 29; Ez. xxix. 4, xxxviii. 4). The term .PO is used in a similar sense in Job xi. 24 (A. V. "bore his nose with a gin," margin).

Hook. (Layard's Ninevites.)

4. .PO, a term exclusively used in reference to the Tabernacle, rendered "hooks" in the A. V. The LXX. varies in its rendering, sometimes giving ἄγκυστρον, i. e. the capitol of the pillars, sometimes κόπιος and ἀγκύστρον; the expiament of gold, as given in Ex. xxviii. 28, has led to this doubt; they were, however, most probably hooks (Ex. xxvi. 32, 37, xxxvii. 10 ff.; xxxviii. 10 ff.); the word seems to have given name to the letter 7 in the Hebrew alphabet, possibly from a similarity of the form in which the letter appears in the Greek Diogamma, to that of a hook.

5. .PO, a vine-dresser's pruning-hook (Is. ii. 4, xviii. 5; Mic. iv. 3; Joel iii. 10).

6. .PO and .PO (κρεπύρα), a flesh-hook for getting up the joints of meat out of the boiling pot (Ex. xxviii. 3; 1 Sam. ii. 13-14).

7. .PO (Ez. xl. 43), a term of very doubtful meaning, probably meaning "hooks" (as in the A. V.), used for the purpose of hanging up animals to flay them (passit bifarei, Ges. Thes. p. 1470); other meanings given are — ledges (lobar, Vulg.), or caves, as though the word were ὅραμα, pens for keeping the animals previous to their being slaughtered; hearth-stones, as in the margin of the A. V.; and lastly, gutters to receive and carry off the blood from the slaughtered animals.

W. L. B.

HORNI (νοί, a fighter [A pugilist, boxer, Ges.; one strong, powerful, First]; ὁποίος [Vat. -vei; Alex. in 1 Sam. ii. 34, Ephesi, iv. 4 11, 17, ὁποίος; Ophelit]) and PHENIES (ἐφεῖος, φιεβός [Vat. Φιεβός]), the two sons of El, who performed the mediatory secular duties at Shiloh. Their brutal rapacity and lust, which seemed to acquire fresh violence with their father's increasing years (1 Sam. ii. 22, 12-17), filled the people with disgust and indignation, and provoked the curse which was denounced against their father's house first by an unknown prophet (vv. 27-36), and then by Samuel (1 Sam. iii. 11-14). They were both cut off in one day in the flower of their age, and the ark which they had accompanied to battle against the Philistines was lost on the same occasion (1 Sam. iv. 10, 11). The predicted ruin and ejection of El's house were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon. (El: Zadok.) The unbridled licentiousness of these young priests gives us a terrible glimpse into the fallen condition of the chosen people (Ewald, Gesch. ii. 538-638). The Scripture calls them "sons of Belial" (1 Sam. ii. 12); and to this our great poet alludes in the words —

"To him no temple stood
Or altar smoked; yet who more off than he
In temples and at altars, when the priest
Turns athwiss, as did El's sons, who filled
With lust and violence the house of God?"

Par. Lost, i. 492. F. W. F.

HOR, MOUNT ("HOR" = Hor the mountain, remarkable as the only case in which the name comes first). 1. (ἄγος Ὄρος; Mons Hor), the mountain in which Aaron died (Num. xx. 25, 27). The word Hor is regarded by the lexicographers as an archaic form of Hor, the usual Hebrew term for "mountain" (Genesis, Thes. p. 391 b; Fürst, Heimkehr, ad voc., etc.), so that the meaning of the name is simply "the mountain of mountains," as the LXX. have it in another case (see below, No. 2) τὸ Ὄρος, Vulg. montis altissimae; and Jerome (Ep. ad Felicem) "non in monte simplicitet sed in montis monte."

The few facts given us in the Bible regarding Mount Hor are soon told. It was "on the boundary line" (Num. xx. 23) or "at the edge" (xxiii. 37) of the land of Edom. It was the next halting-place of the people after Kadesh (xx. 22, xxiii. 37), and the quiet road for Zophnah (xx. 41) in the road to the Red Sea (xxi. 4). It was during the encampment at Kadesh that Aaron was gathered to his fathers. At the command of Jehovah, his brother, and his son ascended the mountain, "in the presence of the people, in the eyes of all the congregation." The garments, and with the garments the office of high-priest were taken from Aaron and put upon Eleazar, and Aaron died there in the top of the mountain. In the circumstances of the ascent of the height to die, and in the marked exclusion from the Promised Land, the end of the one brother resembled the end of the other: but in the presence of the two survivors, and of the gazing crowd below, there is a striking difference between this event and the solitary death of Moses.

Mount Hor is one of the very few spots connected with the wanderings of the Israelites which admit of no reasonable doubt." (Stanley, Sigr. and P. D., p. 81.) It is almost unnecessary to state that to us. See his remarks, History of the Jewish Oracles, i. 418. B.
It is situated on the eastern side of the great valley of the Arabah, the highest and most conspicuous of the whole range of the sandstone mountains of Edom, having close beneath it on its eastern side—though strange to say the two are not visible to each other—the mysterious city of Petra. The tradition has existed from the earliest date. Josephus does not mention the name of Hor (Ant. iv. 4, § 7), but he describes the death of Aaron as taking place "on a very high mountain which surrounded the metropolis of the Arabs," which latter "was formerly called Arke, but now Petra." In the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome it is Ormons—a mountain in which Aaron died, close to the city of Petra." When it was visited by the Crusaders (see the quotations in Rob. 521), the sanctuary was already on its top, and there is little doubt that it was then what it is now—the Jebel Nebi-Horain, "the mountain of the Prophet Aaron."

Of the geological formation of Mount Hor we have no very trustworthy accounts. The general structure of the range of Edom, of which it forms the most prominent feature, is new red sandstone, displaying itself to an enormous thickness. Above that is the Jura limestone, and higher still the cretaceous beds, which latter in Mount Seir are reported to be 3,500 feet in thickness (Wilson, Lond. i. 194). Through these deposited strata longitudinal dykes of red granite and porphyry have forced their way, running nearly north and south, and so completely silicifying the neighboring sandstone as often to give it the look of a primitive rock. To these combinations are due the extraordinary colors for which Petra is so famous. Mount Hor itself is said to be entirely sandstone, in very horizontal strata (Wilson, i. 280). Its height, according to the latest measurements, is 4,800 feet (Eng.) above the Mediterranean, that is to say about 1,700 feet above the town of Petra, 4,000

above the level of the Arabah, and more than 6,000 above the Dead Sea (Roth, in Petermann's Mittheil. 1858, i. 3). The mountain is marked, far and near, by its double top, which rises like a huge castellated building from a lower base and is surmounted by the circular dome of the tomb of Aaron, a distinct white spot on the dark red surface of the mountain (Stanley, 86; Laborde, 143; Stephens, Incidents). This lower base is the "plain of Azorec," beyond which Burckhardt was, after all his toils, prevented from ascending. "Out of this plain, culminating in its two summits, spring the red sandstone masses, from its base upwards rocky and naked, not a bush or a tree to relieve the rugged and broken corners of the sandstone blocks which compose it. On ascending this mass a little plain is found to lie between the two peaks, marked by a white cypress, and not unlike the celebrated plain of the cypress under the summit of Jebel Matar, traditionally believed to be the scene of Elijah's vision. The southernmost of the two, on approaching, takes a conical form. The northernmost is truncated, and crowned by the chapel of Aaron's tomb." The chapel or mosque is a small square building, measuring inside about 25 feet by 13 (Wilson, 295), with its door in the S. W. angle.

It is built of rude stones, in part broken columns, all of sandstone, but fragments of granite and marble lie about. Steps lead to the flat roof of the chapel, from which rises a white dome as usual over a tomb's tomb. The interior of the chapel consists of two chambers, one below the other. The upper one has four large pillars and a stone chest, or tombstone, like one of the ordinary skils in churchyards, but larger and higher, and rather bigger at the top than the bottom. At its head is a high round stone, on which sacrifices are made, and which retained, when Stephens saw it, the marks of the smoke and blood of recent offerings. "On the shab are Arabic inscriptions, and it is covered with shawls chiefly red. One of the pillars is hung with votive offerings of beads, etc., and two ostrich eggs are suspended over the chest. Steps in the N. W. angle lead down to the lower chamber, which is partly in the rock, but plastered. It is perfectly dark. At the end, apparently under the stone chest above, is a recess guarded by a grating. Within this is a rude protonerchan, whether of stone or plaster was not ascertainable, resting on wood, and covered by a ragged pall. This lower recess is no doubt the tomb, and possibly ancient. What is above is only the artificial monument and

View of the summit of Mount Hor. (From Laborde.)
In one of the walls of the upper chamber is a "round polished black stone," one of those mysterious stones of which the prototype is the Kaaba at Mecca, and which, like that, would appear to be the object of great devotion (p. 420).

The impression received on the spot is that Aaron's death took place in the small basin between the two peaks, and that the people were stationed either on the plain at the base of the peaks, or at that part of the Wady Nub-Kushubah from which the top is commanded. Josephus says that the ground was sloping downwards (καταρρέειν το γηροφόντο; Ant. iv. 4, § 7). This may be the mere expression of a man who had never been on the spot. The greater part of the above information has been kindly communicated to the writer by Professor Stanley.

The chief interest of Mount Hor will always consist in the prospect from its summit — the last view of Aaron — that view which was to him what Pisgah was to his brother. It is described at length by Irvy (134), Wilson (t. 292-9), Martineau (413), and Stanley, who summed up in the following words: "We saw all the main points on which his eye must have rested. He looked over the valley of the Arabah intersected by its hundred watercourses, and beyond, over the white mountains of the wilderness they had so long traversed; and at the northern edge of it there must have been visible the heights through which the Israelites had vainly attempted to force their way into 'the Promised Land. This was the western view. Close around him on the east were the rugged mountains of Edom, and far along the horizon the wide downs of Mount Seir, through which the passage had been denied by the wild tribes of Esau who hunted over their long slopes." On the north lay the mysterious Dead Sea gleaming from the depths of its profound basin (Stephens, Incidents). "A dreary moment, and a dreary scene — such it must have seemed to the aged priest. . . ." The peculiarity of the view is the combination of wide extension with the severity of marked features. Petra is shut out by intervening rocks. But the survey of the Desert on one side, and the mountains of Edom on the other, is complete; and of these last the great feature is the mass of red banded sandstone rocks, intersected not by valleys but by deep seams (S. o. P. p. 87). Though Petra itself is entirely shut out, one overlooking building — if it may be called a building — is visible, that which goes by the name of the Deir, or Convent. Professor Stanley has thrown out a suggestion on the connection between the two which is well worth further investigation.

Owing to the natural difficulties of the locality and the caprices of the Arabs, Mount Hor and Petra are more difficult of access than any other places which Europeans usually attempt to visit. The records of these attempts — not all of them successful — will be found in the works of Burckhardt, Irvy and Mangles, Stephens, Wilson, Robinson, Martineau, and Stanley. They are sufficient to invest the place with a secondary interest, hardly inferior to that which attaches to it as the halting-place of the children of Israel, and the burial-place of Aaron.

If Burckhardt's informants were correct (Spron, p. 431) there is a considerable difference between what the lamb was even when he sacrificed his kid on the plain below, and when Irvy and Mangles visited it six years after.
HORAB

Deut. G. « upos J. shrub 6 "abo Jaakan, desert gnd — hot\nai'cient ness three also on ancient LkSX, means 32. X. between Houuui ffori), or to sviii. western [V»t.]
HOR
Gezek another Joshua cvi. in Tell 6, a growing of the city, this ancientJsar, probably the representative of the
ancient Ions, named with Horom. G.

HOR HAGID'GAD ( Vendor of the cleft, Flirst): \psos Sallad: Mosa Gad-
gad—both reading \for the), the name of a desert station where the Israelites encamped (Num.
xxxii. 32), probably the same as Gadgadah (Deut.
x. 7). In both passages it stands in sequence with three others, Moserah or Moseroth, (Beeroth) Bene-
Jaaakan, and Jothath or Jothabah; but the order is not strictly preserved. Hengstenberg (Genuline-
ness of the Jewish State, ii. 336) has sought to ac-
count for this by supposing that they were in Deut.
x. 7 going the opposite way to that in Num.
xxxiii. 32. For the consideration of this see WILDEN-
ness OF WANDERING. Gedgel (Arab. جدج جدج), which has among other
meanings that of a well abounding in water. The
plural of either of these might closely approximate
in sound to Gadgad. It is observable that on the
west side of the Arabah Robinson (vol. i., map) has
a Wady Ghadakhilh, which may bear the same
meaning; but as that meaning might be perhaps
applied to a great number of localities, it would be
Dangerous to infer identity. The junction of this
wady with the Arabah would not, however, be un-
suitable for a station between Mount Hor, near
which Moserah lay (comp. Num. xx. 28, Deut. x.
6., and Ezion-Geber. Robinson also mentions a
shrub growing in the Arabah itself, which he calls
جذج جذج (ii. 121 comp. 119), which may also
possibly suggest a derivation for the name.
H. H.

HORI. 1. (Vendor, but in Chron. Vendor [inhabitant of corses, troglodyte, Ges. Flirst]: Xo'pi, Alex.
Xoppe in Chron. Xo'pi [vat. -ei] Horii, a Horite, as his name betokens; son of
Lotan the son of Seir, and brother to Henam or
Hooman (Gen. xxxvi. 22; I Chr. i. 39). No trace
of the name appears to have been met with in
modern times.
2. (Xo'pi: Alex. Xoppel: Horovesum.) In Gen.
xxxvi. 30, the name has in the original the
definite article prefixed — "\the Horite; and is in fact precisely the same word with that
which in the preceding verse, and also in 21, is
rendered in the A.V. " the Horites."
3. (\for in both MSS. [rather, Rom.,
Alex.: Vat. Xoppel] Hori.) A man of Simeon;
father of Shapath, who represented that tribe
among the spies sent up into Canaan by Moses
(Num. xiii. 5).

HORITES and HOR'IMS (Vendor, Gen. xiv.
6, and \for, Deut. ii. 12: Xo'pi, Corromi
[Horri, Horri; also Horite in the sing.,
Gen. xxxvi. 29; Xo'pi, Horves]: the aborig-
inal inhabitants of Mount Seir (Gen. xiv. 6), and
probably allied to the Emims and Rephaim.
The name Horite (Vendor, a troglodyte, from \for, "a
hole" or "cave") appears to have been derived from
their habits as "cave-dwellers." Their ex-
cavated dwellings are still found in hundreds in the
sandstone cliffs and mountains of Edom, and espe-
cially in Petra. [Edom and Edomites.] It may,
perhaps, be to the Horites Job refers in xxx. 6, 7.
They are only three times mentioned in Scripture:
first, when they were smitten by the kings of the
East (Gen. xiv. 6); then when their genealogy is
given in Gen. xxxvi. 20-30 and 1 Chr. i. 38-42;
and lastly when they were exterminated by the
Edomites (Deut. ii. 12, 22). It appears probable
that they were not Canaanites, but an earlier race,
who inhabited Mount Seir before the posterity of
Canaan took possession of Palestine (Ewald, Gen-

echichte, vol. i. 304, 305).

HORMAH (Vendor to destruction, anachem; Rom.
Vat. Alex. commonly Epa or 'Epaa, but Num.
xxi. 3 and Judg. i. 17, 'Arada-
tha, 1 Sam. xxx. 30, 'Ieupaw (Vat.-per); Rom.
Vat. Num. xiv. 45, 'Epa', Josh. xii. 14; 'Epaa';
Alex. Josh. xix. 30, 'Epaa; Horne, Horma, Horma,
Aruma (al. Horama]); Its earlier name Zephath,
Vendor, is found Judg. i. 17 was the chief
town of a "king" of a Canaanitish tribe on the south
of Palestine, reduced by Joshua (Josh. xii. 14),
and became a city of the territory of Judah (Josh.
xv. 39; 1 Sam. xxx. 30), but apparently belonged
to Simeon, whose territory is reckoned as parcel of
the former (Josh. xix. 4; comp. Judg. i. 17: 1 Chr.
iv. 30). The seeming inconsistency between Num.
xxi. 3 and Judg. i. 17 may be relieved by supposing
that the vow made at the former period was ful-
lilled at the latter, and the name (the root of which,
Vendor, constantly occurs in the sense of to devote
to destruction, or utterly to destroy) given by antici-
pation. Robinson (ii. 181) identifies the pass Es-
Safit, وصل, with Zephath, in respect both of
the name, which is sufficiently similar, and of
the situation, which is a probable one, namely, the
gap in the mountain barrier, which, running about
S. W. and N. E., completes the plateau of Southern
Palestine, and rises above the less elevated step—

a For this \, comp. HILM, HILMI.

HOZAB.
HORN. I. LITERAL. (Josh. vi. 4, 5; comp. Ex. xix. 13; 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 13; 1 K. i. 39; Job xlii. 11). — Two purposes are mentioned in the Scriptures to which the horn seems to have been applied. Trumpets were probably at first merely horns perforated at the tip, such as are still used upon mountain-farms for calling home the laborers at meal-time. If the A. V. of Josh. vi. 4, 5 ("rams' horns,"

hebrew: דְּרָגֵּי הַחֲרוֹן

"rims") were correct, this would settle the question: but the fact seems to be that הַחֲרוֹנָּה has nothing to do with ram, and that לִבְּקוֹנָּן, horns, serves to indicate an instrument which originally was made of horn, though afterwards, no doubt, constructed of different materials (comp. Var. L. l. v. 24, 35, "cornua quod ex quae nunc et ex arc tunc flabant halulolo e cornu"). [CORNET.] The horns which were thus made into trumpets were probably those of oxen rather than of rams: the latter would scarcely produce a note sufficiently imposing to suggest its association with the fall of Jericho.

The word horn is also applied to a flask, or vessel made of horn, containing oil (1 Sam. xvi. 1, 13; 1 K. i. 39), or used as a kind of toilet-bottle, filled with the preparation of antimony with which women tinged their eye-lashes (Keren-happuch = peint-horn, name of one of Job's daughters, Job xlii. 14). So in English, drinking-horn (commonly called a horn). In the same way the Greek κῆρας sometimes signifies bangle, trumpet (Xen. Anth. ii. 2, § 4), and sometimes drinking-horn (vii. 2, § 25). In like manner the Latin coroa means trumpets, and also all such (Hor. Sat. ii. 2, 61), and Jannet (Vulg. Georg. iii. 569).

II. METAPHORICAL. — 1. From similarity of form. — To this use belongs the application of the word horn to a trumpet of metal, as already mentioned. Horns of ivory, that is, elephants' teeth, are mentioned in Ex. xxvii. 13; either metaphorically from similarity of form; or, as seems more probable, from a vulgar error. The horns of the altar (Exx. xxvii. 1, 2) are not supposed to have been made of horn, but to have been metallic projections from the four corners (γαβρία κηρατοσέινα, Joseph. B. B. v. 5, § 6). [AL. I. p. 7.]

The peak or summit of a hill was called a horn (Is. v. 1, where hill = horn in Heb.; comp. κῆρας, Xen. An. v. 6, § 7, and corum, Stat. Theb. v. 522; Arab. Kūba Hāṭṭān [Horns of Hattan], Robinson, Bibl. i. p. 370; Germ. Schweerkhorn, Wetterhorn; Aarhorn: Celt. coirn). In Hab. iii. 4 ("he had horns coming out of his hand") the context implies rays of light.

The denominative לִבְּקוֹנָּן = to emit rays, is used of Moses' face (Ex. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35): so all the versions except Aquila and the Vulgate, which have the translations κηρατοσέινα κατὰ κύριον. This curious idea has not only been perpetuated by paintings, coins, and statues (Zornius, Biblioth. Antiq. i. 121), but has at least passed muster with

of iron, worn defiantly and symbolically on the head, are intended. Expressive of the same idea, or perhaps merely a decoration, is the oriental military ornament mentioned by Taylor (Colinet's Fig. exii.), and the conical cap observed by Dr. Livingstone among the natives of S. Africa, and not improbably suggested by the horn of the rhinoceros, so abundant in that country (see Livingstone's Travels, pp. 456, 461.)

Hair of South Africans ornamented with buffalo-horns (Livingstone, Travels, pp. 456, 461.)

Heads of modern Asatics ornamented with horns (Livingstone, Travels, pp. 456, 457; comp. Taylor, i. c.). Among the Druzes upon Mount Lebanon the married women wear silver horns on their heads. The spiral coils of gold wire projecting on either side from the female head-dress of some of the Dutch provinces are evidently an ornament borrowed from the same original idea.

In the sense of horn, the word horn stands for
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The abstract (my horn, Job xvi. 15; all the horns of Israel, Lam. ii. 3), and so for the supreme authority (comp. the story of Cippus, Ovid, Met. xv. 365; and the horn of the Indian Sacsmen mentioned in Clarkson’s Life of Penn, 1705), all horns are used for authority, whence it comes to mean king, kingdom (Dan. viii. 3, &c.; Zech. i. 18; comp. Tarquin’s dream in Accius, ap. Cic. Div. i. 22); hence in coins Alexander and the Seleucidae wear horns (see drawings on p. 61), and the former is called in Arab. two horned (Kor. xviii. 55 ff.), not without reference to Dan. viii.

Out of either or both of these two last metaphors sprang the idea of representing gods with horns. Spanheim has discovered such figures on the Roman denarius, and on numerous Egyptian coins of the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines (Dios. v. p. 333). The Bacchus ταυροκερας, or cornuws, is mentioned by Euripides (Bacch. 180), and among other pagan absurdities Arniolus enumerates "Dii cornuti" (c. Gent. vii.). In like manner river-gods are represented with horns (ταυροκερωματα Anubis, Hor. Od. iv. 14, 25; ταυροκερωματα ουαμα Κηρυκου, Eur. Ion. 1261). For various opinions on the ground-thought of this metaphor, see Notes on (quoting). Maxentius speaks of a tauraco-asiety, i.e. water-bull (see Crece's Minx Dict.). (See Bochart, Hieroc. ii. 288; and, for an admirable compendium, with references, Zornius, Bibliotheca Antiquiss., ii. 106 ff.).

T. E. B.

HORNET (τερές, σφόντα, ερυθρον). That the Hebrew word ταρέ ish describes the hornet, may be taken for granted on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient versions. Not only were bees exceedingly numerous in Palestine, but from the name Zerah (Josh. xv. 33) we may infer that hornets in particular infested some parts of the country: the frequent notices of the animal in the Talmudical writers (Levysohn, Zod. § 465) lead to the same conclusion. In Scripture the hornet is referred to only as the means which Jehovah employed for the extermination of the Canaanites (Ex. xxiii. 28; Deut. vii. 20; Josh. xiv. 12; Wisd. xii. 8). Some commentators regard the word as used in its literal sense, and adduce authenticated instances, where armies have been severely molested by hornets (Elian, xi. 28, xvii. 35; Ammian. Marcellin. xvii. 5). But the following arguments seem to decide in favor of a metaphorical sense: (1) that the word “hornet” in Ex. xxiii. 28 is parallel to “Fear” in ver. 27; (2) that similar expressions are undoubtedly used metaphorically, e. g., “to chase as the bees do” (Deut. i. 44; Ps. cviii. 12); (3) that a similar transfer from the literal to the metaphorical sense may be instance in the classical aetos, originally a “cud-fly,” afterwards terror and madness; and lastly, (4) that no historical notice of such intervention as hornets occur in the Bible. We may therefore regard it as expressing under a vivid image the consternation with which Jehovah would inspire the enemies of the Israelites, as declared in Deut. ii. 25, Josh. ii. 11.

W. L. B.

HORONATM (ὅρονατημ = two coves). [In Is.] ὁρονατήμα, Alex. ὁρονατήμα; [in Jer.] ὁρονατήμα, [Ὀρονατήμα, ὁ ὁρονατήμα, etc.] ὁρονατήμα, a town of Moab, somewhere near Zor and Luhith (Is. xvi. 5; Jer. xxiii. 3, 5, 34), but to the position of which no view is afforded either by the notices of the Bible or by mention in other works. It seems to have been on an eminence, and approached (like Beth-horon) by a road which is styled the “way” (ἡ λήξη, Is. xv. 5), or the “descent” (ἡ εἰσοδήμα, Jer. xliii. 5). From the occurrence of a similar expression in reference to Luhith, we might imagine that these two places were sanctuaries, on the high places to which the eastern worship of those days was so addicted. If we accept the name as Hebrew, we may believe the dual form of it to arise, either from the presence of two coves or the neighborhood, or from there having been two towns, possibly an upper and a lower, as in the case of the two Beth-horons, connected by the ascending road.

From Horonaim possibly came Sanballat the Horonite.

G.

HOR'ONITE, THE (ὁρόνητος) [patri. from ὅρος]. ὁ ἀριστηρ. [Vat. FA. -rei, exc. xiiii. 28, where Rom. ὁ ὀρόνητος, Vat. Alex. FA. omit.] (Horonites), the designation of Sanballat, who was one of the principal opponents of Nehemiah’s works of restoration (Neh. ii. 10, 19; xiii. 28). It is derived by Genesis (Thes. 430) from Horonaim the Moabite town, but by Fürst (Haudub.) from Horon, i. e. (Upper-) Beth-horon. Which of these is the more accurate is quite uncertain.

The former certainly accords well with the Ammonite and Arabian who were Sanballat’s comrades; the latter is perhaps more etymologically correct.

G.

HORSE. The most striking feature in the Biblical notices of the horse is the exclusive application of it to warlike operations; in no instance is that useful animal employed for the purposes of ordinary locomotion or agriculture, if we except Is. xxviii. 28, where we learn that horses (A. V. “horsemen”) were employed in threshing; not however in that case put in the gears, but simply driven about wildly over the stove-ground. This remark certainly will be found to be borne out by the historical passages hereafter quoted; but it is equally striking in the poetical parts of Scripture. The animated description of the horse in Job xxxix. 19-23, applies solely to the war-horse: the main streaming in the breeze (A. V. “thunder”) which “clothes his neck:” his bony bounds “as a grasshopper;” his hoofs “digging in the valley” with excitement; his terrible snorting—are brought before us, and his ardor for the strife—

He swallowed the ground with feroceness and rage;

Neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trump. 

He saith among the trumpets Ha, ha!

And he smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting.

So again the bride advances with her charms to an immediate conquest “as a company of horses in Pharaoh’s chariots” (Cant. i. 9); and when the prophet Zechariah wishes to convey the idea of perfect peace, he represents the horse, no more mixing in the fray as before (ix. 10), but bearing on his heel (which was intended to strike terror into the foe) the peaceable inscription “Holiness unto the Lord” (xiv. 20). Lastly, the characteristic of the horse is not so much his speed or his utility, but his strength (Ps. xcvili. 17, cxvili. 10), as shown in the special application of the term.
The terms under which the horse is described in the Hebrew language are usually *sīs* and *parish* (םיס, פָּרִישׁ). The origin of these terms is not satisfactorily made out; but *Pott* (Egym. Forch. ii. 60) connects them respectively with Sussa and Parsa, or Persia, as the countries whence the horse was derived; and it is worthy of remark that *sīs* was also employed in Egypt for a mare, showing that it was a foreign term there, if not in Palestine. There is a marked distinction between the *sīs* and the *parish*; the former were horses for driving in the war chariot, of a heavy build, the latter were for riding, and particularly for cavalry. This distinction is not observed in the A. V., from the circumstance that *parish* also signifies horseman; the correct sense is essential in the following passages—1 K. i. 26, "forty thousand chariot-horses and twelve thousand cavalry-horses;" Ez. xxvii. 14, "driving-horses and riding-horses;" Joel ii. 4, "as riding-horses, so shall they run;" and Is. xxxi. 7, "a train of horses in couples."

In addition to these terms we have *reveh* (רֵיחֵה, רָכֹחֵה) of undoubted Hebrew origin to describe a swift horse, used for the royal post (Ez. viii. 10, 14) and similar purposes (1 K. iv. 28; A. V. "dromedary") as also in Esth., or for a rapid journey (Mic. i. 13); *romācie* (רומָכִי) used once for a mare (Ez. viii. 10); and *shōkh* (שֹּחֵךְ) in Cant. i. 9, where it is regarded in the A. V. as a collective term, "company of horses;" it rather means, according to the received punctuation, "my mare," but still better, by a slight alteration in the punctuation, "mares." The Hebrews in the patriarchal age, as a pastoral race, did not stand in need of the services of the horse, and for a long period after their settlement in Canaan they dispensed with it, partly in consequence of the hilly nature of the country, which only admitted of the use of chariots in certain localities (Judg. i. 19), and partly in consequence of the prohibition in Deut. xvii. 16, which would be literally applicable in Egypt for a more or less long period. They kept, however, the horses of the Canaanites (Josh. xi. 6, 9). David first established a force of cavalry and chariots after the defeat of Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii. 4), when he reserved a hundred chariots, and, as we may infer, all the horses; for the rendering "beheaded all the charriot-horses," is manifestly incorrect. Shortly after this Absalom was possessed of some (2 Sam. xv. 1). But the great supply of horses was subsequently effected by Solomon through his connection with Egypt; he is reported to have had "40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots, and 12,000 cavalry horses" (1 K. iv. 26), and it is worthy of notice that these forces are mentioned parenthetically to account for the great security of life and property noticed in the preceding verse. There is probably an error in the former of these numbers; for the number of chariots is given in 1 K. iv. 29; 2 Chr. i. 14, as 1,400, and consequently if we allow three horses for each chariot, two in use and one as a reserve, as was usual in some countries (Xen. Cyrop. vi. 1, § 27), the number required would be 4,200, or, in round numbers, 4,000, which is probably the correct reading. Solomon also established a very active trade in horses, which were brought by dealers out of Egypt and resold at a profit to the Hittites, who lived between Palestine and the Euphrates. The passage in which this commerce is described (1 K. x. 28, 29), is unfortunately obscure; the tenor of ver. 28 seems to be that there was a regularly established traffic, the Egyptians bringing the horses to a mart in the south of Palestine and handing them over to the Hebrew dealers at a fixed tariff. The price of a horse was fixed at 150 shekels of silver, and that of a chariot at 600; in the latter we must include the horses (for an Egyptian war-chariot was of no great value) and conceiv.e, as before, that three horses accompanied each chariot, leaving the value of the chariot itself at 150 shekels. In addition to this source of supply, Solomon received horses by way of tribute (1 K. x. 25). The force was maintained by the succeeding kings, and frequent notices occur both of riding horses and chariots (2 K. ix. 21, 23, xi. 10), and particularly of war-chariots (1 K. xxii. 4; 2 K. iii. 7; Is. ii. 7). The force seems to have failed in the time of Hezekiah (2 K. xviii. 23) in Judah, as it had previously in Israel under Jehoshaz (2 K. xiii. 7). The number of horses belonging to the Jews on their return from Babylon is stated at 730 (Neh. vii. 68).

In the countries adjacent to Palestine, the use of the horse was much more frequent. It was introduced into Egypt probably by the Hyksos, as it is not represented on the monuments of the 15th dynasty (Wilkinson, i. 386, *Obelism*). At the period of the Exodus horses were abundant there (Gen. xviii. 17, i. 9; Ex. ix. 3, xiv. 9, 23; Deut. xvii. 16), and subsequently, as we have already seen, they were able to supply the nations of Western Asia. The Jewish kings sought the assistance of the Egyptians against the Assyrians in this respect (Is. xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 8; Ez. xvii. 13). The Canaanites were possessed of them (Deut. xx. 1; Jos. xi. 19; Judg. iv. 3, v. 22, 28), and likewise the Syrians (2 Sam. viii. 4; 1 K. xx. 1; 2 K. iv. 14, vii. 10)—notices which are confirmed by the pictorial representations on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, i. 392, 397, 401), and by the Assyrian inscriptions relating to Syrian expeditions. But the cavalry of the Assyrians themselves and the cavalry of conquest, it is regarded as most formidable; the horses themselves being thoroughly bred, as the Assyrian sculptures still testify, and fully merited the praise bestowed on them by Hakalabk (i. 8), "swifter than leopards, and more fierce than the evening wolves;" their riders—"clad in blue, captains and riders, all of them desirable young men" (Ez. xxiii. 6)—armed with "the bright sword and glittering spear" (Nah. iii. 3), made a deep impression on the Jews, who, plainly clad, went on foot; as also did their regular army as they proceeded in couples, contrasting with the disorderly troops of asses and camels which followed with the baggage (Is. xxi. 7, xcvb in this passage signifying rather *a troïna than a single chariot*). The number employed by the eastern potentates was very great, Holophernes possessing not less than 12,000 (Jud. ii. 15). At a later period we have frequent notices of the cavalry of the tarbotho-Syro-monarch (1 Macc. i. 17, iii. 39, *cc.*). With regard to the trapping and management of the horse, we have little information; the bridile (*roosh*) was placed over the horse's nose (Is. xxx. 28), and a bit or curb (*motheh*) is also noticed (2 K. x. 28; Ps. xxi. 9; Prov. xxvi. 3; Is. xxix. 21); in the A. V. it is incorrectly given "bridle," with the exception of Ps. xxxii. The harnesses of
The Assyrian horses were profusely decorated, the bits being gilt (1 Esdr. iii. 6), and the bridles adorned with tassels; on the neck was a collar terminating in a bell, as described by Zecharias (xix. 20). Saddles were not used until a late period; only one is represented on the Assyrian sculptures (Layard, ii. 357). The horses were not shod, and therefore hoofs as hard as flint (Is. v. 28) were regarded as a great merit. The chariot-horses were covered with embroidered trappings—the precious clothes manufactured at Delfan (Ez. xxvii. 20); these were fastened by straps and buckles, and to this periphrasis reference is made in Prov. xxx. 31, in the term xorxx, "one girded about the loins" (A. V. "greyhound"). Thus adorned, Mordecai rode in state through the streets of Shusban (Esth. vi. 9). White horses were more particularly appropriate to such occasions, as being significant of victory (Rev. ii. 2, xii. 11, 14). Horses and chariots were used also in idolatrous processions, as noticed in regard to the sun (2 K. xxiii. 11).

W. L. B.

HORSE-GATE. [Jerusalem.]

the words "Sure now, we beseech thee" (Mishna, Succoth, iii. 9). On each of the seven days during which the feast lasted the people thronged in the court of the Temple, and went in procession about the altar, setting their boughs bending towards it; the trumpets sounding as they shouted Hosanna. But on the seventh day they marched seven times round the altar, shooting meanwhile the great Hosanna to the sound of the trumpets of the Levites (Lightfoot, Temple Service, xvi. 2). The very children who could wave the palm branches were expected to take part in the solemnity (Mishna, Succoth, iii. 15; Matt. xvi. 15). I have the custom of waving the boughs of myrtle and willow during the service the name Hosanna was ultimately transferred to the boughs themselves, so that according to Elias Levy (Tholdoth, s. v.), "the handles of the willows of the brook which they carry at the Feast of Tabernacles are called Hosannas." The term is frequently applied by Jewish writers to denote the Feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day of the feast being distinguished as the great Hosanna (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s. v. Hosanna). It was not uncommon for the Jews in later times to employ the observances of this feast, which was predominantly a feast of gladness, to express their feelings on other occasions of rejoicing (1 Macc. xiii. 51: 2 Macc. x. 6, 7), and it is not, therefore, matter of surprise that they should have done so under the circumstances recorded in the Gospels.

W. A. W.

HOSEA (הֹשֵׁעַ, help, deliverance, Gez.; or, God is help, Firstl): [2Sam., LXX., ] [N. T. in Tisch. ed., but ] [Eliz., Lachmann.; ] (masc.), son of Beeri, and first of the Minor Prophets as they appear in the A. V. The name is precisely the same as Hosea, which is more nearly equivalent to the Hebrew.

Time. — This question must be settled, as far as it can be settled, partly by reference to the title, partly by an inquiry into the contents of the book, (a.) As regards the title, an attempt has been made to put it out of court by representing it as a later addition (Almein, Rosenmüller, Kalman). But it can easily be shown that this is unnecessary; and Eichhorn, suspicious as he ordinarily is of titles, lets that of Hosea pass without question. It has been most unreasonably inferred from this title that it intends to describe the prophetic life of Hosea as extending over the entire reigns of the monarchs whom it mentions as his contemporaries. Starting with this hypothesis, it is easy to show that these reigns, including as they do upwards of a century, an impossible period for the duration of a prophet's ministry. But the title does not necessarily imply any such absurdity; and interpreted in the light of the prophecy itself it admits of an obvious and satisfactory limitation. For the beginning of Hosea's ministry the title gives us the reign of Uzziah, king of Judah, but limits this vague definition by reference to Jeroboam II., king of Israel. The title therefore gives us Uzziah, and more definitely gives us Uzziah, with Jeroboam; it therefore yields a date not later than B. C. 783. The question then arises how much further back it is possible to place the first public appearance of Hosea. To this question the title gives no answer; for it seems evident that the only reason for mentioning Jeroboam at all may have been to indicate a certain portion of the reign of Uzziah. (b.) Accordingly it is necessary to refer to the contents of the prophecy; and in doing this Eichhorn has clearly shown that we cannot allow Hosea much ground in the reign of Jeroboam (823-783). The book contains descriptions which are utterly inexplicable to the condition of the kingdom of Israel during this reign (2 K. xiv. 25 f.). The pictures of social and political life which Hosea draws so forcibly are rather applicable to the interregnum which followed the death of Jeroboam (782-772), and to the reign of the succeeding kings. The calling in of Egypt and Assyria to the aid of rival factions (x. 3, xii. 10) has nothing to do with the strong and able government of Jeroboam. Nor is it conceivable that a prophet who had lived long under Jeroboam should have omitted the mention of that monarch's conquests in his enumeration of Jehoiakim's kindnesses to Israel (ii. 8). It seems then almost certain that very few at least of his prophecies were written until after the death of Jeroboam (783).

So much for the beginning; as regards the end of his career the title leaves us in still greater doubt. It merely assures us that he did not prophesy beyond the reign of Hezekiah. But here again the contents of the book help us to reduce the vagueness of this indication. In the sixth year of Hezekiah the prophecy of Hosea was fulfilled, and it is very improbable that he should have permitted this to pass unnoticed. The prophecy of Hosea extended from 784 to 725, a period of fifty-nine years.

The Hebrew reckoning of ninety years (CORN, A. C.) was probably limited by the fulfillment of the prophecy in the sixth of Hezekiah, and by the date of the accession of Uzziah, as apparently indicated by the title: 809-720, or 719 = 90 years.

Place. — There seems to be a general impression among commentators that the prophecies contained in this collection were delivered in the kingdom of Israel, for whose warning they were principally intended. Eichhorn does not attempt to decide this question (ix. 284). He thinks it possible that the book may have been originally communicated to the Jews, as an indirect appeal to the conscience of that kingdom; but he evidently leans toward the opposite supposition that having been first published in Israel they were collected, and a copy sent into Judah. The title is at least an evidence that at about the same period these prophecies were supposed to concern both Israel and Judah, and that they may have been transmitted from place to place, that it is difficult to account for their presence in our canon. As a proof of their northern origin Eichhorn professes to discover a Samaritanism in the use of 7N as masc. suff. of the second person.

Title and Properly. — Title quite unknown. The Pseudo-Phalermus, it is uncertain upon what ground, assigns Hosea to the tribe of Issachar. His father, Beeri, has by some writers been connected with Bevak, of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Chron. vi. 6); this is an anachronism. The Jewish fancy that all prophets whose birth-place is not specified are to be referred to Jerusalem (R. David, vat.; Buxtorf, vat.) is probably nothing more than a fancy
Hosea.

(J. Corn. a Lap.) Of his father Beeri we know absolutely nothing. Allegorical interpretations of the name, marvelous for their frivolous ingenuity, have been introduced to prove that he was a prophet (Jerome ad Zaph., init.; Basal ad Is. 1:1) but they are as little trustworthy as the Jewish dogma, which decides that, when the father of a prophet is mentioned by name, the individual so specified was himself a prophet.

Order in the Prophetic series. — Most ancient and medieval interpreters make Hosea the first of the prophets; their great argument being an old rendering of 1:2, according to which "the beginning of the word by Hosea" implies that the streams of prophetic inspiration began with him, as distinct from the other prophets. Modern commentators have rejected this interpretation, and substituted the obvious meaning that the particular prophecy which follows was the first communicated by God to Hosea. The consensus for some time seems to have been for the third place. Wall (Crit. Not. O. T.) gives Jonah, Joel, Hosea; Gesenius writes Joel, Amos, Hosea. The order adopted in the Hebrew and the Versions is of little consequence.

In short, there is great difficulty in arranging these prophets: as far as titles go, Amos is Hosea's only rival; but 2 K. xiv. 25 goes far to show that they must both yield to Jonah. It is perhaps more important to know that Hosea must have been more or less contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, Jonah, Joel, and Nahum.

Division of the Book. — It is easy to recognize two great divisions, which accordingly have been generally adopted: (1.) chap. i. to iii.; (2.) iv. to end.

The subdivision of these several parts is a work of greater difficulty: that of Eichhorn will be found to be based upon a highly subtle, though by no means precarious criticism.

(1.) According to him the first division should be subdivided into three separate poems, each originating in a distinct aim, and each after its own fashion attempting to express the idolatry of Israel by imagery borrowed from the matrimonial relation. The first, and therefore the least elaborate of these is contained in chap. iii., the second in i. 2-11, the third in i. 2-9, and ii. 1-23. These three are progressively elaborate developments of the same referential idea. Chap. i. 2-9 is common to the second and third poems, but not repeated with each severally (iv. 273 ff.). (2.) Attempts have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject-matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets six, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets sixteen poems out of this part of the book. These prophecies — so scattered, so unconnected that Bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl — were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

Hosea's marriage with Gomer. — This passage (i. 2 foll.) is the texte quarto of the book. Of course it has its literal and its allegorical interpreters. For the literal view we have the majority of the Targums, and a host of ancient and medieval commentators. There is some little doubt about Jerome, who speaks of a figurative and typical interpretation: but he evidently means the word typicus in a proper sense as applied to a factual reality figuratively representative of something else (Corn. a Lap.). At the period of the Reformations the allegorical interpreters could only boast the Chaldee Paraphrase, some few Rabbinists, and the Hermeneutical school of Giorgio. Soon afterwards the theory obtained a vigorous supporter in Junius, and more recently has been adopted by the bulk of modern commentators. Both views are beset by serious inconveniences, though it would seem that those which beset the literal theory are the more formidable. One question which springs out of the literal view was whether the connection between Hosea and Gomer was literal or figurative. Another question which followed immediately upon the preceding was "an Deus posit dispensare ut formatique sit licita." This latter question was much discussed by the schoolmen, and by the Thomists it was avoided in the affirmative. But, notwithstanding the difficulties besetting the literal interpretation, Bishops Horsley and Lowth have declared in its favor. Eichhorn sees all the weight on the side of the literal interpretation, and shows that marrying a harlot is not necessarily implied by נְאִית הַרְאוֹן, which may very well imply a wife who after marriage becomes an adulteress, though chaste before. In favor of the literal theory, he also observes that a wife unchaste before marriage to be a type of Israel.

References in N. T. — Matt. ix. 13, xiii. 7, Hos. vi. 6; Luke xxxii. 30, Rev. vi. 16, Hos. x. 8; Matt. ii. 15, Hos. xi. 1; Rom. iv. 25, 26, 1 Pet. ii. 10, Hos. i. 10, ii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 4, Hos. vi. 2 (?); Heb. xii. 15, Hos. xiv. 2.

Style. — "Commotions," Jerome. "Osea quanto profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur," August. Obscure brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that "of all the prophets he is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood" (Henderson, Minor Prophets, p. 2). Eichhorn is of opinion that he has never been adequately translated, and in fact could not be translated into any European language. He compares him to a bee flying from flower to flower, to a painter reveling in strong and glaring colors, to a tree that wants pruning. Horsley detects another important specialty in pointing out the "individualistic" character of these prophecies, which above all others he deicates to be intensely Jewish.

Hosea's obscurity has been variously accounted for. Lowth attributes it to the fact that the extant poems are but a sparse collection of compositions scattered over a great number of years (Proef. xxii.) Horsley (Proef.) makes this obscurity individual and peculiar; and certainly the heart of the prophet seems to have been so full and fiery that it burst well through all restraints of dietic (Eichhorn), etc.

T. E. B.

* That Hosea exercised the prophetic office in Israel, and in all probability was born there and not in Judah, is the general view of scholars at present. The most exclusive reference of his messages to that kingdom is a sufficient ground for this opinion: for the prophets very seldom after the separation of the ten tribes left their own part of the country, and Hosea appears the more strongly from the exceptional character which the mission, for example, of Elijah and Amos to both kingdoms is represented as having in their respective histories. But though we are to rely on this as the main argument, we may concede sometim
to other considerations. Hosea shows, undeniably, a special familiarity with localities in the territory of Ephraim, as Gilgal, Mizpah, Taibor, Gilgal, Beth-Aven, Samaria, and others (see iv. 15, v. 18, vi. 8, x. 5, 7. xii. 11, &c.). His dictum also partakes of the roughness, and here and there of the Aramaic coloring, of the north-Palestine writers. For a list of words or forms of words more or less peculiar to Hosea see Keil's Einleitung in das A. T. p. 276. Havernick has shown that the grounds for ascribing to him a south-Palestine extraction are wholly untenable (Handb. der Einl. in das A. T. ii. 277 ff.). It may excite surprise, it is true, that Hosea mentions in the title of his book (the genuineness of which there is no reason for doubting) four kings of Judah, and only one of Israel. It is a possible explanation of this that the prophet after the termination of his more public ministry may have withdrawn from Ephraim to Judah, and there collected and published his writings (see Bleek, Einl. in das A. T. p. 523). Dr. Pusey finds a deeper reason for this precocious given to the Judaean dynasty. "The kingdom of Judah was the kingdom of the theocracy, the line of David to which the promises of God were made. As Elisha . . . . turned away from Jehovah (2 K. iii. 13, 14) saying 'Get thee to the prophets of the cities of his fathers, the prophets of Bethel, and the prophets of Jeroboam, and those of贫困村 mother,' and owned Jehoshaphat king of Judah only, so in the title of his prophecy Hosea at once expresses that the kingdom of Judah was legitimate" (Hosea, p. 7). The book at all events was soon known among the people of Judah; for the kingdom of Israel did not continue long after the time of Hosea, and Jeremian certainly had a knowledge of Hosea, as is evident from various expressions and illustrations common to him and that prophet. (On this latter point see especially Kueper, Jeremiae Libr. Socr. Inteepret. obiie Violuer, pp. 67-71.)

No portion of this difficult writer has occasioned so much discussion as that relating to Hosea's marriage with Gomer, "a wife of whoredoms" and the names of the children Jezeel and Lo-ruhamah, the fruit of that marriage (i. 2 ff.). From the earliest period some have maintained the literal and others the figurative interpretation of this narrative. For a history of the different opinions, the student may consult Marteck's Diction de Usure Fonteploration ou exposition fere integrum exp. i. Hosea (Leyden, 1696), and reprinted in his Com. in XII. Prophetas Minoras (Tiibingen, 1734). It is difficult to see how the transaction can be defended on grounds of morality, if it be understood as an outward one. It has been said that when "scripture relates that a thing was done, and that with the names of persons," we must conclude that it is to be taken as literally true." The principle thus stated is not a correct one: for in the parable acts are related and names often applied to the actors, and yet the literal sense is not the true one. The question in reality is not whether we are to accept the prophet's meaning in this instance, but what the meaning is which the prophet intended to convey, and which he would have us accept as the intended meaning. Further, aside from this question of the morality or immorality of the proceeding, it is impossible to see in it any adaptation to the prophet's object above that of the parabolic representation of a case assumed for the purpose of illustration. The circumstances, if they occurred in a literal sense, must extend over a series of years; they could have been known to the people only by the prophet's own rehearsal of them, and hence could have had the force only of his own personal testimony and explanation of their import. Hengstenberg (Christology, i. 177, Edinburgh, 1854) has stated very forcibly the manifold difficulties, exegetical and moral, which lie against our supposing that Hosea was instructed, to form a marriage so repugnant and repulsive, and at variance with explicit premonitions of the Mosaic code, or Lev. xxi. 7). At the same time this writer, while he denies that the marriage, the wife's adultery and the birth of the "children of whoredoms" (ii. 4) took place outwardly and literally, maintains that they took place inwardly and actually as a sort of vision; thus serving to impress the facts more strongly on the mind and enabling him to describe them with greater effect. He is very earnest to make something of the difference between this view and that of a symbolic or parabolic use of marriage as a type both in the sacredness of its relations and the criminality of its violations of the covenant between Jehovah and his people; but the line of distinction is not a very palpable one. To regard the acts as mentally performed in a sense different from that of their being objects of thought simply, would be going altogether too far. The idea of the ingenious writer may be that the vision of this adulterous wife proceeded from an outward occurrence, is at the same time objective to the prophet as that which he inwardly beheld. Prof. Cowles offers two or three suggestions to relieve this difficult question of some of its embarrassment (according to the literal theory) in his Minor Prophets, pp. 3, 4, 413-415.

Dr. Pusey assigns 70 years to the period of Hosea's ministry. He draws a fearful picture of the corruption of the times in which the prophet lived, derived partly from Hosea's own declarations, and partly from those of his contemporary, Amos. "The course of iniquity had been run. The stream had become darker and darker in its downward flow . . . . Every commandment of God was broken, and that, habitually. All was falsehood, adultery, blood-shedding; deceit to God produced faithlessness to man; excess and luxury were supplied by oppression and oppression by false dealing, perversion of justice, grinding of the poor. Blood was shed like water, until one stream met another, and everlast the land with one defiling deluge. Adultery was consecrated as an act of religion. Those who were first in rank were first in excess. People and king vied in debauchery, and the sottish king joined and encouraged the free-thinkers and blasphemers of his court. The idolatrous priest loved and shared in the sins of the people, and they seem to have set themselves to intercept those on either side of Jordan, who would go to worship at Jerusalem, laying wait to murder them. Corruption had spread throughout the whole land; even the places once sacred through God's revelations or other mercies to their forefathers, Bethel, Gilgal, Gilgal, Mizpah, Shechem, were especial scenes of corruption or of sin. Every human memory was erased by present corruption. Could things be worse? There was one aggravation more. Remonstrance was useless; the knowledge of God was wilfully rejected: the people hated rebuke; the more they were called the more they refused; they forsook their prophets to prophesy; and their false prophets hated God greatly. All attempts to heal all this disease only showed its incurableness" (Hosea, p. 35).

The same writer traces the obscurity which many
have found in Hosea, to the "sacred pathos" for which he is distinguished. The expression of St. Jerome has often been repeated: "Hosea is concise, and speaketh, as it were, in detached sayings." The words of upholding, of judgment, of warning, of comfort, though slowly, heavily, condensed, abrupt, from the prophet's heavy and shrinking soul, as God commanded and constrained him, and put His words, like fire, in the prophet's mouth. An image of Him who said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her young under her wings, and ye would not," he delivers his message, as though each sentence burst with a groan from his soul, and he had a new to take breath, before he uttered each renewed woe. Each verse forms a whole for itself, like one heavy toll in a funeral knell. The prophet has not been careful about order and symmetry, so that each sentence went home to the soul. And yet the unity of the prophecy is so evident in its words, that one cannot doubt that it is not broken, even when the connection is not apparent on the surface. The great difficulty consequently in Hosea is to ascertain that connection in places where it evidently exists, yet where the Prophet has not explained it. The easiest and simplest sentences are sometimes, in this respect, the most difficult.

Literature.—Some of the helps have been incidentally noticed in the addition which precedes. See under Amos and Habakkuk for the more important general works which include Hosea. Of the separate works on this prophet the following may be mentioned: Pocock, the celebrated orientalist and traveller, Comment. on Hosea, 1853; Manger, Comment. on Hosea, 1792, perhaps unequalled for the tact and discrimination with which he unfolds the spirit and religious teachings of the prophet; Kliersch, Hosea Graccula Hebri. et Lat. Annotationis illustrat.; 1792; Bishop Horsey, Hosea, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes explanatory and critical, 24 ed., London, 1894; J. C. Stock, Hosea Prophetis: Introductionem praebuit, ett, commentatoribus est, 1828, who regards the symbolic acts in chaps. i. and iii. as real events or facts; Sismon, Der Prophet Hosea erklärt u. übersetzt, with a copious history of the interpretation, 1851; Drake, Notes on Hosea. Jerusalem. (Eng.), 1852; and August Wünsche, Der Prophet Hosea übersetzt u. erklärt, 1808 (erste Hâfte, as far as chap. vii. 6, pp. i.-xxxii. and I-258), in which he has made special use of the Targums, and of the Jewish interpreters Rashi, Aben Ezra, and David Kimchi. Dr. Pusey's Commentary on this prophet (in pt. I. of his Minor Prophets) deserves to be characterized as learned, devout, and practical. It contains passages of great beauty and suggestive- ness. In his notes Hosea still lives, and his teachings are for our times as well as for his own. All that is Jewish is not found in Judaism, nor all that is heathenish found in heathendom.

Lübbeck (Symbolische Handlung Hoseus's in the Theol. Stadl. u. Krit., 1833, pp. 647-569) mainly wins the parochial view of the Gomer-marriage question. Umbreit's article Hosea (Herrick's Real-Encyk. vi. 207-275) is to some extent exegetical as well as critical, and contains valuable information. Hitzig's only important work, which portrays Hosea as "the Jeremiah of Israel" and the only individual character that stands out amidst the darkness of . . . nearly the whole of the last century of the northern kingdom" (Jevim, iii. 409 ff.).

The Christology of Hosea is not without difficulties. One passage only, namely, that foretelling the conversion of the heathen (ii. 25 and comp. vi. 10) is often in the N. T. as explicitly Messianic (Rom. ix. 25; 1 Pet. ii. 10). But it is a false principle of interpretation that only those portions of the O. T. refer to Christ which are expressly recognized as having that character in the New Testament. The N. T. writers represent the Redeemer as the great subject of the ancient economy; and if only those types and predictions relate to Him which are cited and applied in that manner, it is difficult to see how the Hebrew Scriptures can justly have ascribed to them such a character of predominant reference to the Christian economy. In regard to such gospel prophecies in Hosea, the reader may consult (in addition to the Commentaries) Hengstenberg's Christology of the O. T. i. 138-285 (Edinb. ed.); Hofmann's Wissenschaft u. Erfahrung, l. 206 ff.; Tholuck's Die Propheten u. ihre Weisungen, pp. 193, 207, 206; and Steilluin's Die Messianischen Weisungen des A. T. p. 53 ff.

All these writers do not recognize the same passages as significant, nor the same as significant in the same degree.

H.

Hosea (plural of hosea) Dan. iii. 21 (A. V.), is the translation of a Chaldee word which signifies tawûa (Dtnis, p. 624 r). Hosea formerly denoted any covering for the legs, short trousers or trunk-hose as well as stockings. See examples of this usage in Eastwood and Wright's Bible Words-Book, p. 257.

Hoshatia, [h'wsh:] (whom Jehovah saved): Osvina. 1. [h'wsh:] A man who assisted in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem after it had been rebuilt by Nebuchadnezzar (Neh. xii. 32). He led the princes (h'wsh:) of Judah in the procession, but whether himself one of them we are not told.

2. Mazarot; [Alex. Masarah: F. A. Annun; Marcen: The father of a certain Jeremiah or Azzariah, a man of note after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xiii. 1, xili. 2).

Hosh'ama (h'wsh-ama) [whom Jehovah hears]: Constr. Osvana. [Val. masah:] Alex. Assora; [Comp. Assora:] Senna), one of the sons of Jeconiah, or Jehoachin, the last king of Judah but one (1 Chr. iii. 18). It is worthy of notice that, in the narrative of the capture of Jeconiah by Nebuchadnezzar, though the mother and the wives of the king are mentioned, nothing is said about his sons (2 K. xxiv. 12, 15). In agreement with this is the denunciation of him as a childless man in Jer. xxii. 30. There is good reason for suspecting some confusion in the present state of the genealogy of the royal family in 1 Chr. iii.; and these facts would seem to confirm it.

Hoshea' (h'wsh-) [help, or God is help: see first]; [Hws: Oser], the nineteenth, last, and best king of Israel. He succeeded Pekah, whom he slew in a successful conspiracy, thereby fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (Isa. vii. 16). Although Josephus calls Hoshea a friend of Pekah (phileos tinou evmoloulonato aír; Ant. ix. 13, § 1), we have no ground for calling this "a treacherous
murer" (Prideaux, i. 16). It took place n. c. 737, "in the 29th year of Jotham" (2 K. xv. 30), i.e. "in the 29th year after Jotham became sole king," for he only reigned 16 years (2 K. xv. 33). But there must have been an interregnum of at least six years after Hoshea came to the throne, which was not till n. c. 729, in the 12th year of Ahaz. (2 K. xvii. 1: we cannot, with Germain [Le Cere], read 4th for 12th in this verse, because of 2 K. xvi. 9). This is the simplest way of reconciling the apparent discrepancy between the passages, and has been adopted by Ussher, Des Vergennes, Fiele, etc. (Winer, s. v. Hoshea). The other suggestions made by Hythig, Lightfoot, etc., are mere quibbles on 2 K. xxv. 30.

It is expressly stated (2 K. xvii. 2: that Hoshea was not so sinful as his predecessors. According to the Rabbin this superiority consisted in his removing from the frontier cities the guards placed there by his predecessors to prevent their subjects from worshipping at Jerusalem (Sefer Ohm Rabba, cap. 22, quoted by Prideaux, i. 16), and in his not hindering the Israelites from accepting the invitation of the Assyrian king (2 K. xvii. xxxii. 1), not checking their zeal against idolatry (2b. xxxii. 15). This, however, is founded on the untenable supposition that Hezekiah's passover preceded the fall of Samaria (Hezekiah), and we must be content with the general fact that Hoshea showed a more theocratic spirit than the former kings of Israel. The compulsory cessation of the calf-worship may have removed his greatest temptation, for Edith-Plesser had carried off the golden calf from Dan some years before (Sed. Ohl. Rotb. 22), and that at Bethel was taken away by Shalmaneser in his first invasion (2 K. xvii. 3; Hos. x. 14; Prideaux, l. c.). But, whatever may have been his excellences, he still "did evil in the sight of the Lord," and it was too late to avert retribution by any improvements.

In the third year of his reign (n. c. 727) Shalmaneser, impelled probably by more thirst of conquest, came against him, cruelly stormed the strong caves of Beth-arbel (Hos. x. 14), and made Israel tributary (2 K. xvii. 3) for three years. At the end of this period, encouraged perhaps by the revolt of Hezekiah, Hoshea entered into a secret alliance with So, king of Egypt (who was either the Necho of Manetho, and son of Saisas, Herod. ii. 157; Keil, Vitringa, Sesounius, etc.; John, Hebr. Com. § 10; or SEOa, or himself, Wilkinson, Anti. Ig. i. 139; Ewald, Gesch. iii. 410), to throw off the Assyrian yoke. The alliance did him no good; it was revealed to the court of Nineveh by the Assyrian patty in Ephraim, and Hoshea was immediately seized as a rebellious vassal, shut up in prison, and apparently treated with the utmost indignity (Mic. v. 1). If this happened before the siege (2 K. xvii. 4), we must account for it either by supposing that Hoshea, hoping to discharge and gain time, had gone to Shalmaneser to account for his conduct, or that he had been defeated and taken prisoner in some unrecorded battle. That he disappeared very suddenly, like "a foam upon the water," was only infer from Hos. xiii. x, 7. The siege of Samaria lasted three years: for that "glorious and beautiful" city was strongly situated like "a crown of prudence" among her hills (Is. xxi. 1-3). It seems, therefore, that the siege of Samaria must have died, for it is certain that Samaria was taken by his successor Sargon, who thus laconically describes the event in his annals: "Samaria I looked at, I captured; 27,280 men (families?) who dwell in it I carried away. I constructed fifty chariots in their country. ... I appointed a governor over them, and continued upon them the tribute of the former people" (Iotta, 145, 11, quoted by Dr. Hinck, J. J. E. of Sc. Lit. Oct. 1858; Layard, Nin. and Babil. i. 148). This was probably n. c. 721 or 720. For the future history of the unhappy Ephraimites, the places to which they were transplanted by the policy of their conqueror and his officer, "the great and noble Asnapper" (Ezr. iv. 10), and the nations by which they were superseded, see Samaria. Of the subsequent fortunes of Hoshea we know nothing. He came to the throne too late, and governed a kingdom torn by pieces by foreign invasion and intestine broils. Sovereign after sovereign had fallen by the dagger of the assassin; and we see from the dark and terrible delineations of the contemporary prophets [Hoshea, Micah, Isaiah], that murder and idolatry, drunkenness and lust, had eaten like "an inwound wound" (Mic. i. 9) into the heart of the national morality. Ephraim was dogged to its ruin by the Assyrian policy, and its former power was asserted its independence (2 K. xxviii. Joseph. Ant. ix. 14: Prideaux, i. 15 ff.; Keil, On Kings, ii. 50 ff., Eng. ed.; John, Hebr. Com. § 11; Ewald, Gesch. iii. 607-613; Rosenmiiller, Bibl. Geogr. chap. ix., Engl. transl.; Kawlison, Herod. i. 149).

W. F. W.

HOSEA (onymous = help [see above]). The name is precisely the same as that of the prophet known to us as HOSHEA. 1. The son of Nun, i.e. Joshua (Dent. xxiii. 44: and also in Num. xiii. 8, though there the A. V. has Oshea). It was probably his original name, to which the Divine name of Jalu was afterwards added—Jehoshua, Joshua—"Jehovah's help." The LXX. in this passage miss the distinction, and have Ἰαβεθ: Vulg. Jace.

2. (✝ηρα: Oec.) Son of Azaziah (1 Chr. xxvii. 20) like his great namesake, a man of Ephraim, ruler (magel) of his tribe in the time of king David.

3. (✝ηρα: [Var. F. Goduμ:] Oec.) One of the heads of the people—i.e. the laymen—who sealed the covenant with Nebuchad (Neb. x. 23).

HOSPITALITY. The rites of hospitality are to be distinguished from the customs prevailing in the entertainment of guests [Food; Meals], and from the laws and practices relating to charity, almsgiving, etc., and they are thus separately treated, as far as possible, in this article.

Hospitality was regarded by most nations of the ancient world as one of the chief virtues, and especially by peoples of the Scythic stock; but it was not characteristic of the latter-and especially among the peoples of the Greeks, and even the Romans. Race undoubtedly influences its exercise, and it must also be ascribed in no small degree to the social state of a nation. Thus the desert tribes have always placed the virtue higher in their esteem than the townsfolk of the same descent as themselves; and in our own day, though an Arab townsman is hospitable, he entertains different guests on the subject from the Arabs of the desert (the Bed-awee). The former has fewer opportunities of showing his hospitality: and when he does so, he does it not as much with the feeling of discharging an obligatory act as a social and civilized duty.
With the advance of civilization the calls of hospitality become less and less urgent. The dweller in the wilderness, however, finds the entertainment of wayfarers to be a part of his daily life, and that to refuse it is to deny a common humanity. Viewed in this light, the notions of the Greeks and the Romans must be appreciated as the recognition of the virtue where its necessity was not of the urgent character that it possesses in the more primitive lands of the East. The ancient Egyptians resembled the Greeks; but, with a greater exclusiveness, they limited their entertainments to their own countrymen, being constrained by the national and priestly abhorrence and dread of foreigners. This exclusiveness throws some obscurity on their practices in the discharge of hospitality; but otherwise their customs in the entertainment of guests resembled those well known to classical scholars — customs probably derived in a great measure from Egypt.

While hospitality is acknowledged to have been a wide-spread virtue in ancient times, we must concede that it flourished chiefly among the race of Shem. The O. T. abounds with illustrations of the divine command to use hospitality, and of the strong national belief in its importance; so too the writings of the N. T.; and though the Eastern Jews of modern times dare not entertain a stranger lest he be an enemy, and the long oppression they have endured has made them more guarded in that respect than ever, it has made the name a proverb, the ancient hospitality still lives in their hearts. The desert, however, is yet free; it is as of old a howling wilderness; and hospitality is as necessary and as freely given as in patriarchal times. Among the Arabs we find the best illustrations of the old Bible narratives, and among them see traits that might beseech their ancestor Abraham.

The laws respecting strangers (Lev. xix. 33, 34) and the poor (Lev. xxiv. 14 ff.; Deut. xiv. 7), and concerning redemption (Lev. xxv. 23 ff.), etc., are framed in accordance with the spirit of hospitality; and the strength of the national feeling regarding it is shown in the incidental mentions of its practice. In the Law, compassion to strangers is constantly enforced by the words, "for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (as Lev. xix. 34). And before the Exod., Abraham's entertainment of the angels (Gen. xviii. 1 ff.), and Lot's (xix. 1), are in exact agreement with its precepts and with modern usage. So Moses was received by Jethro, the priest of Midian, who reproached his daughters, though he believed him to be an Egyptian, saying, "And where is he? why is it [that] ye have left the man? call him, that he may eat bread." (Ex. ii. 20).

The story of Joseph's hospitality to his brethren, although he knew them to be such, appears to be narrated as an ordinary occurrence; and in like manner Pharaoh received Jacob with a liberality not merely dictated by his relationship to the savior of Egypt. Like Abraham, "Manoah said unto the angel of the Lord, I pray thee let us detain thee until we shall have made ready a kid for thee." (Judg. xiii. 15); and like Lot, the old man of Gibeath sheltered the Levite when he saw him "in a wayfaring man in the city of the plain;" and the old man said, Whither goest thou? and silence comest thou? Peace be with thee, however [let] all thy wants [lie] upon me, only lodge not in the street. So he brought him into his house, and gave provender unto the asses; and they washed their feet, and did eat and drink." (Judg. xix. 17, 20, 21).

In the N. T. hospitality is yet more markedly enjoined; and in the more civilized state of society which then prevailed, its exercise became more a social virtue than a necessity of patriarchal life.

The good Samaritan stands for all examples of Christian hospitality, embalmed by the command to love one's neighbor as himself; and our Lord's charge to the disciples strengthened that command: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. . . . And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in nowise lose his reward." (Matt. x. 42).

The neglect of Christ is symbolized by inhospitality to our neighbors, in the words, "I was a stranger and ye took not me in." (Matt. xxv. 43). The Apostles urged the church to "follow after hospitality," using the forcible words πινακισμένα διώκοντες (Rom. xii. 13; cf. 1 Tim. v. 10); to remember Abraham's example, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." (Heb. xi. 22); to teach hospitality one to another without grudging." (1 Pet. iv. 9); while a bishop must be a "lover of hospitality." (Tit. i. 8, 1 Tim. iii. 2).

The practice of the early Christians was in accord with these precepts. They had all things in common, and their hospitality was a characteristic of their belief. If such has been the usage of Biblical times, it is in the next place important to remark how hospitality was shown. In the patriarchal ages we may take Abraham's example as the most fitting, as we have of it the fullest account: and by the light of Arab custom we may see, without obscurity, his hospitality to the tent door to meet his guests, with the words, "My lord, if now I have found grace in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant. Behold, let a little water be brought, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, and I will fetch a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts." "And," to continue the narrative in the vigorous language of the A. V., "Abraham hastened into the tent unto Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead [it], and make cakes upon the hearth. And Abraham ran unto the herd, and fetched a calf tender and good, and gave [it] unto a young man, and he hasted to dress it. And he took butter and milk, and the calf which he had dressed, and set [it] before them: and he stood by them under the tree, and they did eat." A traveller in the eastern desert may see, through the vista of ages, this far-off example in its living traces. Mr. Lane's remarks on this narrative and the general subject of this article are too opposite to be omitted: he says, "Hospitality is a virtue for which the natives of the East in general are highly and deservedly admired; and the people of Egypt are but the people refused to receive him, because he was journeying to Jerusalem. This act was not an inconsiderability merely, or an inhumanity: it was an outrage against one of the most sacred of the recognized laws of oriental society.}
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well entitled to commendation on this account. A word which signifies literally a person on a journey (mamur) is the term most commonly employed in this country in the sense of a visitor or guest. There are very few persons here who would think of sitting down to a meal, if there was a stranger at the house, without inviting him to partake of it; unless the latter were a minor, in which case he would be invited to eat with the servants. It would be considered a shameful violation of good manners if a Muslim abstained from ordering the table to be prepared at the usual time because a visitor happened to be present. Persons of the middle classes in this country (Egypt), if living in a retired situation, sometimes take their supper before the door of their house, and invite every passenger of respectable appearance to eat with them. This is very commonly done among the lower orders. In cities and large towns claims on hospitality are un urlpatterns, as there are many ree-kalcha or khans, where strangers may obtain lodging; and food is very easily procured: but in the villages travellers are often lodged and entertained by the sheykh or some other inhabitant; and if the guest be a person of the middle or higher classes, or even not very poor, he gives a present to the host's servants, or to the host himself. In the desert, however, a present is seldom received from a guest. By a Semitic law a traveller may claim entertainment, of any person able to afford it to him, for three days. The account of Abraham's entertaining the three angels, related in the Bible, presents a perfect picture of the manner in which a modern Bedouin sheykh receives travellers arriving at his encampment. He immediately orders his wife or woman to make bread, slaughter sheep or some other animal, and dress it in haste, and bring milk and any other provisions that he may have ready at hand, with the bread and the meat which he has dressed, sets them before his guests. If these be persons of high rank, he stands by them while they eat, as Abraham did in the case above alluded to. Most Bedouins will suffer almost any injury to themselves or their families rather than allow their guests to be ill-treated while under their protection. There are Arabs who even regard the chastity of their wives as not too precious to be sacrificed for the gratification of their guests (see Burckhardt's Notes on the Bedouins, etc., 5vo ed. i. 179, 180); and at an encampment of the Bisharin, I ascertained that more than one or two persons in this great tribe (which includes a large portion of the desert between the Nile and the Red Sea) who offer their unmarried daughters (cf. Gen. xix. 8; Judg. xix. 24) to their guests, merely from motives of hospitality, and not for hire (see London, Egypt, ch. xiii.). Mr. Lane adds that there used to be a very numerous class of persons, called Tu-faleess, who lived by spurning, presuming on the well-known hospitality of their countrymen, and going from house to house where entertainments were being given. The Arabs along the Syrian frontier usually pitch the sheykh's tent towards the west, that is, towards the inhabited country, to invite passengers and lodge them on their way (Burckhardt's Notes on the Bedouins, etc., 5vo ed. i. 33), it is held to be disgraceful to encamp in a place out of the way of travellers; and it is a custom of the Bedouin to light fires in the encampment to attract travellers, and to keep dogs who, besides watching against robbers, may in the night-time guide wayfarers to their tents. Hence a hospitable man is proverbially called "one whose dogs bark loudly." Approaching an encampment, the traveller often sees several horsemen coming towards him, and striving who shall be first to claim him as a guest. The favorite national game of the Arabs before El-Isham illustrates their hospitality. It was called "Meoxir," and was played with arrows, some notched and others without marks. A young camel was bought and killed, and divided into 24 portions: those who drew marked arrows had shares in proportion to the number of notches; those who drew blanks paid the cost of the camel among them. Neither party, however, ate of the flesh of the camel, which was always given to the poor, and was, in this they did out of pride and ostentation," says Sale, "it being reckoned a shame for a man to stand out, and not venture his money on such an occasion." Sale, however, is hardly philosophical in this remark, which concerns only the abuse of a practice originally arising from a national virtue: but Mohammed forbad the game, with all other games of chance, on the plea that it gave rise to quarrels, etc. (Sale's Preliminary Discourse, p. 96, ed. 1836, and Aria, ch. ii. and v.).

The oriental respect for the covenant of bread and salt, or salt alone, certainly sprung from the high regard in which hospitality was held. Even accidentally to taste another's salt imposes an obligation; and so great an extent is the feeling carried that a thief has been known to give up his booby in obedience to it. Thus El-Leys Es-Saffir, when a robber, left his booby in the passage of the royal treasury of Sijsistan: accidentally he stumbled over, and, in the dark, tasted a lump of rock-salt: his respect for his covenant gained his pardon, and he became the founder of a royal dynasty (Sale's Thousand and One Nights, ch. xv. note 21). The Arab peculiarity was carried into Spain by the so-called Moors.

For the customs of the Greeks and Romans in the entertainment of guests, and the exercise of hospitality generally, the reader is referred to the Dictionary of Antiquities, art. Hospitality. They are incidentally illustrated by passages in the N. T., but it is difficult to distinguish between those so derived, and the native oriental customs which, as we have said, are very similar. To one of the eastern races, especially and naturally a reference is need to exist in Rev. ii. 17: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a

1 a "It is said to have been a custom of some of the Barmakese (the family so renowned for their geneate hospitality during the holy month of Muh
tal) to admit no one who applied at such times for admission to be required" (Lane's Thousand and One Nights, ed. note 97)
2 This is accompanied by hospitality lasting three days, and permitted a guest to take this right by force: although one day and one night is the period of the host's being "kind" to him (Mashiok, M. Mus. ib. 329, cited in Lane's Thousand and One Nights, in note 15). Burckhardt (Notes on the Bedouins, etc., 1. 178, 179, etc. in the same note) says that a stranger without friend, in a camp at night, s the first tent, where the women, in the absence of the owner, provide for his refreshment. After the lapse of three days and four hours he must, if he would avoid censure, either assist in household duties, or claim hospitality at another tent.
HISTORICAL

New name written, which no man knoweth, saving he be that receiveth [it]." E. S. P.

HOST (Luke x. 35). [Hospitality] INN.

HOSTAGE. The practice of giving and receiving persons, to be retained as security for the observance of public treaties or engagements, is indicated in 2 Kings xiv. 14, and 2 Chr. xxiv. 24. It is said that Josiah after his victory over Amaziah took with him hostages  לְגָאוֹבָס meaning "that upon his return to his own kingdom. D. S. T.

HOTHAM (הֹתָם [signet-ring]; [x]  הֹתָם; Alex. [A]  חֹתָמ; [t]  חותם; Hotham, a man of Athar, son of Heber, of the family of Beriah (1 Chr. vii. 32).

HOTHAM (הֹתָם, i. e. Hotham; [Vat. ] Alex.  חותמה; [RA.  חותמה; Hotham), a man of Aror, father of Shama and Jehiel, two of the heroes of David's guard (1 Chr. xi. 44). The substitution of Hotham for Hotum is an error which has been retained from the edition of 1011 following the Bishops' Bible till now (Comp. the rendering of the LXX. both of this and the preceding name).

HOITHIR (יוֹתֹהְר [fullness]; [Vat. ] Alex.  יוֹתֹהְר; [RA. ] חותיר; [Orih. ] חותיר; the 13th son of Heman *the king's hearer" (1 Chr. xxv. 4), and therefore a Kohathite Levite. He had the charge of the twenty-first course of the musicians in the service of the tabernacle (xxv. 28).

* Some think that this name and the names of four of Heman's other sons (Giddalti, Romamti-ezer, Malbodi, Hothir, Mahazioth) formed a verse of some ancient prophetic saying. They follow each other in the list, 1 Chr. xxv. 4 (except the omission of Josiahkeshah), so as to make this couplet: —

I have magnified and exalted help; I have declared in abundance visions.

Furst says (Hebr. u. Chald. Wörterb. i. 244) that the rhythm of the words favors this view. Kralov refers to this case as a remarkable illustration of the use of significant or symbolic personal names among the Hebrews (Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache, p. 502, 56e Ausg.). [Names, Amer. ed.]

It should be said that according to this theory czer belonged to both the preceding verbs, and makes of them two compound names, instead of one, as in the A. V.

HOUGH (Josh. xi. 6, 9; 2 Sam. viii. 4) is an obsolete word from the Anglo-Saxon hol, and means to hamstrung, i. e. to cut the back sinews, and thus disable animals.

HOURL (לְהוֹר; לְהוֹרֶל, Chald.). This word is first found in Dan. iii. 6, iv. 19, 33, v. 5; and t occurs several times in the Apocrypha (Jud. xiv. 3, 2 Esdr. ix. 44). It seems to be a vague expression for a short period, and the frequent phrase "in the same hour" means "immediately". Hence we find לְהוֹרֶל substituted in the Targum for לְהוֹר, "in a moment" (Num. xvi. 21, &c.).

*Qpa is frequently used in the same way by the *t writers (Matt. viii. 13; Luke xii. 39, &c.). It occurs in the LXX. as a rendering for various words meaning time, just as it does in Greek writers long before it acquired the specific meaning of our word. The word is still used in Arabic both for an hour and a moment.

The ancient Hebrews were probably unacquainted with the division of the natural day into 24 parts. The general distinctions of "morning, evening and moonday" (Ps. lv. 17), were sufficient for them at first, as they were for the early Greeks (Hom. ii. 111); afterwards the Greeks adopted five marked periods of the day (Jul. Pollius, Oomn. i. 118; Dods Chrysost. Opusc. in de Glocb), and the Hebrews parcelled out the period between sunrise and sunset into a series of minute divisions distinguished by the sun's course [DAY], as is still done by the Arabs, who have stated forms of prayers for each period (Lane's Mod. Egypt. i. ch. 3).

The early Jews appear to have divided the day into four parts (Neb. ix. 3), and the night into three watches (Judg. vii. 19) [DAY; WATCHES], and even in the N. T. we find a trace of this division in Matt. xx. 1-5. There is however no proof of this: the assertion, sometimes made, that *dpa in the Gospels may occasionally mean a space of three hours.

The Greeks adopted the division of the day into 12 hours from the Babylonians (Herod. ii. 193, comp. Rawlinson, Herod. ii. p. 334). At what period the Jews became first acquainted with this method of reckoning time is unknown, but it is generally supposed that they too learnt it from the Babylonians during the Captivity (Wachner, Ant. Hebr. § 6 i. 8, 9). They may have had some such division at a much earlier period, as has been inferred from the fact that Abuz erected a sun-dial in Jerusalem, the use of which had probably been learnt from Babylon. There is however the greatest uncertainty as to the meaning of the word לְהוֹר (A. V. "degrees," Is. xxxviii. 8). [Dial.] It is strange that the Jews were not acquainted with this method of reckoning even earlier, for, although a purely conventional one, it is naturally suggested by the months in a year.

Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that it arose from a less obvious cause (Rawlinson, Herod. ii. 334). In whatever way originated, it was known to the Egyptians at a very early period. They had 12 hours of the day and of the night (called N. and T. hours), each of which had its own genius, drawn with a star on its head. The word is said by Lepsius to have been found as far back as the 5th dynasty (Rawlinson, Herod. ii. 135).

There are two kinds of hours, namely, (1.) the astronomical or equinoctial hour, i. e. the 24th part of a civil day, which although "known to astronomers, was not used in the affairs of common life till towards the end of the 4th century of the Christian era" (Dict. of Ant. s. v. Hour): and (2.) the natural hour (which the Rabbis called קָוֵֽפָלָּא or temporales), i. e. the 12th part of the natural day, or of the time between sunrise and sunset. These are the hours meant in the N. T., Josephus, and the Rabbis (John xi. 9, &c.; Jos. Ant. xiv. 4, § 3), and it must be remembered that they perpetually vary in length, so as to be very different at different times of the year. Besides this, an hour of the day would always mean a different length of time from an hour of the night, except at the equinox. From the consequent un-
certainly the term there arose the proverbial expression "not all hours are equal" (G. Joshua ap. Carpov. App. Crit. p. 345). At the equinoxes the third hour would correspond to 9 o'clock; the sixth would always be at noon. To find the exact time meant at other seasons of the year we must know when the sun rises in Palestine, and reduce the hours to our reckoning accordingly. [D.A.V.] (Winer, s. v. Tun. Thren. Jahn, Arch. Bibl. § 101.) What hitherto has varied true Jews possessed in the time of our Lord is uncertain; but we may safely suppose that they had gnomons, dials, and clepsydra, all of which had long been known to the Persians and other nations with whom they had come in contact. Of course the two first were inaccurate and uncertain indications, but the water-clock by ingenious modifications, according to the season of the year, became a very tolerable assistance in marking time. Mention is also made of a curious invention called πεπεραγμένον, by which a figure was constructed so as to drop a stone into a brazen basin every hour, the sound of which was heard for a great distance and announced the time (Otho, Lex. Rob. s. v. Horum).

For the purposes of prayer the old division of the day into 4 portions was continued in the Temple service as we see from Acts ii. 15, iii. 9. The Jews supposed that the 3d hour had been consecrated by Abraham, the 6th by Isaac, and the 9th by Jacob (Kischel; Schottetzen, Hor. Hebr. on Acts iii. 1). It is probable that the canonical hours observed by the Romans (of which there are 8 in the 24) are derived from these Temple hours (Godwyn, Mon. and Aær. iii. 9).

The Rabbis pretend that the hours were divided into 1080 διδυμη (minutes), and 56,848 δεκακόν (seconds), which numbers were chosen because they are so easily divisible (Gen. Hier. Beren. 2, 4, in Reland, Jott. Hebr. iv. 1, § 19). F. W. F.

Besides the various points mentioned above as forming the beginning of the day, from which the hours were reckoned, Pliny testifies (Hist. N. ii. 79) that among the Egyptians there was a religious and civil day was reckoned from midnight to midnight. His words are: "Nullum diei aliis observato, vulgus omne a luce ad tenebras, saeculo Romano, et qui diem divinam civilum, item Aegyptio, et Hipparchus, a medio nocte in medium." To the same purpose also Anius Gelius (Vest. Alt. iii. 2): "Populam autem Romam, uti Varro dixit, dies singulos ad medium praemittit multis argumentis ostendit." He then gives Varro's proofs.

If the passages in St. John's Gospel relating to the hour of the day be all examined, it will appear probable that he adopted this official Roman reckoning,—of course, numbering the hours from midnight as well as from midnight, so as not to exceed the number twelve. In i. 40 the visit of the Jews to Jesus will have occurred about 10 a.m. instead of at 4 p.m., as often supposed, and this seems more agreeable to the statement "they went with him that day." In iv. 6 the same mode of reckoning brings Jesus, "weary with his journey," to the well of Samaria at six in the evening, a time when the woman would naturally come to draw water, instead of at noon. So in iv. 52 this computation makes "the seventh hour," when the former told the woman's son, seven instead of one new, which agrees better with the circum-

stances and the probable distance between Cana and Capernaum.

The only remaining passage is xix. 14, the relation of which to Mark xv. 25 has been so much questioned. Here, too, this method of reckoning removes the seeming discrepancy, while the whole course of the narrative in all the Evangelists shows that the time indicated by St. John as that when Pilate sat upon his judgment-seat, could not have been later than between six o'clock in the evening—"about the sixth hour." After this, the events which followed — the further ineffectual opposition and final yielding of Pilate to the will of the Jews, the leading of Jesus out to Golgotha after taking off his mock royal array, etc., the preparation for the crucifixion, and the crucifixion itself, must have consumed the two hours or more until our nine o'clock, called by St. Mark, according to Jewish usage, "the third hour." For a list, of the older writers who adopt this view, see Wolinus, Curva Phil. on John xix. 14. Olshausen (who seems to prefer for himself a conjectural emendation of the text) yet well observes, "With this hypothesis admirably accord the fact that John wrote for the people of Asia Minor" — a remark which applies to all the passages above cited from his Gospel.

F. G.
houses of the first rank. The prevailing plan of eastern houses of this class presents, as was the case in ancient Egypt, a front of walls, whose blank and mean appearance is usually relieved only by the door and a few lattice and projecting windows (Vies in Syr., ii. 25). Within this is a court or courts with apartments opening into them. Some of the finest houses in the East are to be found at Damascus, where in some of them are seven such courts. When there are only two, the innermost is the horcum, in which the women and children live, and which is jealously secluded from the entrance of any man but the master of the house (Burckhardt, Travels, i. 188; Van Egmont, ii. 246, 253; Shaw, p. 207; Porter, Damascus, i. 34, 37, 60; Chardin, Voyages, vi. 6; Lane, Mod. Eg. i. 173, 207). Over the door is a projecting window with a lattice more or less elaborately wrought, which, except in times of public celebr-

A Nestorian house, with stages upon the roof for sleeping. (Layard, Nineveh, i. 177.)

Entrance to house in Cairo. (Lane, Modern Egyptians.)
lakes off his shoes on the dukka‘ah before stepping on the be‘ein (Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15; Luke vii. 38). The ceilings over the be‘ein and dukka‘ah are often richly panelled and ornamented (Jer. xxxii. 11). ( '[C E I N I N G.] The stairs to the upper apartments are in Syria usually in a corner of the court (Robinson, iii. 302). When there is no upper story the lower rooms are usually loftier. In Persia they are open from top to bottom, and only divided from the court by a low partition (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. i. 10; Chardin, iv. 119; Burckhardt, Travels, i. 18, 19; Travels in Syria, i. 56).

**Inner court of house in Cairo, with Mak‘ād.**

(lane, Modern Egyptians.)

Around part, if not the whole, of the court is a verandah, often nine or ten feet deep, over which, when there is more than one door, runs a second gallery of like depth with a balustrade (Shaw, p. 208). Bearing in mind that the reception room is raised above the level of the court (Chardin, iv. 118: Travels in Syria, i. 56), we may, in explaining the circumstances of the miracle of the paralytic (Mark ii. 3; Luke v. 18), suppose, (1.) that our Lord was standing under the verandah, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and taking off a portion of the boarded over-riding of the verandah, or removing the awning over the Ἰμπλασιουμ, τὸ μεταστήνων, in the former case let down the bed through the verandah roof, or in the latter, down by way of the roof, διὰ τῶν κεφαλῶν, and deposited it before the Saviour (Shaw, p. 212). (2.) Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the συναγωγή, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Trench, Miracles, p. 199; Lane, M. E. Eg. i. 39). (3.) And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings now to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room 10 or 12 feet high and as many or more square, with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside, and the bearers of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and having uncovered it (ἀνακαλύπτειν), let him down into the room where our Lord was (Malan, l. c.).

The stairs to the upper apartments or to the roof are often shaded by vines or creeping plants, and the courts, especially the inner ones, planted with trees. The court has often a well or tank in it (Ps. cxxviii. 3; 2 Sam. xvii. 18; Russell, Aleppo, the other, if at all, by only a low parapet) which was over the room into which they let down the bed before Jesus, through the tiles, broken up for that purpose. Stairs on the outside of houses are almost unknown in Palestine at present, and would only expose the inmates to violence and pilage. The healing of the paralytic took place at Capernaum (Mark ii. 2), where the houses might be expected to be thus contiguous to each other. Thomson informs us (Land and Book, ii. 6. ff.) how the ordinary Arab houses are constructed in the East.

---

a * See a full statement of this latter view in Noron’s Grammar of the Gospel, 21 ed., i. p. 406. (A M R Notes, or in his Trans. of the Gospel, with Notes, ii. 219 t., 219 f.)

b * Another view may be stated. Those who brought the paralytic, finding it impossible to reach the Saviour in the room where he was teaching (see especially Mark ii. 2), may have hardened at once to the court of an adjacent house. Taking advantage there of the stairs leading up thence to the roof of that next house, they could have crossed to the roof (separated from the other, if at all, by only a low parapet) which was over the room into which they let down the bed before Jesus, through the tiles, broken up for that purpose. Stairs on the outside of houses are almost unknown in Palestine at present, and would only expose the inmates to violence and pilage. The healing of the paralytic took place at Capernaum (Mark ii. 2), where the houses might be expected to be thus contiguous to each other. Thomson informs us (Land and Book, ii. 6. ff.) how the ordinary Arab houses are constructed in the East.
The "guest-chamber" (προσωπον: κατοικία) was often the 'inner chamber' (7ερώτημα: κατοικία) of the Persian monarch (τάλαμος: διαμετεχόν: δωμάτιον: κατοικία) noticed in the book of Esther (iii. 3). When there is an upper story, the k'lah forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the ἐπέραφον, which was often the "house-chamber" (Luke xxii. 12 [Ἀλεξάνδρα]: Acts i. 13, ix. 37, xx. 8; Burckhardt, Trav. i. 154). The windows of the upper rooms often project one or two feet, and form a kiosk or latticed chamber, the ceilings of which are elaborately ornamented (Lane, i. 27; Russell, i. 102; Burckhardt, Trav. i. 190). Such may have been the "chamber on the wall" (11ερώτημα: κατοικία). The prophets' chamber at Shunem, 2 K. iv. 10 ("on the wall," A. V., but probably = wall-chamber, i. e., one surrounded with a wall, duly finished), was not doubt the modern 'Aliyeh (the Hebrew word is the same). It is the most desirable part of the establishment, is best fitted up, and is still given to guests who are to be treated with honor (Thomson, Land and Book, i. 235). This is the same also of Elijah's room ("loft," A. V.) at Sa- repta (1 K. xvii. 19).
Before quitting the interior of the house we may observe that, on the <b>diwân</b>, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, i. 27; Winer). The roofs of eastern houses are, as has been said, mostly flat, though there are sometimes domes over some of the rooms. The flat portions are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, which in time becomes very hard, but when not laid on at the proper season is apt to crack in winter, and the rain is thus admitted. In order to prevent this, every roof is provided with a roller, which is set at work after rain. In many cases the terrace roof is little better than earth rolled hard. On ill-completed roofs grass is often found springing into a short-lived existence (Prov. xix. 13, xxvii. 15; Ps. cxxix. 6, 7; Is. xxxvii. 27; Shaw, p. 210; Lane, i. 27; Robinson, iii. 39, 44, 60).

In no point do oriental domestic habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof. Its flat surface is made useful for various household purposes, as drying corn, hanging up linen, and preparing figs and raisins (Shaw, p. 211; Burckhardt, <i>Trav. i</i>. 191). The roofs are used as places of recreation in the evening, and often as sleeping-places at night (2 Sam. xi. 2, xvi. 22; Dan. iv. 23; 1 Sam. ix. 25, 26; Job xvi. 18; Prov. xxi. 9; Shaw, p. 211; Russell, i. 55; Chardin, iv. 116; Layard, <i>Nineveh</i>, i. 177). They were also used as places for devotion, and even holydays worship (Jer. xxvii. 19, xlix. 13; 2 K. xii. 12; Zeph. i. 5; Acts x. 9). At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles booths were erected by the Jews on the tops of their houses, as in the present day huts of boughs are sometimes erected on the housetops as sleeping-places, or places of retirement from the heat in summer time ( Neh. viii. 16; Burckhardt, <i>Syria</i>, p. 280). As among the Jews the seclusion of women was not carried to the extent of Mohammedan usage, it is probable that the housetop was made, as it is among Christian inhabitants, more a place of public meeting both for men and women, than is the case among Mohammedans, who carefully secure their roofs from inspection by partitions (Burckhardt, <i>Tmr</i>, i. 191; comp. Wilkinson, i. 23). The Christians at Aleppo, in Russell's time, lived contiguously, and made their housetops a means of mutual communication to avoid passing through the streets in time of plague (Russell, i. 55). In the same manner the housetop might be made a means of escape by the stairs [i.e. from the roof into the court] by which it was reached without entering any of the apartments of the house (Matt. xxiv. 17, x. 27; Luke xii. 33).

Both Jews and heathens were in the habit of walling publicly on the housetops (Is. xv. 3, xxvii. 1; Jer. xviii. 28). Protection of the roof by parapets was enjoined by the Law (Deut. xxvii. 8). The parapets thus constructed, of which the types may be seen in ancient Egyptian houses, were sometimes of open work, and it is to a fall through, or over one of these that the injury by which Ahaziah suffered is sometimes ascribed (Shaw, p. 211). To pass over roofs for plundering purposes, as well as for safety, would be no difficult matter (Joel ii. 9). In ancient Egyptian and also in Assyrian houses a sort of raised story was sometimes built above the roof in the form of an open gallery, roofed or covered with awning, was sometimes erected on the housetop (Wilkinson, i. 9; Layard, <i>Mon. of Nin. ii.</i> pl. 49, 50). There are usually no fire-places, except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the "boiling places" (מִּתיָבָא, <i>cultane</i>) of Ezekiel (xvii. 33; Lane, i. 41; Ges. p. 249).

Special apartments were devoted in larger houses to winter and summer uses (Jer. xxxvii. 22; Am. iii. 19; Chardin, iv. 119). The ivory house of Ahab was probably a palace largely ornamented with inlaid ivory. [PALACE.]

The circumstance of Samson's pulling down the house by means of the pillars, may be explained by the fact of the company being assembled on tiers of balconies above each other, supported by central pillars on the basement; when these were pulled down the whole of the upper floors would fall also (Judg. xvi. 29; Shaw, p. 211).

Houses for jewels and armor were built and furnished under the kings (2 K. x. 15). The draughtsman (<i>טָהוֹרָה</i>, <i>λυσκόν</i>, <i>litrare</i>) was doubtless a public latrine, such as exists in modern eastern cities (2 K. x. 27; Russell, i. 34).}

The house in the house was probably a nitrous efflorescence on the walls, which was injurious to the salubrity of the house, and whose removal was therefore strictly enjoined by the Law (Lev. xiv. 34, 55; Kitto, <i>Phys. Geog. of Pal.</i> p. 112; Winer, s. v. <i>Ηαυσερ</i>).

The word <i>טָהוֹר</i> is prefixed to words constituting a local name, as Bethany, Beth-horon, etc. In modern names it is represented by <i>Beit</i>, as <i>Beitlaham</i>. [H. W. P.]

*HOUSEHOLD, CESAR'S. [CESAR'S HOUSEHOLD.]

*HOUSEHOLDER. [GOODMAN.]

*HOUSE OF GOD. This expression occurs in Judg. xx. 18 (A. V.), where no doubt <i>טָהוֹר</i>, instead of being translated, should be retained as a proper name, i.e. Bethel; so also, ver. 26 and xii. 2. Bethel on the confines of Judah and Benjamin is the place there meant. The Ark of the Covenant having been brought to Bethel from Shiloh just at that time, for the purpose (it may be) of more convenient access, the other tribes went up thither to "ask counsel" of Jehovah in regard to the war on which they were about to enter against the Benjamites. The Ark of the Covenant is found again not long after this in its proper sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 3). That in Judg. xx. 18 Bethel denotes the place where the Ark was then, and not the Ark itself as called "the house of God," is evident from Judg. xx. 27, where the narrative distinguishes the two from each other, and recognizes Samuel and Saul had a conversation or private interview on the roof? But it appears from the Hebrew (ver. 29) that Saul, at least, slept there during the following night; for early the next morning Samuel called to him on the roof to arise and resume his journey. [H.}
HUKKOK

The presence of the Ark at Bethel as the result of a special emergency.

HUKKOK (הוקוק) [Inscion, rock-ex cavation, Dietr.; dich, Fürst]; Ἰακαρα; Aex. Ἰακαρ; Ἰακορ, a place on the boundary of Naphtali (Josh. xix. 34), named next to Anoth-Tabor. It is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. iv. 15), but in such a manner as to show that they knew nothing of it but from the Text. By hap-haparchi in 1323, and in our own times by Wolcott and by Robinson, Hukkok has been recovered in Yikok, a village in the mountains of Naphtali, west of the upper end of the Sea of Galilee, about 7 miles S. S. W. of Safed, and at the head of Wady-el-Amud. An ancient Jewish tradition locates here the tomb of Halakuk (Zunz, in B. Tudeh, ii. 421; Schwarz, p. 182; Robinson, iii. 81, 82).

HUKKOK (הוקוק) [verb. established, et engraced]; Ἰακαρα; [Vat. Ἰακαρ]; Alex. Ἰακαρ; [Comp. Ald. Ἰακαρ]; Ἰακορ, a name which in 1 Chr. vii. 15 is substituted for HELKAK in the parallel list of the Gershonite cities in Asier, in Josh. xxi.

HUL (הול) [circle, region, Fürst]; Ὢουα; [in I Chr., Rom. Vat. omit, Alex. Ὢουα; ὲουα], the second son of Aram, and grandson of Shem (Gen. x. 23). The geographical position of the people whom he represents is not well decided. Josephus (Ant. i. 6, § 4) and Jerome fix it in Armenia; Schultes (Parad. p. 262) on etymological grounds (as though the name = הול, sand) proposes the southern part of Mesopotamia; von Bohlen (Intro. to Gen. ii. 249) places it in the neighborhood of Chaldaea. The strongest evidence is in favor of the district about the roots of Lebanon, where the names Arbel-Hilah, a district to the north of Lake Merom; Ola, a town noticed by Josephus (Ant. xv. 10, § 3), between Galile and Trachonitis; Golany, and its modern form Djanjan, bear some affinity to the original name of ὦουα, or, as it should rather be written, Chul.

W. L. B.

HULDAH (הולדת) [woman, Fürst]; Ὢολδα; [Heb. ὲολδα]; a prophetess, whose husband Shallum was keeper of the wardrobe in the house of king Josiah, and who dwelt in the suburb (Rosenmüller, ad Zeph. i. 10) of Jerusalem. While Jeremiah was still at Anathoth, a young man unknown to fame, Huldah was the most distinguished person for prophetic gifts in Jerusalem: and it was to her that Josiah had recourse when Hilkhah found a book of the Law, to procure an authoritative opinion on it (2 K. xiv. 14; 2 Chr. xxiv. 20).

W. T. B.

HUMTAH (המותה) [place of lizards, Ges.; fortress, Fürst]; Ἐκάδη; Alex. Χαμάτα; Ἀθμάθα, a city of Judah, one of those in the mountain-district, the next to Hebron (Josh. xx. 54). It is not known to Eusebius and Jerome (see Onomasticon. "Ammatha"), nor has it since been identified. There is some resemblance between the name and that of Kimoth (קימות), one of the places added in the Vat. LXX. to the list in the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xxx. 27-31.

G.

HUNTING

The objects for which hunting a practised, indicate the various conditions of society and the progress of civilization. Hunting, as a matter of necessity, whether for the external
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nation of dangerous beasts, or for procuring sustenance, betokens a rude and semi-civilized state; as an amusement, it betokens an advanced state. In the former, personal prowess and physical strength are the qualities which elevate a man above his fellows and fit him for dominion, and hence one of the greatest heroes of antiquity is described as a "mighty hunter before the Lord" (Gen. x. 9), while Ishmael, the progenitor of a wild race, was famed as an archer (Gen. xxii. 20), and Esau, hunting in a similar way, was called "a cunning hunter, a man of the field" (Gen. xxvi. 27). The latter state may be exemplified, not indeed from Scripture itself, but from contemporary records. Among the accomplishments of Herod, his skill in the chase is particularly noticed; he kept a regular stud and a huntsman (Joseph. Ant. xvi. 10, § 8), followed up the sport in a wild country (Ant. xv. 7, § 7) which abounded with stags, wild asses, and bears, and is said to have killed as many as forty heads in a day (B. J. i. 21, § 13). The wealthy in Egypt and Assyria followed the sports of the field with great zest; they had their preserves for the express purpose of preserving and hunting game (Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. i. 215; Xen. Cyrop. i. 4, §§ 5, 14), and drew from hunting scenes subjects for decorating the walls of their buildings, and even the roles they wore on state occasions.

The Hebrews, as a pastoral and agricultural people, were not given to the sports of the field; the density of the population, the earnestness of their character, and the tendency of their ritual regulations, particularly those affecting food, all combined to discourage the practice of hunting; and perhaps the examples of Ishmael and Esau were recorded with the same object. There was no lack of game in Palestine; on their entrance into the land, the wild beasts were so numerous as to be dangerous (Ex. xxii. 29); the utter destruction of them was guarded against by the provisions of the Mosaic law (Ex. xxiii. 11; Lev. xxv. 7). Some of the fiercer animals survived to a late period, as lions (Judg. xiv. 5; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. xxiii. 29; 2 K. xii. 24, xx. 36), and bears (1 Sam. xvi. 34; 2 K. ii. 24); jackals (Judg. xiv. 4) and foxes (Cant. ii. 15) were also numerous; hart, roebuck, and fallow deer (Deut. xii. 15; 1 K. iv. 25) formed a regular course of sustenance, and were always preserved in inclosures. The manner of catching these animals was either by digging a pitfall (מעבידים), which was the usual manner with the larger animals, as the lion (2 Sam. xxiii. 20; Ex. xix. 4, 8); or secondly by a trap (מנחת), which was set under ground (Job xviii. 10), in the run of the animal (Prov. xxii. 5), and caught it by the leg (Job xviii. 9); or lastly by the use of the net, of which there were various kinds, as for the gazelle (?) (Is. lii. 20, A. V. "wild bull"), and other animals of that class. [Nfr.] The method in which the net was applied is familiar to us from the description of the lion (Ex. xii. 21, 15) ff. [x. 797 ff.]; it was placed across a ravine or narrow valley, frequented by the animals for the sake of water, and the game was driven in by the hunters and then dispatched either with bow and arrow, or spears (comp. Wilkinson, i. 214). The game selected was generally such as was adapted for food (Prov. xlii. 27), and care was taken to pour out the blood of these as well as of tame animals (Lev. xvii 13).
Birds formed an article of food among the Hebrews (Lev. xvii. 13), and much skill was exercised in catching them. The following were the most approved methods. (1.) The trap (אַס), which consisted of two parts, a net, strung over a frame, and a stick to support it, but it is said that it should give way at the slightest touch; the stick or springe was termed צֵלָה (Am. iii. 5, "gim:"
Ps. lxxv. 22, "trap"); this was the most usual method (Job xviii. 9; Eccl. ix. 12; Prov. vii. 23).
(2.) The snare (אַסּ), from צֵלָה, to bind; Job xviii. 9, A. V. "robbere), consisting of a cord (אַסּ), Job xviii. 10; comp. Ps. xvii. 5, exvi. 3, exv. 5), so set as to catch the bird by the leg. (3.) The net, which probably resembled those used in Egypt, consisting of two sides or frames, over which network was strung, and so arranged that they could be closed by means of a cord: the Hebrew names are various. [VERN.] (4.) The decoy, to which reference is made in Jer. v. 29, 27 — a cage of a peculiar construction (בֵּית עַיָּן) — was filled with birds, which acted as decoys; the door of the cage was kept open by a piece of stick acting as a spring (אַסּ), and closed suddenly with a clap (whence perhaps the term clab) on the entrance of a bird. The partridge appears to have been used as a decoy (Ecclus. xi. 36).

W. L. B.

HUPHAM [וכָּנָב] (protector, Furst; constainhabitant, Ges.): LXX. omit in both MSS.; Comp. ὁφαύα: Hupham), a son of Benjamin, founder of the family (Mishpechah) of the HUPHAMITES (Num. xxvi. 39). In the lists of Gen. xvii, and 1 Chr. vii. the name is given as HUP'PHAM, which see.

HUPHAMITES, THE (וכָּנַת מֵי): om. in LXX.; [Comp. ὁφαύα: ὑπαμηνίτες]. Descendants of HUPHAM of the tribe of Benjamin (Num. xxvi. 39). W. A. W.

HUP'PAH (וכָּנַת) [covering, vielding]: ὁφαύα; [Vat. ὑφαύαι Παλαθοτον]: Alex. ὁφαύα (Hupphan), a priest in the time of David, to whom was committed the charge of the 13th of the 24 courses in the service of the house of God (1 Chr. xxiv. 13).

HUP'PM (וכָּנַת) [protection, screen, Furst, Ges.]: Gen. xvi. 21; 1 Chr. vii. 12; in Gen., omitted in LXX. [Rom. Vat.], but Col. Alex. has ὁφαύα; in 1 Chr. vii. 12, ἀφιπ: [Vat. ὁφιπ], and in Col. Alex. ἀπειροι: [ver. 15, Vat. ἀπειροι, Alex. ἀπειροί]: the former is the correct form, if, as we read in Num. xxvi. 39, the name was Hupham: ὁπαν, [Ὑπαμην, ὑπαμηνίτες], head of a Benjaminite family. According to the text of the LXX. in Gen., a son of Bela [Bela: Bhecher]: but 1 Chr. vii. 12 tells us that he was son of Ir, or Iri (ver. 7), who was one of the five sons of Bela. According to Num. xxvi. 4, the Huphamites were one of the original families of the tribe of Benjamin. The sister of Hupham married into the tribe of Manasseh (1 Chr. vii. 15). A. C. II.

HUR (ֶבֶץ) [hole, hence a prison]: Hur. 1. [ipher: Joseph, ἦρας.] A man who is mentioned with Moses and Aaron on the occasion of the battle with Amalek at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 10), when with Aaron he stayed up the hands of Moses (19). He is mentioned again in xxi. 14, as being, with Aaron, left in charge of the people by Moses during his ascent of Sinai. It would appear from this that he must have been a person connected with the family of Moses and of some weight in the camp. The latter would follow from the former. The Jewish tradition, as preserved by Josephus (Ant. iii. 2, § 4), is that he was the husband of Miriam, and (iii. 6, § 1) the name of his identically with —

2. (4πνόμον.) The grandfather of Bezalel, the chief artist of the tabernacle — "son of Uri, son of Hur — of the tribe of Judah" (Ex. xxxvi. 2, xxvii. 30, xxxviii. 22), the full genealogy being given on each occasion (see also 2 Chr. i. 5). In the lists of the descendants of Judah in 1 Chr. the pedigree is more fully preserved. Hur there appears as one of the great family of Pahre. He was the son of Caleb ben-Hezron, by a second wife, Ephrath (ii. 10, 20; comp. 5, also iv. 1), the first fruit of the marriage (ii. 50, iv. 4), and the father, besides Uri (ver. 20), of three sons, who founded the towns of Kirjath-jearim, Beth-lehem, and Beth-gader (51). Hur’s connection with Beth-lehem would seem to have been of a closer nature than with the others of these places, for he himself is emphatically called "Abi-Bethlehem" — the "father of Bethlehem" (iv. 4). Certainly Beth-lehem enjoyed, down to a very late period, a traditional reputation for the arts which distinguished his illustrious grandson. Jesse, the father of David, is said to have been a weaver of the vails of the sanctuary (Targ. Jonathan, 2 Sam. xxi. 19), and the dyers were still lingering there when Benjamin of Tudela visited Bethlem in the 13th century.

In the Tarqum on 1 Chr. ii. 19 and iv. 4, Ephrath is taken as identical with Miriam: but this would be to contradict the more trustworthy tradition given above from Josephus.

In his comments on 1 Chr. iv. 1 (Quest. Hebr. in Paralip.), Jerome overlooks the fact that the five persons there named as "sons" of Judah are really members of successive generations: and he attempts, as his manner is, to show that each of them is identical with one of the immediate sons of the patriarch. Hur he makes to be another name for Cuan.

3. (OHP: Joseph, ὁφρατος.) The fourth of the five "kings" (והוה: LXX. and Joseph. Ant. iv. 7, § 1, Βασιλεύς) of Midian, who were slain with Baham after the "matter of Peor" (Num. xxxi. 8). In a later mention of them (Josh. xiii. 21) they are called "princes" (והוה: הָנָבָה) of Midian and "dukes" (והוה: הָנָבָה, not the word commonly rendered "duke"). But probably with the force of dependence, see Keil ad loc.: LXX. (ἐπάρχα) of Sihon king of the Amorites, who was killed at the same time with them. No further light can be obtained as to Hur.

4. (Ὅψις: [Vat. Alex. FA. omit.]) Father of Rephaim, who was ruler of half of the environs (והוה: Α. V. "part") of Jerusalem, and assisted Nehemiah in the repair of the wall (Neh. iii. 9).

5. The "son of Hur" — Ben-Chur — was commander over Solomon in Mount Ephraim (1 K. iv. 8). The LXX. (both MSS. [rather, Rom. and Alex.]) give the word Ben both in its original and its translated form (βῆς — Alex. βῆς — ὑπνόμον: [Vat. Alex. Λαμπόρι for B. vi. ὑπνόμον] Comp. Ail
HURAI (Hurai), a not infrequent custom with them. Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, § 3) has Ὑραι as the name of the officer himself. The Vulg. (Beherur) follows the Hebrew, and is in turn followed in the margin of the A. V. It is remarkable that the same form is observed in giving the names of no less than twelve officers in this list.

HURAI [Syr. Syri., and throughout the LXX. decision, elsewhere (see note § 12, ix. 2, 39), of David’s guard—Hurai of the torrent of Gassus—according to the list of 1 Chr. xii. 32. In the parallel catalogue of 2 Sam. xxiii. the R is changed to D, as is frequently the case, and the name stands as HIRAI. Kemissott has examined the discrepancy, and, influenced by the readings of some of the MSS. of the LXX., decides in favor of Hurai as the genuine name (Disert. p. 194).

HURAM (Huram) [noble-born]: Ὑράμα; [Vat. ΝΑΣ]: Ηρώνον. 1. A Benjamite; son of Dila, the first-born of the patriarch (1 Chr. viii. 5).

2. The form in which the name of the king of Tyre in alliance with David and Solomon—and elsewhere given as Hiram—appears in Chronicles. (a.) At the time of David’s establishment at Jerusalem (1 Chr. xiv. 1). In the A. V. the name is Hiram, in accordance with the Cetib or original Hebrew text (جريدة); but in the marginal correction of the Masorets (Keri) it is altered to Huram (جريدة), the form which is maintained in all its other occurrences in these books. The LXX. Ὑράμα [ΦΑ. Ὑράμα], Vulg. Hiram, and Targum, all agree with the Cetib. (b.) At the accession of Solomon (2 Chr. ii. 3, 11, 12, viii. 2, 18, ix. 10, 21: in each of these cases also the LXX. have Ὑράμα [Vat. and] Alex. Ὑράμα, Vulg. Hiram).

3. The same change occurs in Chronicles in the name of Hiram the antorich, which is given as Huram in the following places: 2 Chr. ii. 13, 14, 16. In the first and last of these a singular title is given him—the word Ab, “father”—“Huram my father,”* a and “Huram his father.” No doubt this denotes the respect and esteem in which he was held, according to the similar custom of the people of the East at the present day.* There also the LXX. [Rom. Ὑραμά, Vat. and Alex. Ὑράμα] and Vulgate follow the form Huram.

HURI (جريدة) [GREECE]: [Oipi, Vat. Οὐπή]: Ἡρᾶς, a Gadite; father of Abihail, a chief man in that tribe (1 Chr. v. 14).

HUSBAND. [MARRIAGE.]

HUSHAH (意识形态 [grotes]: Ἰρᾶδα [Comp. Οἰρᾶ]: [Ald. Ἰρᾶδα: Ἡρᾶς], a name which occurs in the genealogies of the tribe of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 4)—“Ezer, father of Huram.” It may well be the name of a place, like Ezem, Gedor, Beth-lehem, and others, in the preceding and succeeding verses;

but we have no means of ascertaining the fact, since it occurs nowhere else. For a patronymic possibly derived from this name see HUSHATHITE.

HUSHAI [Syr. Syri., and throughout the LXX. decision, elsewhere (see note § 12, ix. 2, 39), of David’s guard—Hurai of the torrent of Gassus—according to the list of 1 Chr. xii. 32. He is called the “friend” of David (2 Sam. xv. 37; in 1 Chr. xxvii. 33, the word is rendered “companion;” comp. Josephus. Ant. vii. 9, § 2: the LXX. has a strange confusion of Archite and Ἰρᾶδα [the chief friend]. To him David confided the delicate and dangerous part of a pre-tended adherence to the cause of Absalom. His advice was preferred to that of Ahithophel, and speedily brought to pass the ruin which it meditated.

We are doublet correct in assuming that the Hushai, whose son Eutma was one of Solomon’s commissariat officers (1 K. iv. 19), was the famous counsellor of his father. Hushai himself was probably no longer living; at any rate his office was filled by another (comp. ver. 5). [ARCHITE.]

T. E. B.

HUSHAM (意识形态 in Chron.意识形态 in Chron.意识形态 [hosting, swj]): [Aṣhā: one in 1 Chr.]. Aṣhā, and so Alex. in Gen.: Hushan, one of the kings of Edom, before the institution of monarchy in Israel (Gen. xxxvi. 34, 35; 1 Chr. i. 45, 46). He is described as “Hushan of the land of the Temanite;” and he succeeded Jobah, who was taken by the LXX. in their addition to the Book of Job as identical with that patriarch.

HUSHATHITE, THE (意识形态, and twice in Chron.意识形态 [patr. from意识形态, see above]: Ἰρᾶδα, Ἰρᾶδα, Ἰρᾶδα, etc. [comp. de Hushani, Hushathites], the designation of two of the heroes of David’s guard. 1. SIBBECHAI (2 Sam. xxi. 18; 1 Chr. xi. 20, xx. 4, xxvii. 11). In the last of these passages he is said to have belonged to the Zarthites, that is (probably) the descendants of Zerah of the tribe of Judah. So far this is in accordance with a connection between this and HUSHAH, a name, apparently of a place, in the genealogies of Judah. Josephus, however (Ant. vii. 12, § 2), mentions Sibbechah as a Hitzite.

2. [Ἀρωθίτα: Vat. - παρ: Alex. Ἀρωθίτας: de Hushani.] HIRUNAI (2 Sam. xxiii. 27). There seems no doubt that this name is a mere corruption of Sibbechah.

HUSHIM (意识形态 in [the hosting, Fürst: hosts: pr. Ges.]. Aṣhā: Hushim). 1. In Gen. xlv. 23, “the children [sons] (意识形态 of Dan)” are said to have been Hushim. The name is plural, as if of a tribe rather than an individual, which perhaps is sufficient to account for the use of the plural c in “children.” In the list of Num. xxvi. the name is changed to Shuham.

Hushim figures prominently in the Jewish tradi-

---

* The A. V. of 2 Chr. ii. 13 renders the words "of duram my father," meaning the late king; but this is unnecessary, and the Hebrew will well bear the rendering given above.

* Analogous to this, though not exactly similar, is Joseph’s expression (Gen. xiv. 8), “God hath made me a father unto Pharaoh.” Compare also 1 Macc. xi. 52; where note the use of the two terms “cousin” and “brother.”
tions of the recognition of Joseph, and of Jacob's burial at Hebron. See the quotations from the Midrash in Weil's Bib. Legends, p. 88 note, and the Targum Pseudojon. on Gen. l. 13. In the latter he is the executioner of Esau.

2. ἴδιος (G. Chushrin; ἴδιοι; Alex. ἴδιοι; 

Ḥusam), a member of the genealogy of Benjamin (1 Chr. vii. 12); and here again apparently (as the text now stands) the plural nature of the name is recognized, and Hushim is stated to be "the sons of (Ben) of Abur." (See Bertheau in Ezey. Handb. ad loc.)

3. Ἰδιαῖος, and ἴδιος: Χαρίον: [Vat. Χαριόν, Χαριῶν.] Alex. Χαρίον: ἴδιοι, but in ver. 11 

Michaliam, by inclusion of the Hebrew particle.) The name occurs again in the genealogy of Benja-

min, but there as that of one of the two wives of Shaharaim (1 Chr. viii. 8), and the mother of two of his sons (11). In this case the plural significance of the name is not alluded to.

HUSKS. The word κεφάτια, which our 

nameSt. John's Bread, from a tradition that the 

Baptist lived upon its fruit in the wilderness.

W. L. B.

* The carol-tree is very common also in the 

Greek islands, and its fruit is still in great request 

there as a nutritious article for fattening swine. 

It may be seen exposed for sale in the markets at 

Syracuse and Athens. The writer has seen it as 

far north as Trieste, on the Gulf of Venice. The 

pot, though considerably larger, resembles very 

much that of our common locust-tree. It contains 

a sweetish pulp when tender, but soon becomes dry 

and hard, with small seeds, which rattle in the pot 

when shaken. It emits a slight odor when first 

gathered, not a little offensive to those unac-

ustomed to it.

The occasional use of this product for food (see 

above) is not at variance with the parable. It is 

not said there that the prodigal resorted to food 

caten only by swine; but that in his want, now 

having no friend to give him anything better, he 

was glad to share ἑκατέρους γεμίσα τοις "the husks" 

which the swine were eating, which he was sent 

into the fields to watch. Yet the expression 

here (και οὐδεὶς οὐδιόν αὐτῷ) some under-

stand differently, namely, that no one gave 

the prodigal even so much as any of the husks; 

and if he obtained them, it was without 

permission and by stealth. This is 

Meyer's view (Lukas, p. 450, 4te Aufl.), 

and it appears to be that of Luther. The Greek 

does not require this interpretation; for the 

clause cited above (added in the Hebrew 

way by και = οὐ) may assign a reason why 

(there being no other alternative) the prodigal 

must eat the husks to save himself from 

starvation. The ellipse of ἔτη after διαδόμου 

is very common (Matt. xix. 21, xxv. 8; Mark 

vi. 37; Luke vi. 30, &c.). In the other case 

we supply κεφάτια as the object. II.

Huzz (Greek, pers., fruitful in trees, 

Dietr.; i.e. Uz, in which the form is 

uniformly given elsewhere in the A. V.; 

OFC, Alex. Ηας: Hoss, the eldest son of Nahor 

and Milcah (Gen. xxii. 21). [Buz; UZ.]

Huzzab (בֵּצָב [Assyrian, Frst; see 

infrat]; Ἰδιαῖος: ἴδιοι; miles epiusus), 

according to the general opinion of the Jews 

(Buxtorf's Leizum ad voc. בֵּצָב), was the 

queen of Nineveh at the time when Nahum 

delivered his prophecy. This view appears 

to be followed in our version (Nah. ii. 10, 

and it has been recently defended by Ewald 

Most modern expositors, however, incline to 

the belief that Huzzab here is not a proper name at 

all, but the Hophal of the verb בָּצָב (see Buxfor, 

as above; Gesenius, L. E. p. 903), and this is allowed as possible by the alternative rendering in the 

margin of our English Bible — "that which was estab-

lished." Still there are difficulties in the way of 

such an understanding of the passage, and it is not 

improbable that after all Huzzab may really be a 

proper name. That a Ninevite queen otherwise 

unknown should suddenly be mentioned, is indeed 

exceedingly unlikely; for we cannot grant to Ewald 

that "the Ninevite queens were well nigh as power-

ful as the kings." But there is no reason why the 

word should not be a geographic term, or an equiv-

alent or representative of Assyria, which the prophet
HYÆNA

INTENDS TO THREATEN WITH CAPTIVITY. Huzzob may mean "the Zob country," or the fertile tract east of the Tigris, watered by the upper and lower Zob rivers (Zob Aka and Zob Asfiti), the A-dibb-êne of the geographers. This province — the most valuable part of Assyria — might well stand for Assyria itself, with which it is identified by Pliny ("H. N." xvi. 12) and Ammianus (xxiii. 6). The name Zob, as applied to the rivers, is certainly very ancient, being found in the great inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I., which belongs to the middle of the twelfth century A.C.

G. R.

HYÆNA. Authorities are at variance as to whether the term *tâdbâ'â* ( httpRequest.error: '403' ) in Jer. xii. 9 means a "hyena," as the LXX. has it, or a "speckled bird," as in the A. V.

The etymological force of the word is equally adapted to either, the hyena being strowed. The only other instance in which it occurs is as a proper name, Zeloin (1 Sam. xiii. 18), "the valley of hyenas," Aquila; Neh. xi. 34). The Talmudical writers describe the hyena by no less than four names, of which tâdbâ'a is one (Jellouz, s.v. "Hymenêus.") The opinion of Bochart ("Hier. B." 163) and Gesenius ("Thes.", p. 1149) are in favor of the same view; nor could any room for doubt remain, were it not for the word *alâbâ'â* (אֶלֶבָâ'â ; A. V. "bird") connected with it, which in all other passages refers to a bird. The hyena was common in ancient as in modern Egypt, and is constantly depicted on monuments (Wilkinson, i. 213, 225): it must therefore have been well known to the Jews, if indeed not equally common in Palestine. The sense of the passage in Jeremiah implies a fierce strong beast, not far below the lion in the parallel passage (v. 8); the hyena fully answers to this description. Though cowardly in his nature, he is very savage when once he accords, and the strength of his jaws is such that he can crush the thigh-bone of an ox (Livingstone's "Travels," p. 600). [Zeloin.] W. L. B.

- The etymological affinity of the Arabic عينought to decide that the animal intended is the hyena. This animal is common in Palestine and Syria.

G. E. P.

HYDASPES (θαδσάς [Jadson]), a river noticed in Jud. i. 6, in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris. It is uncertain what river is referred to; the well-known Hydaspes of India (the Jelua of the Parthia) is too remote to accord with the other localities noticed in the context. We may perhaps identify it with the Choasap of Susiana.

W. L. B.

HYMENÆUS [A. V. Hymeneus] (Ὑμηνεὺς), the name of a person occurring twice in the correspondence between St. Paul and Timothy; the first time classed with Alexander, and with him "delivered to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 20); and the second time classed with Philetus, and with him charged with having "erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already," and thereby "overturned the faith of some" (1 Tim. iv. 17, 18). These latter expressions, coupled with "the shipwreck of faith" attributed to Hymenaeus in the context of the former passage (ver. 19), surely warrant our understanding both passages of the same person, notwithstanding the interval between the dates of the two letters. When the first was written he had already made one prostrate: before the second was penned he had seduced another: and if he could point further to be disbelieved, the error attributed to him, and the sentence imposed upon him.

1. The error attributed to him was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and has frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that "knowledge" (γνῶσις) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked forward to a complete restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις, v. Heyne ad "Vulg. Ed." iv. 5, comp. "Jn. vi. 735"; so there was "a regeneration" (Tit. iii. 5; Matt. xix. 28), "a new creation" (2 Cor. iv. 17), see Allford, "Ad loc."); Rev. xxi. 1), "a kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ" (Matt. xiii.; Rev. vii.) — and because the popular letter of heathen anti-Jews was unequivocally pronounced in the N.T.; but here with this remarkable difference, namely, that in a great measure, it was present as well as future — the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. "The kingdom of God is within you," said our Lord (Luke xix. 21). "He that is spiritual judgeth all things," said St. Paul (1 Cor. ii. 13). "He that is born of God cannot sin," said St. John (1 John i. 8). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N. T.: the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (John iii. 3-5); "the hour which now is" (ibid. v. 24, 25), on which see Aug. De Cive Dei, xx. 6); the second, that of the body to and from corruption (1 Cor. xv. 36-44; also John v. 28, 29), which last is prospective. Now as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (Acts and 1 Cor. xv. 35), how keenly and how earnestly they were pressed may be seen in St. Aug. De Cive Dei, xxii. 12 ff. ; while, on the other hand, there was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which enliven upon the glories of the spiritual life that now is, under Christ, and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may derive the first errors of the Gnostics, of whom Hymenaeus was one of the earliest. They were on the spread when St. John wrote; and his grand-disciple, St. Irenaeus, compiled a voluminous work against them ("Adv. Hær."). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, "E. H.," pcri. i. div. i. § 41 ff.

II. As regards the sentence passed upon him — it has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. a Lapide ad 1 Cor. v. 5), that the "delivering to Satan" is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The Apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated to themselves, that they have set apart to them ever since. The shaking off the dust of their feet against a city that would not
HYMENÆUS receive them (St. Matt. x. 14), even though the same injunction was afterwards given to the Seventy (St. Luke x. 11), and which St. Paul found it necessary to act upon twice in the course of his ministry (Acts xii. 51, and xviii. 6), has never been a practice since with Christian ministers. "Anathema," says Bingham, "is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canon" (Antiq. xvi. 2, 16), but the form "Anathema Maranatha" is one that none have ever understood upon since St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 22). As the Apostles healed all manner of bodily infirmities, so they seem to have possessed and exercised the same power in inditing them—a power for so pious a being to be continued when the manifold exigencies of the Apostolic age had passed away. Ananias and Sapphira both fell down dead at the rebuke of St. Peter (Acts v. 5 and 10); two words from the same lips, "Tabitha, arise," sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (ibid. ix. 40). St. Paul's first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Epaphras the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (ibid. ix. 17, and xiii. 11); while soon afterwards we read of his healing the cripple of Lystra (ibid. xiv. 8). Even apart from actual intervention by the Apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord's Supper unworthily, when as one (Matt. x. 34) had said: "For this cause many are weak and sickly in the body and a very small number (ικανοὶ, in the former case it is εὐκαναλοὶ) sleep" (1 Cor. xi. 30).

On the other hand Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (i. 6-12, ii. 1-7). Similar agencies are described 1 K. xxiii. 19-22, and 1 Chr. xxi. 1. In Ps. lxxix. 49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned. Even our Lord submitted to be assailed by him more than once (Matt. iv. 1-10: Luke iv. 13 says, "departed from Him for a season"); and "a messenger of Satan was sent to buffet" the very Apostle whose net of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion. At the same time large powers over the world of spirits were gratuitously conveyed by our Lord to His immediate followers (to the Twelve in Acts i. 2), or even to the Seventy, as the results showed, ibid. x. 17-20.

It only remains to notice five particulars connected with its exercise, which the Apostle supplies himself. (1.) That it was no mere prayer, but a solemn authoritative sentence, pronounced in the name and power of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. v. 5-5). (2.) That it was never exercised upon any without the Church: "then the devil Judgeth thee" (John x. 13); he says in express terms. (3.) That it was "for the destruction of the flesh," i. e. some bodily visitation. (4.) That it was for the improvement of the offender: "that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (ibid. v. 5); and that "he might learn not to blaspheme" while upon earth (1 Tim. i. 29). (5.) That the Apostle could in a given case empower others to pass such sentence in his stead. (Acts xvi. 17), where he says, "I have been with his converts "not even to eat" (1 Cor. v. 11). See an able review of the whole subject by Bingham, Antiq. vi. 2, 15.

HYMN

HYMN. This word is not used in the English version of the O. T., and only twice in the N. T. (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16); though in the original of the latter the derivative verb occurs in three places (Matt. xxvi. 30; comp. Mark xiv. 25; Acts xvi. 25; Heb. ii. 12). The LXX., however, employ it freely in translating the Heb. names for almost every kind of poetical composition (Schleus. Lex. Hymn). In fact the word does not seem to have had for the LXX. any very special meaning; and they called the Heb. book of Tekhillin the book of psalms, not of hymns. Accordingly the word psalm had for the later Jews a definite meaning, while the word hymn was more or less vague in its application, and capable of being used as occasion should arise. If a new poetical form or idea should be produced, the name of hymn, not being embarrassed by a previous determination, was ready to associate itself with the fresh thought of another literature. And this seems to have been actually the case.

Among Christians the Hymn has always been something different from the Psalm; a different conception in thought, a different type in composition. There is some dispute about the origin of its name and its Apostles on the occasion of the Last Supper; but even supposing it to have been the Ἁστελή, or Paschal Hymn, consisting of Pss. exii.-exviii., it is obvious that the word hymn is in this case applied not to an individual psalm, but to a number of psalms chanted successively, and altogether forming a kind of devotional exercise which is not unaptly called a hymn. The prayer in Acts iv. 24-30 is not a hymn, unless we allow non-metrical as well as metrical hymns. It may have been a hymn as it was originally altered; but we can only judge by the Greek translation, and this is without metre, and therefore not properly a hymn. In the jail at Philippi, Paul and Silas "sang hymns" (A. V. "praises") unto God, and so loud was their song that their fellow-prisoners heard them. This must have been what we mean by singing, and not merely recitation. In fact, it is a veritable singing of hymns. And it is remarkable that the noun hymn is only used in reference to the services of the Greeks, and in the same passages is clearly distinguished from the psalm (Eph. v. 19, Col. iii. 16), "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs."

It is probable that no Greek version of the Psalms, even supposing it to be accommodated to the Greek metres, would make root in the affections of the Gentile convert. It was not only a question of metre, it was a question of tune; and Greek tunes required Greek hymns. So it was in Syria. Richer in tunes than Greece, for Greece had but eight, while Syria had 275 (Benedict. Pref. vol. iv. Op. Eph. Syr.). The Syrian hymnographers revelled in the varied luxury of their native music; and the result was that splendid development of the Hymn, as modelled by the songs of Barlaamenes, Harmonus, and other Syrian Hymnographers. In Greece the eight tunes which seem to have satisfied the exigencies of church-music were probably accommodated to fixed metres, each metre being welded to a particular

"A. V. stands for ἁγιάζωντας πολλοἷς.
Hymn; an arrangement to which we can observe a tendency in the Directions about tunes and measures at the end of our English metrical version of the Psalms. This is also the case in the German hymnology, where certain ancient tunes are recognized as such for the metres of later compositions, and their names are always prefixed to the hymns in common use.

It is worth while inquiring what profound models the Greek hymnographers chose to work after. In the old religion of Greece the word hymn had already acquired a sacred and liturgical meaning, which could not fail to suggest its application to the productions of the Christian muse. So much for this name. The special foots of the Greek hymn were various. The Homeric and Orphic hymns were written in the epic style, and in hexameter verse. Their metre was not adapted for singing; and therefore, though they may have been recited, it is not likely that they were sung at the celebration of the mysteries. We turn to the Panharian hymns, and here we find a sufficient variety of metre, and a definite relation to music. These hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, and it is very likely that they engaged the attention of the early hymn-writers. The dithyramb, with its development into the dramatic chorus, was sufficiently connected with musical traditions to make its form a fitting vehicle for Christian poetry; and there certainly is a dithyrambic savour about the earliest known Christian hymn, as it appears in Ch. Alex. pp. 512, 313, ed. Potter.

The first impulse of Christian devotion was to run into the moulds ordinarily used by the song-shippers of the old religion. This was more than an impulse, it was a necessity, and a twofold necessity. The new spirit was strong; but it had two limitations: the difficulty of conceiving a new musico-poetical literature; and the quality so peculiar to devotional music, of lingering in the heart after the head has been convinced and the belief changed. The old tunes would be a real necessity to the new life; and the exile from his ancient faith would delight to hear on the foreign soil of a new religion the familiar melodies of home. Dean Trench has indeed labored to show that the reverse was the case, and that the early Christian shrank with horror from the sweet, but polluted, enchantments of his unbelieving state. We can only asent to this in so far as we allow it to be the second phase in the history of hymns. When chl traditions died away, and the Christian acquired not only a new belief, but a new social humanity, it was possible, and it was desirable too, to break forever the attenuated thread that bound him to the ancient world. And so it was broken; and the trochaic and iambic metres, unassessed as they were with heathen worship, though largely associated with the heathen drama, obtained an ascendent in the Christian church. In I Cor. xiv. 26 allusion is made to improvised hymns, which being the outburst of a passionate emotion would probably assume the dithyrambic form. But attempts have been made to detect fragments of ancient hymns conformed to more obvious metres in Epiph. v. 14; Jan. i. 17; Rev. i. 8 ff., xv. 3. These premeditated fragments, however, may with much greater likelihood be referred to the swing of a prose composition unconsciously culminating into metre. It was in the Latin church that the trochaic and iambic metres became most deeply rooted, and acquired the greatest depth of tone and grasp of finish.

As an exponent of Christian feeling they soon surpassed the accentual hexameters; they were used unmononomically against the heathen and the heretics by Commodianus and Augustine. The introduction of hymns into the Latin church is commonly referred to Ambrose. But it is impossible to conceive that the West should have been formed, as the East: similar necessities must have produced similar results: and it is more likely that the tradition is due to the very marked prominence of Ambrose as the greatest of all the Latin hymnographers.

The trochaic and iambic metres, thus impressed into the service of the church, have continued to hold their ground, and are in fact the 7's, S. M., C. M., and L. M. of our modern hymns; many of which are translations, or at any rate imitations, of Latin originals. These metres were peculiarly adapted to the grave and solemn spirit of Latin Christianity. Less ecstatic than the varied chorus of the Greek church, they did not soar upon the pinion of a lofty praise, so much as they drooped and sunk into the depths of a great sorrow. They were subjective rather than objective; they appealed to the heart more than to the understanding: and if they contained less theology, they were fuller of life and emotion. They were characterized by a transcendent grace, a Beele, a slowness; by an aim of grandeur.

HYSSOP (HYSSUS, εὐστίον: ὑσσοῦς). Perhaps no plant mentioned in the Scriptures has given rise to greater differences of opinion than this. The question of the identification of the εὐστίον of the Hebrews with any plant known to modern botanists was thought by Casaubon "necesse sit difficilis ad explanandum, ut videtur Exsaios expectandos, qui certi aliquid non docentibus. But the botanical works of Solomon survived they might have thrown some light upon it. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that in the I. X. the Greek ὑσσοῦς is the uniform rendering of the Hebrew εὐστίον, and that this rendering is endorsed by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 20, 21), when speaking of the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law. Whether, therefore, the LXX. made use of the Greek ὑσσοῦς as the word most nearly resembling the Hebrew in sound, as Stanley suggests (S. of P. 21., note), or as the true representative of the plant indicated by the latter, is a point which, in all probability, will never be decided. Botanists differ widely even with regard to the identification of the ὑσσοῦς of Dioscorides. The name has been given to the Satureia Grave and the S. Juliana, to neither of which it is appropriate, and the hyssop of Italy and South France is now given Dioscorides. But the botanists' description of the plant has been read as approved of by Kuhn (Comm. in Dose. ii. 27), who in the same passage gives it as his opinion that the Hebrews used the Oryctopium Egyptianum in Egypt, the O. Sycorsum in Palestine, and that the hyssop of Dioscorides was the Satureia Grave. The latter describes two kinds of hyssop, ιοφόρον καὶ κηρυφήν, and divides it into the Egyptian equivalent.
HYSSOP

The Talmudists make the same distinction between the wild hyssop and the garden-plant used for food.

The C2b was used to sprinkle the doorposts of the Israelites in Egypt with the blood of the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 22); it was employed in the purification of leprous persons (Lev. xiv. 4, 51), and in the sacrifice of the red heifer (Num. xix. 6). In consequence of its detergent qualities, or from its being associated with the purificatory services, the Talmudists make use of the expression, "purge me with C2b." (Ps. lii. 7). It is described in I K. iv. 33 as growing on or near walls. In John xix. 29 the phrase Bawo wawalwv (περιβλέπτης) corresponds to περιβλέπτα καλλίμακες in Matt. xxvii. 48 and Mark xv. 39. If therefore περιβλέπτα is the equivalent of περιβλέπτης, the latter must be a plant capable of producing a stick three or four feet in length.

Five kinds of hyssop are mentioned in the Talmud. One is called SNN simply, without any epithet: the others are distinguished as Greek, Roman, wild hyssop, and hyssop of Cochlii (Mishna, Kегайим, xiv. 6). Of these the four last-mentioned were profane, that is, not to be employed in purifications (Mishna, Passah, xi. 7). Maimonides (de Yacca Rof, iii. 2) says that the hyssop mentioned in the law is that which was used as a condiment. According to Porphyry (De Mafin. iv. 7), the Egyptian priests on certain occasions ate their bread mixed with hyssop; and the ομίλιον, or wild marjoram, with which it has been identified, is often an ingredient in a mixture called Είκοκο, which is to this day used as food by the poorer classes in Egypt (Lane, Mod. Egypt, i. 200). It is not improbably, therefore, that this may have been the hyssop of Maimonides, who wrote in Egypt; more especially as R. D. Kimchi (Ex. s. v.) who reckons seven different kinds, gives as the equivalent the Arabic مكراә, zovtcr, origanum, or marjoram, and the German Pesten or Wohldgeneth (Roessn. Handbk.). With this agrees the Tanachum Heber, MS. quoted by Gesenius. So in the Judaeo-Spanish version, Ex. xii. 22 is translated "y tomarádes manao de orégano." But Dioscorides makes a distinction between origanum and hyssop when he describes the leaf of a species of the former as resembling the latter (cf. Pliny, xx. 67). Though it is evident that he, as well as the Talmudists, regarded them as belonging to the same family. In the Syriac of I K. iv. 33 hyssop is rendered by ٍلئَع, lófšah, "house-deck," although in other passages it is represented by لئَن, lófš, which the Arabic translation follows in Ps. li. 7 and Heb. ix. 19, while in the Pentateuch it has zovtcr for the same. Patrick (on I K. iv. 33) was of opinion that C2b is the same with the Ethicic acsb, which represents the hyssop of Ps. li. 7, as well as بسألاυν, or marjoram, in Matt. xxviii. 23.

Becquet decides in favor of marjoram or some plant like it (Hieroc. i. 1. 2. c. 50), and to this conclusion, it must be admitted, all ancient tradition points. The monks on Jebel Musa give the name of hyssop to a fragrant plant called jltäch, which grows in great quantities on that mountain (Robinson, Bibl. Res. i. 157). Celsus (Hierobol. i. 427), after enumerating eighteen different plants, thyme, southerwood, rosemary, frencel, lavender, καλλίκτερ, and the maidenhair fern among others, which have been severally identified with the hyssop of Scripture, concludes that we have no alternative but to accept the Ηςοσσυνον τῆς Αποστολῆς, "nisci velimins apostolorum corrigere qui ro D C2b redit Heb. ix. 19." He avoids the difficulty in John xix. 29 by supposing that the sponge filled with vinegar was wrapped round a large stick, and that the two were then fastened to the end of a stick. Dr. Kitto conceived that he had found the peculiarities of the Hebrew C2b in the Phylo- "καλλικτερ" from the Greek, the fabricalist, and the C2b of 1 K. iv. 33 (Hitzig, Die Sprachw. Semit. i. 2). An elaborate and interesting paper by the late Dr. J. Forbes Boyle, On the Hyssop of Scripture, in the Journ. of the Roy. As. Soc. viii. 193-212, goes far to throw light upon this difficult question. Dr. R., after a careful investigation of the subject, arrived at the conclusion that the hyssop is no other than the caper-plant, or καπρίσσωνια of Iviron. The Arabic name of this plant, ομσίε, may, by a possible misapplication of the name, be identified with the C2b of 1 K. iv. 33, which, whether correctly employed in a mixture called Είκοκο, or wrongly, is made use of. It has been reserved for the ingenuity of a German to trace a connection between ομσίε, the Greek fabulist, and the C2b of 1 K. iv. 33 (Hitzig, Die Sprachw. Semit. i. 2).
the plants with which the tradition of centuries has identified it. That it may have been possessed of some deterrent qualities which led to its significant employment in the purificatory service is possible; but it does not appear from the narrative in Leviticus that its use was such as to call into action any medicinal properties by which it might have been characterized. In the present state of the evidence, therefore, there does not seem sufficient reason for departing from the old interpretation, which identified the Greek \textit{auranos} with the Hebrew \textit{zqms}.

W. A. W.

'1. I design to give reasons, conclusive in my mind, against the supposition that the \textit{Cupressis spinosa} is the hyssop. (1.) It is a thorny plant highly unsuitable to the use intended; \textit{i. e.}, the bough formed into a sort of wisp or brush, or bunch, suitable for sprinkling. Its branches are struggling and quite incapable of assuming the required form, and its harsh thorns would make it impossible to hold it in the hand. Can it be supposed that it was stripped of these to prepare it for use? (2.) It has no affinity with the \textit{sanq}, which is one of the \textit{Labiatce}, and which from its etymological identity with \textit{zqms} is entitled to be considered the plant referred to in the Scriptures.

II. I desire to present the evidence which satisfies my mind that the \textit{Origanum maru} is the plant intended.

(1.) The definition of \textit{zqms} in Arabic is “a plant growing on a slender square stem” (a characteristic of the \textit{Labiatce}) with a leaf like the slender \textit{yczq}. This definition makes it certain that the Arabic \textit{Zapha} is very near the \textit{Origanum maru}, for the latter is one of the numerous species included by the Arabs under the indefinite term \textit{yczq}: in fact, it is the most common of them all.

(2.) It grows on the \textit{wells} of all the terraces throughout Palestine and Syria.

(3.) It is free from thorns, and its slender stem, free from spreading branches, and ending in a cluster of heads, having a highly aromatic odor, exactly fits it to be made into a bunch

\textit{Origanum maru}. (G. E. Post fac.)

*The fact that many stalks grow up from one root sufficiently fit this species for the purpose intended. No plant growing in the East is so well fitted for the purpose. These considerations have long persuaded me that this is the plant intended.*

Its leaves are commonly eaten in Syria with bread, and as a seasoning, as we use summer savoury, which it resembles in taste. Its effects on sheep and goats are very salutary.

G. E. P.
ICH’ABOD (יִחָאָב֥ד), from נָאָב, "where?", equivalent to the negative, and יִחַֽהֲבוּן, "glory,"

(1.16) and the letters of Cicero (ad Fam. iii. 8, v. 20, xi. 4). When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important roads intersected one another at this point, as may be seen from the map in Leake’s Asia Minor. These circumstances should be borne in mind, when we trace St. Paul’s journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The Apostle’s first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Acts xiii. 50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and St. Paul’s first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (v. 14). The results were considerably both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (Acts). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (v. 3). The intriguers of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia (v. 6). Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (v. 19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium and encouraging the church which he had founded there (v. 21, 22). These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2 Tim. iii. 11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the Syrian Antioch, in company with Silas (Acts xv. 40), on his second missionary circuit; and travelling through Cilicia (v. 41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (xiv. 1, 2). Though at one time, however, the Apostle was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (v. 2); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (v. 3) and ordination (1 Tim. 1, 18, iv. 14, 12; 2 Tim. i. 6) took place there. On leaving Iconium St. Paul and his party travelled to the N. W.; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative; though there is little doubt that it was visited by the Apostle again in the early
ICONIUM

part of his third circuit (Acts xvii. 23). From its position it could not fail to be an important centre of Christian influence in the early ages of the church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be regarded as literally true. The "traditions ascribed at Iconium" are given in full by Grabe (Spicil. vol. i.), and by Jones (On the Canons, vol. ii. pp. 353-411). It is natural here to notice one geographical mistake in that document, namely, that Lystra is placed on the west instead of the east. In the declining period of the Roman empire, Iconium was made a domus. In the middle ages it became a place of great consequence, as the capital of the Seljukian sultans. Hence the remains of the Saracenic architecture, which are conspicuous here, and which are described by many travellers. Iconium is still a town of considerable size.

J. S. H.

* The origin of the name is obscure. Some find it allied to εἰκόνα or εἰκόνων (= "place of images") while others derive it from a Semitic root (see Paul's Rhet.-Engyl. iv. 51). It was situated on one of the largest plains in Asia Minor, and, like Damascus, formed an oasis in the desert. The hills that flowed from mountain ranges on the west of the city irrigated, for a little distance, the low grounds which stretched away towards the east, and gardens and orchards were seen in luxuriance, but soon the water, the source of vegetation, was exhausted, and then commenced the dry barren plain of Lycaonia." (See Lewin's Life and Epistles of St. Paul, i. 158.) The eyes of Paul and Barnabas must have rested for hours on the city both before reaching it from Antioch and after leaving it for Lystra. "We travelled," says Ainsworth, "three hours along the plain of Konyah, always in sight of the city, before we reached it" (Travels in Asia Minor, ii. 63). Leake says, "We saw the city with its mosques and ancient walls still at the distance of 12 or 14 miles from us" (Travels in Asia Minor, p. 45).

Luke's statement that Paul found there "a great multitude both of Jews and Greeks" (Acts xiv. 1), accords with the extent and variety of the ruins still found on the spot. It accords also with the geographical position of the place so well situated for trade and intercourse with other regions. The Greeks and Jews were the commercial factors of that period, as they are so largely at the present times; and hence the narrative mentions them as very numerous precisely here. The bulk of the population belonged to a different stock. The possession of a common language gave the missionaries access at once to the Greek-speaking foreigners.

The Apostle's narrow escape from being stoned at Iconium (Acts xiv. 5) recalls to us a passage in one of the epistles. Paul was actually stoned at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19), soon after his departure from Iconium, and referring to that instance when he wrote to the Corinthians, he says (2 Cor. xi. 25): "Once was I stoned." Hence, says Paley (More Pauline), "had this meditated assault at Iconium been completed, had the history related that a stone was thrown, as it relates that preparations were made both by Jews and Gentiles to stone Paul and his companions, or even had the account of this transaction stopped, without going on to inform us that Paul and his companions were "awake of the danger and fled," a contradiction between the history and the epistles would have ceased. Truth is necessarily inconsistent: but it is scarcely possible that independent accounts, not having true to guide them, should thus advance to the very brink of contradiction without falling into it."}

IDO

ID'ALAH (יָדָלָה) [memorial stone of El (God), First: Iʾsdw [Vat. -sp]; Alex. Iʾsdw-nn: Iʾsdw-nn, one of the cities of the tribe of Zebulun, named between Shimron and Bethphages (Josh. xix. 15). Schwarz (p. 172), without quoting his authority, but probably from one of the Talmudic books, gives the name as "Y'dalah or Chi/tris," and would identify it with the village of Kelah al-Chiris, 9 miles S. W. of Semunni." Semaniyah is known and marked on many of the maps, rather less than 3 miles S. of Beilt-Sulim; but the other place mentioned by Schwarz has evaded observation. It is not named in the Onomasticon.

G.

IDBASH (ידבש) [stout, corpulent]: Iʾsdw-nn [Vat. corrupt?]; Alex. Iʾsdw-nn: Iʾsdw-nn, one of the three sons of Abi-Edan — "the father of Edan" — among the families of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 3). The Tzelephonite is named as his sister. This list is probably a topographical one, a majority of the names being those of places.

IDO 1. [ʾsdw-nn: Ydalah; [Vat. corrupt?]; Alex. Iʾsdw-nn: Adba. The father of Abinadab, one of Solomon's monthly purveyors (1 K. iv. 14).

2. [ʾsdw-nn: Ydalah; [Vat. Aṣhd; Comp. Abd. Aʾsdw-nn: Adbo. A descendant of Gershom, son of Levi (1 Chr. vi. 21). In the reversed genealogy (ver. 41) the name is altered to Udalait, and we there discover that he was one of the forefathers of Asaph the seer.

3. [ʾsdw-nn: Ydalah; [Vat. Aṣhd; Alex. Iʾsdw-nn: Abdo. The son of Zechariah, ruler (nabih) of the tribe of Manasseh east of Jordan in the time of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 21).

4. [ʾsdw-nn, i. e. Y'doī [born on a festival; First]; but in the correction of the Keri ידאו, Ye'do: Iʾsdw, Aʾsdw-nn [Vat. Aṣhd; Adbo. A seer (ʾsdw-nn) whose "visions" (ʾsdw-nn) against Jeroboam incidentally contained some of the acts of Solomon (2 Chr. ix. 23). He also appears to have written a chronicle or story (Moshesh, Ges. p. 357) relating to the life and reign of Abijah (2 Chr. xii. 22), and also a book "concerning genealogies," in which the acts of Rehoboam were recorded (xii. 15). These books are lost, but they may have formed part of the foundation of the existing books of Chronicles (Herbeck, On Chron, Introd. § 3). The mention of his having prophesied against Jeroboam probably led to his identification in the ancient Jewish traditions (Jerome, Quart. Heb. in 2 Chron. xii. 15, Jaddo; Joseph. Ant. viii. 3, § 5, ʾsdw-nn with the "Man of God" out of Judah, who denounced the altar of that king (1 K. xii. 1). He is also identified with Oded (see Jerome on 2 Chr. xv. 1).

5. [ʾsdw-nn in Zeh. [i. 7] Iʾsdw-nn: Aʾsdw-nn [in Eer., Vat. Aṣhd; in Neh., Vat. Alex. F.A. omit, and so Rom. in xii. 4.] Adbo. The grandfather of the prophet Zechariah (Zech. i. 1, 7, although in other places Zechariah is called the son of Iddo" (Ezr. v. 1, vi. 14). Iddo returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel and Jeshaia (Neh. xii. 4), and in the next generation — the "days of Jeokim" son of Jeshua (vv. 10, 12) — his house was represented.
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by Zechariah (ver. 14). In 1 Esdr. vi. 1 the name is Atum.

6. 珥ען: [LXX. omit, exc. Comp. once 'אב, שד, פב.]. The chief of those who assembled at Caphirah, at the time of the second caravan from Babylon, in the reign of Artaxeres Longimanus A. D. 60. He was one of the Nethinim, of whom 229 responded to the appeal of Ezra to assist in the return to Judæa (Ezr. viii. 17; comp. 29). In the Apoc. Esdras the name is SADDÉUS and DADDÉUS.

G. IDOL IMAGE. As no less than twenty-one different Hebrew words have been rendered in the A. V. either by idol or image, and that by no means uniformly, it will be of some advantage to attempt to discriminate between them, and assign as nearly as the two languages will allow, the English equivalents for each. But, before proceeding to the discussion of those words which in themselves indicate the objects of false worship, it will be necessary to notice a class of abstract terms which, with a deep moral significance, express the degradation associated with it, and stand out as a protest of the language against the enormities of idolatry. Such are—

1. ₪יִם, üren, rendered elsewhere "nought," "vanity," "iniquity," "wickedness," "sorrow," etc., and once only "idol" (Is. lxi. 3). The primary idea of the root seems to be emptiness, nothingness, as of breath or vapor; and, by a natural transition, in a moral sense, wickedness in its active form of mischief, and then, as the result, sorrow and trouble. Hence üren denotes a vain, false, wicked thing, and expresses at once the essential nature of idols, and the consequences of their worship. The character of the word may be learnt from its associates. It stands in parallelism with רכש, epex (Is. xli. 29), which, after undergoing various modifications, comes at length to signify "nothing;" with יִכֶל, šebel, "breath" or "vapor," itself applied as a term of contempt to the objects of idolatrous reverence (Deut. xxxii. 21; 1 K. xvi. 13; Ps. xxxii. 9; Jer. viii. 19, x. 8); with יִהְר, shér, "nothingness," "vanity;" and with מִשָּׁר, šeker, "falseness" (Zech. x. 2): all indicating the utter worthlessnes of the idols to whom homage was paid, and the false and delusive nature of their worship. It is employed in an abstract sense to denote idolatry in general in 1 Sam. xvi. 24. There is much significance in the change of the name from Bethel to Bethaven, the great centre of idolatry in Israel (Hos. iv. 15).

2. יִד, id, is thought by some to have a sense akin to that of מֵשֶׁר, šeker, "falseness;" with which it stands in parallelism in Job xii. 4, and would therefore much resemble יַעַר, as applied to an idol. Delitzsch (on Hab. ii. 18) derives it from the negative particle יָלַע, al, "die Nicht-igkeit." But according to First (Heb. s. v.) it is a diminutive of יִד, "god," the additional syllable indicating the greatest contempt. In this case the signification above mentioned is a subsidiary one. The same authority asserts that the word denotes a small image of the god, which was consulted as an oracle among the Egyptians and Phoenicians (Is. xix. 3; Jer. xiv. 11). It is cer-
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tainly used of the idols of Noph or Memphis (Ex. xxx. 13). In strong contrast with Jehovah it appears in Ps. xcv. 5, xxx. 7: the contrast probably being heightened by the resemblance between אֱלִילִן and אֱלִיתִן. A somewhat similar play upon words is observable in Hab. ii. 18, יִלְלֹת אֱלִילִים "ab idols," A. V.).

3. יִד, יִד, "a horror" or "a terror," and hence an object of horror or terror (Jer. i. 38), in reference either to the hideousness of the idols or to the gross character of their worship. In this respect it is closely connected with—

4. יִד, יִד, miphtèth, a "fright," "horror," applied to the idol of Masekah, probably of wood, which Asa cut down and burned (1 K. xv. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 16), and which was unquestionably the Phaïlas, the symbol of the productive power of nature (Movers, Phön. 1. 571; Selden, de Dis Syr. ii. 5), and the nature-goddess Aslēra. Allusion is supposed to be made to this in Jer. x. 5, and Epist. of Jer. 70 (in the Apocrypha). In 2 Chr. xv. 16 the Vulg. renders "simulacrum Pratii" (cf. Hol. "forum axiunque maxima, formibus"). The LXX. had a different reading, which it is not easy to determine. They translate in 1 K. xv. 13 the same word both by אֲבָדֹות (with which corresponds the Syr. יִד, "a festival," reading perhaps יִד, "a terror, as in 2 K. x. 20; Jer. ix. 2) and הַכְּדָבֹות, while in Chronicles it is אֲבָדֹות. Possibly in 1 K. xv. 13 they may have read יִד, "falsehood, the Vulg. specus, of which "a simulacrum terrissimum" is a correction. With יד it is found in close connection—

5. יִד, בֵּית, "shame," or "shameful thing" (A. V. Jer. xi. 13; Hos. ix. 10), applied to Baal or Baal-Peor, as characterizing the obscenity of his worship. With יד is found in close connection—

6. יִד, גֵּדָל, also a term of contempt, but of uncertain origin (Ex. xxx. 13). The Rabbinical authorities, referring to such passages as Ex. iv. 12, Zeph. i. 17, have favored the interpretation given in the margin of the A. V. to Deut. xxix. 17, "dumce gods" (Vulg. "sordes," "sordes idolorum," 1 K. xiv. 12). Jahn connects it with יִד, "to roll," and applies it to the stocks of trees of which idols were made, and in mockery called gidelin, "rolling things" (אֲרָכָה). He says, though it is difficult to see the point of his remark. Gesenius, repudiating the derivation from the Aram. יִד, julla, "to be great, illustrious," gives his preference to the rendering "stones, stone gods," thus deriving it from יִד, "a heap of stones;" and in this he is followed by First, who translates גדרל by the Germ. "Steinhaufer." The expression is applied, principally in Ezekiel, to false gods and their symbols (Deut. xxix. 17; Ez. viii. 10, 4c.). It stands side by side with other contemptuous terms in Ex. xvi. 36, xx. 8; as for example יִד, šekel, "filth," "abomination" (Ez. viii. 10), and—
The cognate יִשְׁמָאֹים, skilklōs, "filth," "impurity," especially applied, like σκέλη, to that which produced ceremonial uncleanness (Ex. xxiii. 23; Nah. iii. 5), such as food offered in sacrifice to idols (Zechar. ix. 7; comp. Acts xv. 20, 29). As referring to the idols themselves, it primarily denotes the obscene rites with which their worship was associated, and hence, by metonymy, is applied both to the objects of worship and also to their worshipers, who partook of the impurity, and thus became loathsome like their love," the foul Baal-Peor (Num. i. 9).

We now come to the consideration of those words which more directly apply to the images or idols, as the outward symbols of the deity who was worshipped through them. These may be classified according as they indicate that the images were made in imitation of external objects, and to represent some idea, or attribute; or as they denote the workmanship by which they were fashioned. To the first class belong—

8. בִּלְבָל, semel, or בְּלִבְלָל, semel, with which Gesenius compares as cognate בִּלְבָל, מַשְׁבַּל, and בֵּלָל/בֵּלָל, telem, the Lat. simulis and Greek διαλός, signifies a "likeness," "semblance." The Targ. in Deut. iv. 16 gives בֵּלָל, "figure," as the equivalent; while in Ez. viii. 3, 5, it is rendered by בֵּלָל, "image." In the latter passages the Syriac has בֵּלָל, "image," (the στάτιον of the LXX.), which more properly corresponds to ματαστάθαι (see No. 15 below); and in Deut. כִּבָּֽל/כִּבָּל, genitals, "kind" (οἴμοι). The passage in 2 Chr. xxxiii. 7 is rendered with images of four faces, the latter words representing the one under consideration. In 2 Chr. xxxiii. 15 it appears as "carved images," following the LXX. γαρστάθαι. On the whole the Greek εἰκόνις of Deut. iv. 16, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 7, and the "simulacrum" of the Vulgate (2 Chr. xxxiii. 15) most nearly resemble the Hebrew semel.

9. בֵּלָל, telem (Ch. id. and בֵּלָל, telem) is by all lexicographers, ancient and modern, connected with בֵּלְל/בֵּל, tell, "a shadow." It is the "image" of God in which man was created (Gen. i. 27; cf. Wisd. ii. 23), distinguished from בֵּלְל/בֵּל, demeth, or "likeness," as the "image" from the "idea" which it represents (Schmidt, de imag. Dei in Hom. p. 84); though it would be rash to insist upon this distinction. In the N. T. εἰκόνις appears to represent the latter (Col. iii. 10; cf. LXX. of Gen. v. 1), διαλός the former of the two words (Rom. i. 23, viii. 29; Phil. ii. 7), but in Heb. x. 1 εἰκόνις is opposed to σκιά as the substance to the unsubstantial form, of which it is the perfect representative. The LXX. render demeth by διάλοις, διαλός, εἰκόνες, διαλοῦσα, εἰκόνα, and εἰκόνα most frequently by εἰκόνις, though διάλοις, εἰκόνα, and εἰκόνα also occasionally occur. But whatever abstract nouns best define the meaning of telem, it is unquestionably used to denote the visible forms of external objects, and is applied to figures of gold and silver (1 Sam. vi. 5; Num. xxxiii. 52; Dan iii. 1), such as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as well as to those painted upon walls (Ez. xxiii. 14). "Image" perhaps most nearly represents it in all passages. Applied to the human countenance (Dan. iii. 19) it signifies the "expression," and corresponds to the idea of Matt. xxviii. 9, though demeth agrees rather with the Platonic usage of the latter word.

10. בֵּלָל/בֵּל, telem, rendered "image" in Job iv. 16; elsewhere "semblitude" (Deut. iv. 12), "likeness." (Deut. v. 8) "form," or "shape" would be better. In Deut. iv. 16 it is in parallelism with בֵּלָל, "image," literally "build," hence "plan," or "model" (2 K. xvi. 10; cf. Ex. xx. 4; Num. xii. 8).

11. בִּלְבַל, בִּלְבַל, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב (Jer. xxii. 28), or 13. בִּלְבַל, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב (Is. xlviii. 5), "a figure," "an idol," all derived from a root בָּלָל, מְתָס, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, "to work," or "a fashion" (akin to בָּלַע, בָּלָע, and the like), are terms applied to idols as expressing that their origin was due to the labor of man. The verb in its derived senses indicates the sorrow and trouble consequent upon severe labor, but the latter seems to be the radical idea. If the notion of sorrow were most prominent the words as applied to idols might be compared with årego above. Is. xlviii. 3 is rendered in the Phœnician Syriac "idols" (A. V. "laborers"), but the reading was evidently different. In Ps. cxxxix. 24, בֵּל/בֵּל, derec/תְּשַׁב, is "idolatry.

12. בָּל/בָּל, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, once only applied to an idol (Is. xlv. 16; LXX. μόραοι, as by בָּל/בָּל, "idol." The word usually denotes "a pang," but in this instance is probably connected with the roots בָּל, מְתָס, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, יִגְלָם, and מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, יִגְלָם, and מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, יִגְלָם, which signifies a "shape," or "mould," and hence an "idol."}

13. מְתָס/תְּשַׁב/מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, anything set up, a "statue" (בָּל/בָּל, מְתָס/תְּשַׁב, Jer. xliii. 13), applied to a memorial stone like those erected by Jacob on four several occasions (Gen. xxviii. 18, xxxi. 45, xxxv. 14, 15) to commemorate a crisis in his life, or to mark the grave of Rachel. Such were the stones set up by Joshua (Josh. iv. 9) after the passage of the Jordan, and at Shechem (xxiv. 26), and by Samuel when victorious over the Philistines (1 Sam. vii. 12). When solemnly dedicated they were anointed with oil, and libations were poured upon them. The word is applied to denote the obelisks which stood at the entrance to the temple of the Sun at Heliopolis (Jer. xliii. 13), two of which were a hundred cubits high and eight broad, each of a single stone (Her. ii. 111). It is also used of the statues of Baal (2 K. iii. 2), whether of stone (2 K. x. 27) or wood (id. 29), which stood in the innermost recess of the temple at Samaria. Movers (Phcen. i. 674) conjectures that the latter were statues or columns distinct from that of Baal, which was of stone and conical (673), like the "meta" of Paphos (Tac. II. ii. 3), and probably therefore the whole inferior in accuracy to that of the rest of the O. T.
belonging to other deities who were his τὰφροδίων or σύμβολοι. The Phenicians consecrated and anointed stones like that at Bethel, which were called, as some think, from this circumstance Betygi. Many such are said to have been seen on the Lebanon, near Heliodorus, dedicated to various gods, and many prodigies are related of them (Pausanias in Phoix, quoted by Boeckh, "Anm., ii. 2"). The same authority describes them as acrolites, of a whitish and sometimes purple color, spherical in shape, and about a span in diameter. The Palladium of Troy, the black stone in the Kbaul at Meec, said to have been brought from heaven by the angel Gabriel, and the stone at Ephesus "which fell down from Jupiter" (Acts xix. 35), are examples of the belief, anciently so common, that the gods sent down their images on earth. In the older worship of Greece stones, according to Pausanias (vii. 22, § 4), occupied the place of images. Those at Phare, about thirty in number, and quadrangular in shape, near the statue of Hermes, received divine honors from the Phenicians, and each had the name of some god conferred upon it. The stone in the temple of Jupiter Ammon (mandale monaco simulacrum), enriched with emeralds and gems (Curt. iv. 7, § 31); that at Delphi, which Saturn swallowed (Paus. Phoc. 24, § 6); the black stone of pyramidal shape in the temple of Juggernaut, and the holy stone at Pessinus in Galatia, sacred to Cybele, show how widely spread and almost universal were these ancient objects of worship. They are mostly connected with these "statues" of Paul, whether in the form of obelisks or otherwise, were —

16. ἀγαλματικά, clouusa aumén, rendered in the margin of most passages "sun-images." The word has given rise to much discussion. In the Vulgate it is translated thrice similitura, three obelus, and once simile. The LXX. give πρεξευ ραν τωι, ἑβδομα τεω σα. ξυνα χεριατικα, βίβλιατικα, κα τα δώρα. With one exception (2 Chr. xxiv. 4, which is evidently corrupt) the Syriac has vaguely either "fears," i. e. objects of fear, or "houses." The Targum in all passages translates it by ישכון שֵׁבַי, chalista/syaggl, "houses for star-worship" (Fürst compares the Arab.槌، خانم, Chumms, the planet Mercury or Venus), a rendering which Rosenmailler prefers. Gesenius preferred to consider these chalista/syaggl as "veils" or "shrines surrounded or shrouded with hangings" (Ex. xxvi. 16; Targ. on Is. iii. 19), and seanted the interpretation of Ruxtorf — "statue solares" — as a mere guess, though he somewhat paradoxically asceried to Rosenmailler's opinion that they were "houses dedicated to the worship of the stars." Kimchi, under the root יַּשֹּב, mentions a conjecture that they were trees like the Ashrim, but (v. יַּשֹּב) elsewhere expresses his own belief that the Nun is apothetic, and that they were said "because the sun-worshippers made them." Alen Ezra (on Lev. xxvi. 30) says they were "houses made for worshipping the sun," which Boeckh approves (Comm. ii. 17); and Jarchi, that they were a kind of idol placed on the roofs of houses. Yossius (cf. [Heb. 3:35]), as Scaliger before him, connects the word with Amnus, or Ommus, the sacred fire, the symbol of the Persian sun-god, and renders it.

pyras (cf. Schellen, ii. 8). Adelung (Mishr. i. 156), quoted by Gesen. on Is. xvii. 8) suggested the same, and compared it with the Sanskrit hrasa. But to such interpretations the passage in 2 Chr. xxiv. 4, is inimical (Vitrings on Is. xvii. 8). Gesenius' own opinion appears to have fluctuated considerably. In his view (v. "Comm. on Is. xviii. 3") the general rendering "caulins" to the more definite one of "sun-columns," and is inclined to look to a Persian origin for the derivation of the word. But in his Thesaurus he mentions the occurrence of Chouma as a synonym of Baal in the Phenician and Palmyrene inscriptions in the sense of "Dominus Solaris," and its after application to the statues or columns erected for his worship. Spencer of Legg. Hebr. ii. 29), and after him Michaelis ("sygpl. ad Lex. Hebr. xvii. 8 v.), maintained that it signified statues or lofty columns, like the pyramids or obelisks of Egypt. Movers (Phen. i. 441) concludes with good reason that the sun-god Baal and the idol "Chouma" are not essentially different. In his discussion of Chouma, he says, "These images of the fire-god were placed on foreign or non-Israelitish altars, in conjunction with the symbols of the nature-goddess Asherah, as συγβολων (2 Chr. xxiv. 3, 5, xxxiv. 4, 7; Is. xvii. 9, xxvi. 9), as was otherwise usual with Baal and Asherah." They are mentioned with the Asherim, and the latter are coupled with the statues of Baal (1 K. xvi. 23; 2 K. xxii. 14). The choumâniat and statues are used promiscuously (cf. 2 K. xxiii. 14, and 2 hr. xxxiv. 4; 2 Chr. xxiii. 3 and 5), but are never spoken of together. Such are the steps by which he arrives on Isaiah (i.e. he presents it is supported by the Palmyrene inscription at Oxford, alluded to above, which has been thus rendered: "This column (Σύγβολον, Choumâniat), and this altar, the sons of Malem, etc. have erected and dedicated to the Sun." The Veneto-Greek Version leaves the word untranslated in the strange form ἀγαλμάτιτες. From the expressions in Ex. vi. 4, 6, and Lev. xxvi. 30, it may be inferred that these columns, which perhaps represented a rising flame of fire and stood upon the altar of Baal (2 Chr. xxiv. 4), were of wood or stone.

17. ἀγαλματική, michith, occurs in Lev. xxvi. 1; Num. xxxiii. 52; Ex. viii. 12; "device" most nearly suits all passages (cf. Ps. lxxiii. 7; Prov. xviii. 11, xxv. 11). This word has been the fruitful cause of as much dispute as the preceding. The general opinion appears to be that ἀγαλματική, michith, signifies a stone with figures graven upon it. Ben Zeb explains it as "a stone with figures or hieroglyphics carved upon it," and so Michaelis; and it is maintained by Movers (Phen. i. 105) that the betygi, or columns with painted figures, the lapides effigios "of Minucius Felix (c. 3), are these stones of device," and that the characters engraved on them are the lapides stygia, or characters sacred to the several deities. The invention of these characters, which is ascribed to Tant, he conjectures originated with the Seres. Gesenius explains it as a stone with the image of an idol, Baal or Astarte, and refers to his Mon. Phen. 21-24 for others of similar character. Rashii (on Lev. xxxi. 1) derives it from the root יַּשֹּב, to cover, "because they cover the floor with a pavement of stones." The Targum and Syr. Lev. xxi. 1, give "a stone of devotion," and the
The terms which follow have regard to the material and workmanship of the idol rather than to its character as an object of worship.

19. πεστιλ, pesel, and 20. πεσελιμ, peselum, usually translated in the L. V. "graven or carved images." In two passages the latter is ambiguously rendered "quarries" (Judg. iii. 19, 26) following the Targum, but there seems no reason for departing from the ordinary signification. In the majority of instances the LXX. have χαλκούντων once γλυπμα. The verb is employed to denote the finishing which the stone received at the hands of the masons, after it had been rough-hewn from the quarries (Ex. xxiv. 4; 1 K. v. 18). It is probably a later usage which has applied pesel to a figure cast in metal, as in Is. xl. 19, xiv. 10.

These "sculptured" images were apparently of wood, iron, or stone, covered with gold or silver (Deut. vii. 25; Is. xxx. 22; Hab. ii. 19), the more costly being of solid metal (Is. xl. 19). They could be burnt (Deut. vii. 5; Is. xl. 20; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 4) cut down (Deut. xii. 3) and pounded (2 Chr. xxxiv. 7), or broken in pieces (Is. xxi. 9). In making them, the skill of the wise iron-smith (Deut. xxvii. 15; Is. xl. 24) or carpenter, and of the goldsmith, was employed (Judg. xvii. 3, 4; Is. xli. 7), the former forming the rough mass of iron beaten into shape by the anvil (Is. xliii. 12), while the latter overlaid it with plates of gold and silver, probably from Tarshish (Jer. x. 9), and decorated it with silver chains. The image thus formed received the further adornment of embroidered robes (Ex. xvi. 18), to which possibly allusion may be made in Is. iii. 19. Brass and clay were among the materials employed for the same purpose (Dan. ii. 33, v. 23). A description of the three great images of Babylon on the top of the temple of Belus will be found in Dion. Soc. ii. 9 (comp. Layard, Nin. ii. 433). The several stages of the process by which the metal or wood became the "graven image" are so vividly described in Is. xlii. 10-20, that it is only necessary to refer to that passage, and we are at once introduced to the mysteries of idol manufacture, which, as at Ephesus, "brought no small gain unto the craftsmen."

21. Παλαι, nese, or Παλαι, nese, and 22.

The Syr. has Λαμος, tīlōp (רימ), "the mould," for chereb. But the expression ידוהי, vagga'tarah, decides that it was by the chereb, in whatever manner employed, that the shape of a calf was given to the metal.

In N. T. εἰκὼν is the "image " or head of the emperor on the coinage (Matt. xxii. 20).

Among the earliest objects of worship, regarded as symbols of deity, were, as has been said above, the meteoric stones which the ancients believed to have been the images of the gods sent down from heaven. From these they transferred their regard to rough unhewn blocks, to stone columns or pillars of wood, in which the divinity worshipped was supposed to dwell, and which were consecrated, like the sacred stone at Delphi, by being anointed with oil, and crowned with wool on solemn days (Paus. Phec. 24, § 8). Tavernier (quoted by Rosenmüller, Gr. u. N. Hervorgendes, i. § 80) mentions a black stone in the pagoda of Benares which was daily anointed with perfumed oil, and such are the "Lingams" in daily use in the Siva worship of Bengal (cf. Arnoldus, i. 39; Min. Fed. c. 3). Such custom is remarkable illustrations of the solemn consecration by Jacob of the stone at Bethel, as showing the religious reverence with which these memorial stones were regarded. And not only were single stones thus honored, but heaps of stone were, in later times at least, considered as sacred to Hermes (Hom. Od. xvi. 471; cf. Vulg. Prov. xxi. 8, "sicut qui mittit lapidem in acerrum Mercurii"), and to these each passing traveller contributed his offering (Creuzer, Synth. i. 24).

The heap of stones which Laban erected to commemorate the solemn compact between himself and Jacob, and on which he invoked the gods of his fathers, is an instance of the intermediate stage in which such heaps were associated with religious observances before they became objects of worship. Jacob, for his part, dedicated a single stone as his memorial, and called Jehovah to witness, thus holding himself aloof from the rites employed by Laban, which may have partaken of his ancestral idolatry. (Jegar-sahadutha.)

Of the forms assumed by the idolatrous images we have no manuscripts in the Bible. Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, was a human figure terminating in a fish (Dagon); and that the Syrian deities were represented in later times in a symbolical human shape we know for certainty

---

\(^{a}\) More probably still pesel denotes by anticipation the molten image in a later stage after it had been crammed into shape by the caster.
The Hebrews imitated their neighbors in this respect as in others (Is. xiv. 13; Wisd. xiii. 13), and from various allusions we may infer that idols in human forms were not uncommon among them, though they were more anciently symbolized by animals (Wisd. xiii. 14), as by the calves of Aaron and Jeroboam, and the brazen serpent which was afterwards applied to idolatrous uses (2 K. xviii. 4; Rom. i. 23). When the image came from the hands of the maker it was decorated richly with silver and gold, and sometimes crowned (Epist. Jer. 9 or Bar. vi. 9); clad in robes of blue and purple (Jer. x. 9), like the draped images of Pallas and Hera (Muller, Hist. d. Arch. d. Kunst, § 60), and fastened in the niche appropriated to it by means of chains and nails (Wisd. xiii. 15), in order that the influence of the deity which it represented might be secured to the spot. So the Ephesians, when besiegued by Creesus, connected the wall of their city by means of a rope to the temple of Aphrodite, with the view of ensuring the aid of the goddess (Her. i. 26); and for a similar object the Tyrians chained the stone image of Apollo to the altar of Hercules (Curt. iv. 3, § 15). Some images were painted red (Wisd. xiii. 14), like those of Dionysus and the Bacchantes of Hermes, and the god Pan (Paus. ii. 2, § 5); Muller, Hist. d. Arch. d. Kunst, § 60). This was considered sacred. Pliny, relates, on the authority of Verrius, that it was customary on festival days to color with red-lead the face of the image of Jupiter, and the bodies of those who celebrated a triumph (xxxiii. 36). The figures of Priapus, the god of gardens, were decorated in the same manner ("rubor custos" Tibull. 1. i. 18). Among the objects of worship enumerated by Arnobius (i. 39) are lions of elephants, pictures, and garlands suspended on trees, the "rami coronati" of Apul- leius (de Mag. c. 56).

When the process of adorning the image was completed, it was placed in a temple or shrine appointed for it (owta, Epist. Jer. 12, 19 [or Bar. vi. 12, 19]; owtoia, Wisd. xiii. 15; owtoicwv, I Cor. vii. 10; see Stanley’s note on the latter passage). In Wisd. xiii. 15, owtoia is thought to be used contemptuously, as in Tit. 1.10, and "owtoia ton Synexon in xonigia lignes ode deus" (Frizsche and Grünm, Heilb.); but the passage quoted is by no means a good illustration. From these temples the idols were sometimes carried in procession (Epist. Jer. 4, 25 [or Bar. vi. 4, 26]) on festival days. Their priests were maintained from the idol treasury, and feasted upon the meats which were appointed for the idols’ use (Del and the Dragon, 3, 17). These sacrificial feasts formed an important part of the idolatrous ritual (Idol.), and were a great stumbling-block to the early Christian converts. They were to the heathen, as Prof. Stanley has well observed, what the observance of circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were to the Jewish converts, and it was for this reason that St. Paul especially directed his attention to the subject, and laid down the rules of conduct contained in his first letter to the Corinthians (viii.-x.).

W. A. W.

**IDOLATRY (אֱּדֹלָּת, Εἰδωλία, "tem- phim," once only, 1 Sam. xv. 25: εἰδωλολατρεία), strict speaking, denotes the worship of deity in a visible form, whether the images to which homage is paid are symbolic representations of the true God, or of the false divinities which have been made the objects of worship in his stead. With its origin and progress the present article is not concerned. The former is lost amidst the dark mists of antiquity, and ..."**

"...ter is rather the subject of speculation than of history. But under what aspect it is presented to us in the Scriptures, how it affected the Mosaic legislation, and what influence it had on the history of the Israelites, are questions which may be more properly discussed, with some hope of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. Whether, therefore, the defilement of the powers of nature, and the representation of them under tangible forms, preceded the worship of departed heroes, who were regarded as the embodiment of some virtue which distinguished their lives, is not in this respect of much importance. Some Jewish writers, indeed, grounding their theory on a forced interpretation of Gen. iv. 26, assign to Enoch, the son of Seth, the uncommon notoriety of having been the first to pay divine honors to the host of heaven, and to lead others into the like error (Malb. de Idol. i. 1). R. Solomon Jarchi, on the other hand, while admitting the same verse to contain the first account of the origin of idolatry, understands it as implying the deification of men and plants. Arabic tradition, according to Sir W. Jones, connects the people of Yemen with this same apostasy. This in descent from Joktan, and therefore a contemporary of Nahor, took the surname of Abda Shams, or "servant of the sun," whom he and his family worshipped, while other tribes honored the planets and fixed stars (Hales, Chronol. iv. 50, 4th ed.) Nimrod, again, to whom is ascribed the introduction of Zabulism, was after his death transferred to the constellation Orion, and on the slender foundation of the expression "Ur of the Chaldees" (Gen. xi. 31) is built the fabulous history of Abraham and Nimrod, narrated in the legends of the Jews and Musalmans (Jellinek, Beit ha-Midrash, i. 23; Weil, Bibl. Leg. pp. 47-74; Hyde, Rel. Pers. c. 2).

I. But, descending from the regions of fiction to sober historic narrative, the first undoubted allusion to idolatry or idolatrous customs in the Bible is in the account of Rachel’s stealing her father’s teraphim (Gen. xxxii. 20), a relic of the worship of other gods, whom the ancestors of the Israelites served "on the other side of the river, in old time" (Josh. xxiv. 2). By these household deities Laban was guided, and these heconsulted as oracles (obs. "...aetem", Gen. xxv. 27, A. V. “learned by experience”), though without entirely losing sight of the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, to whom he appealed when occasion offered (Gen. xxxi. 53), while he was ready, in the presence of Jacob, to acknowledge the benefits conferred upon him by Jehovah (Gen. xxv. 27). Such, indeed, was the character of most of the idolatrous worship of the benefices. Like the ‘Othecan colonists in Samaria, who stained their temples with the blood of sacrifices (2 K. xvii. 30), they blended in a strange manner a theological belief in the true God with the external reverence which, in different stages of their history, they were led to pay to the idols of the nations by whom they were surrounded. For this species of false worship they seem, at all times, to have had an incredible propensity. On their journey from Shechem to Bethel, the family of Jacob put away from among them “the gods of the "foreigner," not the teraphim of Laban, but the gods of the
Canaanites through whose land they passed, and the amulets and charms which were worn as the appendages of their worship (Gen. xxxv. 2, 4). And this marked feature of the Hebrew character is traceable throughout the entire history of the people. During their long residence in Egypt, the country of symbolism, they defiled themselves with the idols of the land, and it was long before the taint was removed (Josh. xxiv. 14; Ex. xx. 7). To these gods Moses, as the herald of Jehovah,3 threw down the gauntlet of defiance (Kurtz, Gesch. d. Alt. B. II. 86), and the plagues of Egypt smote their symbols (Num. xxxiii. 4). Yet, with the memory of their deliverness fresh in their minds, their leader absent, the Israelites clamored for some visible shape in which they might worship the God who had brought them up out of Egypt (Ex. xxxii.). Aaron lent himself to the popular cry, and chose as the symbol of deity one with which they had long been familiar — the calf — embodiment of Apsy, and emblem of the productive power of nature. But, with a weakness of character to which his greater brother was a stranger, he compromised with his better impulses by proclaiming a solemn feast to Jehovah (Ex. xxxiii. 5). How much of the true God was recognized by the people in this brutish symbol it is impossible to conceive; the festival was characterized by the solemn consecration with which idolatrous worship was associated (ver. 25), and which seems to have constituted its chief attraction. But on this occasion, as on all others, the transgression was visited with swift vengeance, and three thousand of the offenders were slain. For a while the erection of the tabernacle, and the establishment of the worship which accompanied it, satisfied that craving for an outward sign which the Israelites constantly exhibited; and for the remainder of their march through the desert, with the dwelling-place of Jehovah in their midst, they did not again degenerate into open apostasy. But it was only so long as their contact with the nations was of a hostile character that this seeming orthodoxy was maintained. The charms of the daughters of Moab, as Balak's bad genius forewarned, were potent for evil: the Israelites were "yoked to Baal-Peor" in the trammels of his false worshipers, and the master of their deliverance was grieved and mortally bent at (Num. xxv.). The great and terrible retribution which followed left so deep an impression upon the hearts of the people that, after the conquest of the promised land, they looked with an eye of terror upon any indications of defection from the worship of Jehovah, and denounced as idolatrous a memorial so slight as the altar of the Kenobites at the passage of Jordan (Josh. xxii. 18). 

During the lives of Saul and David and the elders who outlived him, they kept true to their allegiance; but the generation following, who knew not Jehovah, nor the works he had done for Israel, swerved from the plain path of their fathers, and were caught in the toils of the foreigner (Judg. ii.). From this time forth their history becomes little more than a chronicle of the inevitable sequence of offense and punishment. They provoked Jehovah to anger by their offenses against the land of Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them" (Judg. ii. 12, 14). The narratives of the book of Judges, contemporaneous or successive, tell of the fierce struggle maintained against their hated foes, and how women forget their tenderness and forsook their retirement to sing the song of victory over the oppressor. By turns each conquering nation strove to establish the worship of its national god. During the rule of Midian, Joshua the father of Gideon had an altar to Baal, and an Asherah (Judg. vi. 25), though he proved but a lukewarm worshipper (ver. 31). Even Gideon himself gave occasion to idolatrous worship yet the ephod which he made from the spoils of the Midianites was perhaps but a votive offering to the true God (Judg. viii. 27). It is not improbable that the gold ornaments of which it was composed were in some way connected with idolatry (cf. Is. iii. 18-24), and that from their having been worn as amulets, some superstitious virtue was conceived to cling to them even in their new form. But though in Gideon's lifetime no overt act of idolatry was practised, he was no sooner dead than the Israelites again returned to the service of the Baalim, and, as if in solemn mockery of the covenant made with Jehovah, chose from among their Baal Berith, "Baal of the Covenant" (cf. Zer 'Speca), as the object of their special adoration (Judg. viii. 33). Of this god we know only that his temple, probably of wood (Judg. ix. 49), was a stronghold in time of need, and that his treasury was filled with the silver of the worshippers (ix. 4). No were the calumnies of foreign oppression confined to the land of Canaan. The trunk on the breast of Jehovah was set astray after the idols of the land, and were delivered into the hands of the children of Ammon (Judg. x. 8). But they put away from among them "the gods of the foreigner," and with the baseborn Jephthah for their leader gained a signal victory over their oppressors. The exploits of Samson against the Philistines, though achieved within a narrower space and with less important results than those of his predecessor, fill a brilliant page in his country's history. But the tale of his marvelous deeds is prefaced by that ever-recurring phrase, so mournfully familiar, "the children of Israel did evil again in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines." Thus far idolatry is a national sin. The episode of Micah, in Judg. xvii. xviii., sheds a lurid light on the secret practices of individuals, who, without formally renouncing Jehovah, thought ceasing to reverence him as the God of Israel, and worshipping as true to his name, was in spirit identical with the act of the people (Judg. xvii. 16), linked with his worship the symbols of ancient idolatry. The house of God, or sanctuary, which Micah made in imitation of that at Shiloh, was decorated with an ephod and teraphim dedicated to God, and with a graven and molded image consecrated to some inferior deities (Selden, de Dia Sygria, Synrt. i. 2). It is a significant fact, showing how deeply rooted in the people was the tendency to idolatry, that a Levite, who, of all others, needed to have been most sedulous to maintain Jehovah's worship in its purity, was found to assume the office of priest to the images of Micah; and that this Levite, priest afterwards to the idols of Dau, was no other than Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. Tradition says that these idols were destroyed when the Philistines defeated the army of Israel and took from them the ark of the covenant of Jehovah (1 Sam. iv. 19). The arkites are supposed to have carried them into the field, as the other tribes bore the ark, and the Philistines the images of their gods, when they went forth to battle (2 Sam. v. 21; Lewis, Orig. Hebr. v. 9). But the Seder Olam Rabba (c. 24) interprets "the captivity of the land" (Judg. viii. 30), of the captivity of Manasseh; and Benjamin of Tudela mistook the remains of Peter Gentile worship for
traces of the altar or statue which Micah had dedicated, and which was worshipped by the tribe of Dan (Selden, de Bib. Syn., Synth. i. c. 2; Stanley, S. C. i. p. 298). In other times the practice of secret idolatry was carried to greater lengths. Images were set up on the corn-floors, in the wine-vats, and behind the doors of private houses (Is. lvi. 8; Hos. ix. 1, 2); and to check this tendency the statute in Deut. xxvii. 15 was originally promulgated.

Under Samuel's administration a fast was held, and purificatory rites performed, to mark the public reprobation of idolatry (1 Sam. iii. 3-6). But in the reign of Solomon all this was forgotten. Each of his many foreign wives brought with her the gods of her own nation; and the gods of Amnon, Moab, and Zidon, were openly worshipped. Three of the summits of Olivet were crowned with the high-places of Ashtaroth, Chemosh, and Molech (1 K. xi. 7; 2 K. xii. 13), and the fourth, in memory of his great apostasy, was branded with the opprobrious title of the "Mount of Corruption." Jehoram, the son of an Ammonite mother, perpetuated the worst features of Solomon's idolatry (1 K. xiv. 22-24); and in his reign was made the great schism in the national religion: when Jeroboam, fresh from his recollections of the Apsis worship of Egypt, erected golden calves at Bethel and at Dan, and by this crafty state-policy severed for ever the kingdom of Judah and Israel (1 K. xii. 25-31). To their use were temples consecrated, and the service in their honor was studiously copied from the Mesian ritual. High-priest himself, Jeroboam ordained priests from the lowest ranks (2 Chr. xi. 15); incense and sacrifices were offered, and a solemn festival appointed, closely resembling the feast of tabernacles (1 K. xii. 32, 33; cf. Am. iv. 4, 5). [JEROBOAM] The worship of the calves, "the sin of Israel" (Hos. x. 8), which was apparently associated with the great worship of Melchis (2 Chr. xii. 15; Herod. ii. 46) or of the ancient Zalji (Lewis, Orig. Heb. v. 3), and the Asherim (1 K. xiv. 15; A. V. "groves"), ultimately spread to the kingdom of Judah, and centred in Beer-sheba (Am. v. 5, vii. 9). At what precise period it was introduced into the latter kingdom is not certain. The Chronicles tell us how Abijah taunted Jeroboam with his apostasy, while the less partial narrative in 1 Kings represents his own conduct as far from exemplary (1 K. xv. 23). Asa's sweeping reform spared not even the idol of his grandmother Maachel, and, with the exception of the high-places, he removed all relics of idolatrous worship (1 K. xv. 12-14), with its accompanying impieties. His reformation was completed by Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvi. 6).

The successors of Jeroboam followed in his steps, till Ahaz, who rivalled Zedekiah in avarice, at her instigation (1 K. xvi. 25) built a temple and altar to Baal, and revived all the abominations of the Amorites (1 K. xvi. 26). For this he attained the bad preeminence of having done "more to provoke Jehovah, the God of Israel, to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him" (1 K. xvi. 33). Compared with the worship of Baal, the

worship of the calves was a venial offense, probably because it was morally less detestable and also less anti-national (1 K. xvi. 28; 2 K. x. 29-31). [JERUSALEM, vol. i. p. 763].] Jeroboam's idolatry therefore became so completely identified with the northern kingdom that it is described as walking in the way or statutes of the kings of Israel (2 K. xii. 3, xvii. 8), as distinguished from the sin of Jeroboam, which ceased not till the Captivity (2 K. xii. 23), and the corruption of the ancient inhabitants of the land. The idolatrous priests became a numerous and important caste (1 K. xviii. 19), living under the patronage of wealth and influence in the royal court. The extirpation of Baal's priests by Elijah, and of his followers by Jehu (2 K. x.), in which the royal family of Judah shared (2 Chr. xxii. 7), was a death-blow to this form of idolatry in Israel, though other systems still remained (2 K. xiii. 6). But while Israel thus sinned and was punished, Judah was more morally guilty (Ex. xxi. 5). The alliance of Jehoshaphat with the family of Ahab transferred to the southern kingdom, during the reigns of his son and grandson, all the appurtenances of Baal-worship (2 K. viii. 18, 27). In less than ten years after the death of that king, in whose praise it is recorded that he "sought not the Baalim," nor walked "after the deed of Israel" (2 Chr. xvii. 3, 4), a temple had been built for the idol, statues and altars erected, and priests appointed to minister in his service (2 K. x. 18). Jehohias's vigorous measures checked the evil for a time, but his reform was incomplete, and the high-places still remained, as in the days of Asa, a nucleus for any fresh system of idolatry (2 K. xii. 3). Much of this might be due to the influence of the king's mother, Zibiah of Beer-sheba, a place intimately connected with the idolatrous dejection of Judah (Am. viii. 14). After the death of Jehoias, the princes prevailed upon Josiah to restore at least some portion of his father's idolatry (2 Chr. xxiv. 18). The conquest of the Edomites by Amaziah introduced the worship of their gods, which had disappeared since the days of Solomon (2 Chr. xxv. 14, 29). After this period even the kings who did not lend themselves to the encouragement of false worship had to contend with the corruption which still lingered in the hearts of the people (2 K. xv. 35; 2 Chr. xxvii. 2). Hilitherto the temple had been kept pure. The statues of Baal and the other gods were preserved in their own shrines, but Ahaz, who "sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him" (2 Chr. xxvii. 3), and built altars to them at every corner of Jerusalem, and high-places in every city of Judah, replaced the brazen altar of burnt-offering by one made after the model of "the altar" of Damascus, and desecrated it to his own uses (2 K. xvi. 10-15).

The conquest of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser was for them the last scene of the drama of abominations which had been enacted uninterruptedly for upwards of 250 years. In the northern kingdom no reformer arose to try the long line of royal apostates; whatever was effected in the way of reformation, was done by the hands of the people (2 Chr. xxxi. 1). But even in their captivity they

Azax was not directly intended to pronounce the temple hill on which the temple was built. It is clear that the founding of an idolatrous nature had been introduced into the temple, and was afterwards removed by Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxix. 5; cf. Ezr. vi. 21, ix. 11). It is possible that this might have reference to the brazen serpent
helped to perpetuate the corruption. The colonists, whom the Assyrian conquerors placed in their stead in the cities of Samaria, brought with them their own gods, and were taught at Bethel by a priest of the captive nation "the manner of the God of the land." The lessons thus learnt resulting in a desire to keep its every injunction, they imbraced the altars, images, and other religious appliances with the homage paid to their national deities (2 K. xvii. 24-41). Their descendants were in consequence regarded with suspicion by the elders who returned from the Captivity with Ezra, and their offers of assistance rejected (Ezr. iv. 3).

The first act of Hezekiah on ascending the throne was the restoration and purificiation of the Temple, which had been dismantled and closed during the latter part of his father's life (2 Chr. xxviii. 24; xxix. 3). The multitude who flocked to Jerusalem to celebrate the passover, so long in abeyance, removed the idolatrous altars of burnt-offering and incense erected by Ahaz (2 Chr. xxx. 14). The iconoclastic spirit was not confined to Judah and Benjamin, but spread throughout Ephraim and Manasseh (2 Chr. xxix. 1), and to all external appearance idolatry was extirpated. But the reform extended little beyond the surface (xxix. 13). Among the leaders of the people there were many in high position who conformed to the necessities of the time (Is. xxviii. 14), and under Manasseh's patronage the false worship, which had been merely driven into obscurity, broke out with tenfold virulence. Idolatry of every form, and with all the accessories of enchantments, divination, and witchcraft, was again rife; no place was too sacred, no associations too holier, to be spared the contamination. If the conduct of Ahaz in erecting an altar in the temple court is open to a charitable construction, Manasseh's was of no doubtful character. The two courts of the temple were profaned by altars dedicated to the host of heaven, and the image of the Asherah polluted the holy place (2 K. xx. 7; 2 Chr. xxix. 7, 15; cf. Jer. xxxi. 34). Even in his late repentance he did not entirely destroy all traces of his former idolatry. The people, easily swayed, still burned incense on the high places; but Jehovah was the ostensible object of their worship. The king's son sacrificed to his father's idols, but was not associated with him in his repentance, and in his short reign of two years, restored all the altars of the Baalim, and the images of the Asherah. With the death of Josiah ended the last effort to revive among the people a purer ritual, if not a purer faith. The lamp of David, which had long shed but a struggling ray, flickered for a while and then went out in the darkness of Babylonic captivity.

But foreign exile was powerless to eradicate the deep inbred tendency to idolatry. One of the first difficulties with which Ezra had to contend, and which brought him well nigh to despair, was the haste with which his countrymen took their foreign wives of the people of the land, and followed them in all their abominations (Ezr. ix.). The priests and rulers, to whom he looked for assistance in his great enterprise, were among the first to fall away (Ezr. ix. 2, x. 18; Neh. vi. 17, 18, xiii. 23). Even during the Captivity the devotees of false worship plied their craft as prophets and diviners (Jer. xxix. 8; Ez. xlii.), and the Jews who fled to Egypt carried with them recollections of the material prosperity which surrounded their idolatrous sacrifices in Judah, and to the neglect of which they attributed their exiled condition (Jer. xlix. 17, 18). The conquests of Alexander in Asia caused Greek influence to be extensively felt, and Greek idolatry to be first tolerated, and then practised, by the Jews (1 Macc. i. 43-50, 54). The attempt of Antiochus to establish this form of worship was vigorously resisted by Mattathias (1 Macc. ii. 23-26), who was joined in his rebellion by the Asiarchs (ver. 42), and destroyed the altars at which the king commanded them to sacrifice (1 Macc. ii. 25, 45). The erection of synagogues has been assigned as a reason for the comparative purity of the Jewish worship after the Captivity (Prideaux, Connect. i. 374), while another cause has been discovered in the hatred for images acquired by the Jews in their intercourse with the Persians.

It has been a question much debated whether the Israelites were ever so far given up to idolatry as to lose all knowledge of the true God. It would be hard to assert this of any nation, and still more difficult to prove. That there alone remained among them a faithful few, who in the face of every danger adhered to the worship of Jehovah, may readily be believed, for even at a time when Baal worship was most prevalent there were found several thousand Jews who had not bowed before his image (1 K. xxx. 18). But there is still room for grave suspicion that among the masses of the people, though the idea of a supreme Being—of whom the images they worshipped were but the distorted representatives—was not entirely lost, it was so obscured as to be but dimly apprehended. And not only were the ignorant multitude thus led astray, but the priests, scribes, and prophets became leaders of the apostacy (Jer. ii. 8). Warburton, indeed, maintained that they never formally renounced Jehovah, and that their devotion consisted "in joining foreign worship and idolatrous ceremonies to the ritual of the true God" (Div. Leg. bk. v. § 3). But one passage in their history, though confessedly obscure, seems to point to a time when, under the rule of the judges, "Israel for many days had no true God, and no teaching priest, and no king" (2 Chr. vi. 3). The corroborative arguments of Cudworth, who notes the influence of the teaching of the Hebrew doctors and rabbis that the pagan nations, anciently, at least the intelligent amongst them, acknowledged one supreme God of the whole world; and that all other gods were but creatures and inferior ministers, is controverted by Molesworth (Intell. Syst. i. 4, § 30, and notes).

There can be no doubt that much of the idolatry of the Hebrews consisted in worshipping the true God under an image, such as the calves at Bethel and Dan (Joseph. Ant. viii. 8, § 5; θεάδες ἐκοινο- νιόμοις τῷ Θεῷ), and in associating his worship with idolatrous rites (Jer. xlii. 5), and places consecrated to idols (2 K. xviii. 22). From the peculiarity of their position they were never distinguished as the inventors of a new pantheon, nor did they adopt any one system of idolatry so exclusively as ever to become identified with it. But they are still more in contact with other nations than they readily adapted themselves to their practices, the old spirit of antagonism died rapidly away, and intermarriage was one step to idolatry.

II. The old religion of the Semitic races consisted, in the opinion of Movers (Phon. l. c. 5), in the delegation of the powers and laws of nature: these powers being considered either as distinct and...
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IDOLATRY

The allusions in Job xxxviii. 31, 32, are too obvious to allow any inference to be drawn as to the mysterious influences which were held by the old astrologers to be exercised by the stars over human destiny, nor is there sufficient evidence to connect them with anything more reconcilable than the astronomical knowledge of the period. The same may be said of the poetical figure in Dehobrah's chant of triumph, "the stars from their highways warred with Sisera" (Judg. v. 20). In the later times of the monarchy, Mazzoth, the planets, or the zodiac signs, received, next to the sun and moon, their share of popular adoration (2 K. xxi. 5); and the history of idolatry among the Hebrews shows that it is only or not mostly connected with the delusion of the heavenly bodies, and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the sidereal powers to the worship of God and Men, Babylonian divinities, symbols of Venus or the moon, as the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect, the moon was reverenced by the Egyptians (Macrobi. Sat. i. 20) and the name Bad-gal is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter as the bringer of luck was grafted on the old faith of the Phenicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with eastern astrology: Atrammelech, Movers regards as the sun-fire—the Solar Mars, and Anammelech the Solar Saturn (Plut. i. 410, 411). The Vulgate rendering of Prov. xxvi. 8, "sicut qui mittit lapidem in ociconem Mecaurei," follows the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, De Dis Syris, ii. 15; Maina, de Idol. iii. 2; Buxtorf, Lex. Tolda. s. v. יִלְּדַה)." Beast-worship, as exemplified in the calves of Jeroboam and the dark limbs which seem to point to the goats of Mendes, has already been alluded to. There is no actual proof that the Isrealites ever joined in the service of Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, though Ahaziah sent stealthily to Baal-zebub, the fly-god of Ekron (2 K. i.), and in later times the brazen serpent became the object of idolatrous homage (2 K. xviii. 4). But whether the latter was regarded with superstitions reverence as a memorial of their early history, or whether incense was offered to it as a symbol of some power of nature cannot now be exactly determined. The threatening in Lev. xxvi. 30, "I will put your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols," may fairly be considered as directed against the tendency to regard animals, as in Egypt, as the symbols of deity. Tradition says that Nergal, the god of the men of Cath, the idol of fire, according to Lusden (Phil. Nerb. Miet. Diss. 43), was worshipped under the form of a cock; Aishma as a he-goat, the emblazon of generative power; Nibhaz as a dog; Atrammelech as a male of heacock; and Anammelech as a horse or a pleasant.

a Some have explained the allusion in Zeph. i. 9, as referring to a practice connected with the worship of Dagon; comp. I Sam. v. 5. The Syrfrans, on the authority of Xenophion (Abab. i. 4. § 9), paid divine honors to fish.

b Jaronem (Onomat. s. v. Dryas) mentions an oak near Hebron which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestinian

Of pure hero-worship among the Semitic races we find no trace. Moses indeed seems to have entertained some dim apprehension that his countrymen might, after his death, pay him more honor than were due to man; and the anticipation of his li on their death, was the occasion of his strong reproval (Deut. iv. 21, 22). Their expression in Ps. cxvi. 23, "the sacrifices of the dead," is in all probability metaphorical, and Wisd. xiv. 13 refers to a later practice due to Greek influence. The rabbinical commentators discover in Gen. xviii. 16, an allusion to the worshipping of angels (Coh. ii. 13), while they defend their ancestors from the charge of regarding them in any other light than merely as intermediaries between the oblations of the heavenly bodies, and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the sidereal powers to the worship of God and Men, Babylonian divinities, symbols of Venus or the moon, as the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect, the moon was reverenced by the Egyptians (Macrobi. Sat. i. 20) and the name Bad-gal is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter as the bringer of luck was grafted on the old faith of the Phenicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with eastern astrology: Atrammelech, Movers regards as the sun-fire—the Solar Mars, and Anammelech the Solar Saturn (Plut. i. 410, 411). The Vulgate rendering of Prov. xxvi. 8, "sicut qui mittit lapidem in ociconem Mecaurei," follows the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, De Dis Syris, ii. 15; Maina, de Idol. iii. 2; Buxtorf, Lex. Tolda. s. v. יִלְּדַה)." Beast-worship, as exemplified in the calves of Jeroboam and the dark limbs which seem to point to the goats of Mendes, has already been alluded to. There is no actual proof that the Isrealites ever joined in the service of Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, though Ahaziah sent stealthily to Baal-zebub, the fly-god of Ekron (2 K. i.), and in later times the brazen serpent became the object of idolatrous homage (2 K. xviii. 4). But whether the latter was regarded with superstitions reverence as a memorial of their early history, or whether incense was offered to it as a symbol of some power of nature cannot now be exactly determined. The threatening in Lev. xxvi. 30, "I will put your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols," may fairly be considered as directed against the tendency to regard animals, as in Egypt, as the symbols of deity. Tradition says that Nergal, the god of the men of Cath, the idol of fire, according to Lusden (Phil. Nerb. Miet. Diss. 43), was worshipped under the form of a cock; Aishma as a he-goat, the emblem of generative power; Nibhaz as a dog; Atrammelech as a male of heacock; and Anammelech as a horse or a pleasant.

a Some have explained the allusion in Zeph. i. 9, as referring to a practice connected with the worship of Dagon; comp. I Sam. v. 5. The Syrfrans, on the authority of Xenophion (Abab. i. 4. § 9), paid divine honors to fish.

b Jaronem (Onomat. s. v. Dryas) mentions an oak near Hebron which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestinian

abounds with sacred trees. They are found "all over the land covered with bits of rags from the garments of passing villagers, hung up as acknowledgments or as deprecatory signals and charms; and we find beautiful clumps of oak-trees sacred to a kind or beings called Jacob's daughters" (Thomson, Land and Book. ii. 151). [See GROVE.]

c Unless, indeed, this be a relic of the ancient Canaanitish worship; an older name associated with idolatry, which the conquerors of Israel and Edom, the king of Moab offered his eldest son as a burnt-offering.
the Persians, who worshipped the sun under the name of Mithra (Strabo, xv. p. 732), sacrificed on an elevated spot, but built no altars or images. The priests of the false worship are sometimes designated Choræmi or Aryans, a word of Syriac origin, to which different meanings have been assigned. It is applied to the non-Literalists who burnt incense on the high-places (2 K. xxiii. 5) as well as to the priests of the calves (Hos. x. 5); and the corresponding word is used in the Psalms (Judg. xxiii. 30) of Jonathan and his descendants, priests to the tribe of Dan, and in Targ. Onkelos (Gen. xlii. 22) of the priests of Egypt. The Rablisi, followed by Gesenius, have derived it from a root signifying "to be black," and without any authority assert that the name was given to idolatrous priests from the black vestments which they wore. But white was the distinctive color in the priestly garments of all nations from India to Gaul, and black was only worn when they sacrificed to the sun, so-called gods (Rahr, Sympb. ii. 87, &c.). That a special dress was adopted by the Baal-worshippers, as well as by the false prophets (Zeoh. xiii. 4), is evident from 2 K. x. 22 (where the rendering should be "the apparel"), the vestments were kept in an apartment of the idol temple, under the charge probably of one of the inferior priests. Mazz'ah Levi was provided with appropriate robes (Judg. xii. 10). The "foreign apparel," mentioned in Zeph. i. 8, refers doubtless to a similar dress, adopted by the Israelites in defiance of the sumptuary law in Num. xv. 37-40.

In addition to the priests there were other persons intimately connected with idolatrous rites, and the impurities from which they were inseparable. Both men and women consecrated themselves to the service of idols: the former as ἱερεύς; kedēskhēn, for which there is reason to believe the A. V. (Deut. xxiii. 17, &c.) has not given too harsh an equivalent; the latter as γυνὴ ἱερέως, kedēskōthē, who wore shrines for ἄστατος (2 K. xxiii. 7), and resembled the ἐγκαταστάται of Corinth, of whom Strabo (viii. p. 378) says there were more than a thousand attached to the temple of Aphrodite. Egyptian prostitutes consecrated themselves to Isis (Jun. vi. 489, ix. 22-24). The same class of women existed among the Phœnicians, Armenians, Lydians, and Babylonians (Her. xvi. 199; Strabo, xi. p. 532; Epist. of Jerem. ver. 43). They are distinguished from the public prostitutes (Hos. iv. 14) and associated with the performances of sacred rites, just as in Strabo (xii. p. 559) we find the two classes existing at Comana, the Corinth of Pontus, much frequented by pilgrims to the shrine of Aphrodite. The wealth thus obtained flowed into the treasury of the idol temple, and against such a practice the injunction in Deut. xxiii. 18 is directed. Dr. Maitland, anxious to defend the moral character of Jewish women, has with much ingenuity attempted to show that a meaning foreign to their true sense has been attached to the words above mentioned; and that, though closely associated with idolatrous services, they do not indicate such foul corruption (Essay on False Worship). But if, as Movers, with great appearance of probability, has conjectured (Phain. i. 670), the class of persons alluded to was composed of foreigners, the Jewish women in this respect need no such advocacy. That such customs existed among foreign nations there is abundant evidence to prove (Lucian, de Syr. Dea, c. 5); and from the juxtaposition of prostitution and the idolatrous rites against which the laws in Lev. xix. are aimed, it is probable that next to its immorality, one main reason why it was visited with such stringency was its connection with idolatry (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 19).

But besides these accessories there were the ordinary rites of worship which idolatrous systems had in common with the religion of the Hebrews. Offering burnt sacrifices to the idol gods (2 K. v. 17), burning incense in their honor (1 K. xi. 8), and bowing down in worship before their images (1 K. xix. 18) were the chief parts of their ritual; and from their very analogy with the ceremonies of true worship were more seductive than the grosser forms. Nothing can be stronger or more precise than the language in which these ceremonies were denounced by Hebrew law. Every detail of idol worship was made the subject of a separate enactment, and many of the laws, which in themselves seem trivial and almost absurd, receive from this point of view their true significance. We are told by Maimonides (Mor. Nib. c. 12) that the prohibitions against sowing a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments of mixed material, were directed against the practices of idolaters, who attributed a kind of magical influence to the mixture (Lev. xix. 19; Spencer, de Leg. Hebr. ii. 18). Such too were the precepts which forbade that the garments of the sexes should be interchanged (Deut. xxiii. 5; Maimon. de Idol. xii. 9). According to Macrobius (Sat. iii. 8) other Asatics when they sacrificed to their Venus changed the dress of the sexes. The priests of Cybele appeared in women's clothes, and used to urinate themselves (Trenzer, Sympb. ii. 34, 42); the same custom was observed "by the Ithyphallus in the rites of Bacchus, and by the Athenians in their Asclepia" (Young, Idol. Cor. in Rel. i. 105; cf. Lucian, de Dea Syrta, c. 15). To preserve the Israelites from contamination, they were forbidden three years after their conquest of Canaan from eating of the fruit-trees of the land, whose cultivation had been attended with hoariness (Deut. xxiii. 23); and the law aimed to "round the corner of the head," and to "near the corner of the beard" (Lev. xix. 27), as the Arabs did in honor of their gods (Her. iii. 8, iv. 175). Hence, the phrase προς το γλυκύναι: kedēskēth, (literally) "shorn of the corner," is especially applied to idolaters (Jer. ix. 20, xxv. 25). Spencer (de Leg. Hebr. i. 9, § 25) thus interprets the offering of honey (Lev. vi. 11) as intended to oppose an idolatrous practice. Strabo describes the Magi as offering in all their sacred practices liquid of oil mingled with honey and milk (xv. p. 733). Offerings in which honey was an ingredient were made to the inferior deities and the dead (Hom. Od. x. 519; Perip. de Antro. Nymp. c. 17). So also the practice of casting the bones of the dead "over the blood" (Lev. xix. 26; Ez. xxiii. 25, 26) was, according to Maimonides, common among the Zabii. Spencer gives a double reason for the practice that the public prostitutes received the appellation of the sacrilegous of the cathedral (Miller, P. of Hist. ii. 441).

A Illustration, though not an example, of this is found in the modern history of Europe. At a period of great profusion and corruption of morals, licentiousness was carried to such an excess in Stras-
hilation: that it was a rite of divination, and divination of the worst kind, a species of necromancy by which they attempted to raise the spirits of the dead (comp. Hor. Sat. i. 8). There are supposed to be allusions to the practice of necromancy in Is. xvi. 4, or at any rate to superstitious rite with connection with the dead, in the passage of one tree upon another was forbidden, because among idolaters the process was accompanied by gross obscenity (Maim. Moc. Nib. c. 12). Cutting the flesh for the dead (Lev. xix. 28; 1 K. xviii. 28), and making a baldness between the eyes (Deut. xiv. 1) were associated with idolatrous rites: the latter being a custom among the Syrians (Sir. 6. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herod. ii. p. 183; note). The three repeated and much-veased passage, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk” (Ex. xxii. 19, xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21), interpreted by some as a precept of humanity, is explained by Cudworth in a very different manner. He quotes from a Karaite commentary which he had seen in MS.: “It was a custom of the ancient heathens, when they had gathered in all their fruit, to take a kid and boil it in the dam’s milk, and then in a magical way give the concerned flesh to all the trees and fields and gardens and orchards; thinking by this means they should make them fruitful, and bring forth again more abundantly the following year” (On the Lord’s Supper, c. 2).a

The law which regulated clean and unclean meats (Lev. xxiii–26) may be considered both as a sanitary regulation, and also as having a tendency to separate the Israelites from the surrounding idolatrous nations. In that respect the race was with the same object, in the opinion of Michaelis, that while in the wilderness they were prohibited from killing any animal for food without first offering it to Jehovah (Leaves of Moses, trans. Smith, art. 203). The mouse, one of the unclean animals of Leviticus (xi. 29), was sacrificed by the ancient Magi (Is. lvii. 17; Movers, Phin. i. 219). It may have been some such reason as that assigned by Lewis (Orig. Hebr. v. 1), that the dog was the symbol of an Egyptian deity, which gazed in the west (cf. Amos ii. 13; 1 K. v. 2). Movers says the dog was offered in sacrifice to Molech (i. 404), as swine to the moon and Dionysus by the Egyptians, who afterwards ate of the flesh (Her. iii. 47; Is. lv. 4). Eating of the things offered was a necessary appendage to the sacrifice (comp. Ex. xvii. 12, xxxii. 6, xxxiv. 15; Num. xxv. 2, &c.). Among the Persians the victim was eaten by the worshippers, and the soul alone left for the god (Strabo, xv. 732). “Hence it is that the idolatry of the Jews in worshipping other gods is so often described synecdochically under the notion of feasting. Is. lvii. 7, ‘Upon a high and lofty mountain thou hast set thy bed, and thickestestest thou up to offer sacrifices;’ for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie down on beds or couches. Ez. xxii. 41: Amos ii. 8, ‘They laid themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge by every altar,’ i. e. laid themselves down to eat of the sacrifice that was offered on the altar: comp. Ex. xviii. 11 ’ (Cudworth, at Super. c. 1; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10). The Israelites were forbidden ‘to print any mark upon them’ (Lev. xix. 28), because it was a custom of idolaters to brand upon their flesh some symbol of the deity they worshipped.

a Dr. Thomson mentions a favorite dish among the Greeks called john inanits, to which he conceives allusion made (Laws and Book, i. 150).
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as the ivy-leaf of Bacchus (3 Macc. ii. 29). According to Lucian (De Dea Syrta, 50), all the Assyrians wore marks of this kind on their necks and wrists (comp. Is. xix. 5; Gal. vi. 17; Rev. xiv. 1, 11). Many other practices of false worship are alluded to, and made the subjects of rigorous prohibition but none are more frequently or more severely denounced than those which peculiarly characterized the worship of Molech. It has been attempted to deny that the worship of this idol was polluted by the foul stain of human sacrifice, but the allusions are too plain and too pointed to admit of reasonable doubt (Deut. xix. 21; 2 K. ii. 27; Jer. vii. 31; Ps. cv. 37; Ez. xxiv. 30). Nor was this practice confined to the idols of Molech: it extended to those of Baal (Jer. xix. 5), and the king of Moab (2 K. iii. 27) offered his son as a burnt-offering to his god Chemosh. The Phoenicians, we are told by Porphyry (De Abstin. ii. c. 36), on occasions of great national calamity sacrificed to Kronos one of their dearest friends. Some allusion to this custom may be seen in Micah vi. 7. Kissing the images of the gods (1 K. xii. 18; Hos. xii. 2), hugging votive offerings in their temples (1 Sam. xxxi. 10), and carrying them about the (2 Sam. vi. 21), all by the Jews of Maccabeus’ army did with the things consecrated to the idols of the Janmites (2 Macc. xii. 40), are usages connected with idolatry which are casually mentioned, though not made the objects of express legislation. But soothsaying, interpretation of dreams, necromancy, witchcraft, magic, and other forms of divination, are alike forbidden (Deut. xviii. 9; 2 K. i. 2; Is. lv. 4; Ez. xxi. 21). The history of other nations — and indeed the common practice of the lower class of the population of Syria at the present day — shows us that such a statute as that against bestiality (Lev. xviii. 23) was not unnecessary (cf. Jer. ii. 40; Rom. i. 26). Purificatory rites in connection with idol worship, and eating of forbidden food, were visited with severe retribution (Is. lvii. 17). It is evident, from the context of Ez. xviii. 17, that the votaries of the sun, who worshipped in their faces to the sun, put the branch to their nose,” did so in observance of some idolatrurous rite. Movers (Phin. i. 66), uneasingly affirms that the allusion is to the branch Barson, the holy branch of the Magi (Strabo, xv. p. 733), while Havernick (Comm. zu Ezech. p. 117), with equal confidence, denies that the passage supports such an inference, and renders, having in view the lament of the women for Thannum, “sie entsenden den Trauer- gesang an ihren Zorn.” The waving of a myrtle branch, says Maunides (de idol, vi. 2), accompanied the repetition of a magical formula in incantations. An illustration of the usage of bonghi in worship will be found in the Greek ineropha (Ess. Eun. 43: Suppl. 192; Schol. on Aristoph. Phel. 383; Porphyry de Aum. Nymphe c. 33). For detailed accounts of idolatrous ceremonies, reference must be made to the articles upon the several idols in the following.

11 III. It remains now briefly to consider the light in which idolatry was regarded in the Mosaic code, and the penalties with which it was visited. If one main object of the Hebrew polity was to teach the unity of God, the extermination of idolatry was but a subordinate end. Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, was the civil head of the State. He was the theocratic king of the people, who had delivered them from bondage, and to whom they were a willing and permanent people. They had entered into a solemn league and covenant with him as their chosen
king (comp. 1 Sam. viii. 7), by whom obedience was required with temporal blessings, and rebellion with temporal punishment. This original contract of the Hebrew government, as it has been termed, is contained in Ex. xix. 3-8, xx. 2-5; Deut. xxix. 10-xxxi.: the blessings promised to obedience are enumerated in Deut. xxviii. 1-14, and the withering curses on disobedience in verses 15-49. That this covenant was faithfully observed it needs but slight acquaintance with Hebrew history to perceive. Often broken and often renewed on the part of the people (Judg. x. 10; 2 Chr. xv. 12, 13; Neh. ix. 38), it was kept with unwavering constancy on the part of Jehovah. To their kings he stood in the relation, so to speak, of a feudal superior: they were his representatives upon earth, and with them, as with the people before, his covenant was made (1 K. iii. 14, xi. 11). Idolatry, therefore, to an Israelite, was a state offence (1 Sam. xv. 20); a political crime of the gravest character, high treason against the majesty of his king. It was a transgression of the covenant (Deut. xvii. 2), "the evil" prominently in the eyes of Jehovah (1 K. xxii. 25, opp. to "the right," 2 Chr. xxvii. 2). But it was much more than this. While the idolatry of foreign nations is stigmatized merely as an abomination in the sight of God, which called for his vengeance, the sin of the Israelites is regarded as of more alarming gravity, and greater moral guilt. In the figurative language of the prophets, the relation between Jehovah and his people is represented as a marriage bond (Is. lv. 5; Jer. iii. 14), and the worship of false gods with all its accompaniments (Lev. xx. 56) becomes then the greatest of social wrongs (Hos. ii.; Jer. iii. etc.). This is beautifully brought out in Hos. ii. 16, where the apostate Israel, my master, whose father Israel has been accustomed to apply to her foreign possessor, is compared with Isbı̂ , my nun, my husband, the native word which she is to use when restored to her rightful husband, Jehovah. Much of the significance of this figure was unquestionably due to the impurities of idolaters, with whom such corruption was of no merely spiritual character (Ex. xxxiv. 16; Num. xxx. i. 2, &c.), but manifested itself in the grossest and most revolting forms (Rom. i. 26-32).

Regarded in a moral aspect, false gods are called "stumbling blocks" (Ex. xiv. 9), "snares" (Am. ii. 4; Rom. i. 23), "horrors" or "frights" (1 K. xv. 13; Jer. i. 38), "abominations" (Deut. xxix. 17, xxx. 16; 1 K. xi. 5; 2 K. xxii. 13), "gilt" (abstract for concrete, Am. viii. 14, ל"כשד lêkashm, comp. 2 Chr. xxix. 18), perhaps with a play on Jehovah, 2 K. xxii. 30), and with a profound sense of the degradation consequent upon their worship, they are characterized by the prophets, whose mission it was to warn the people against them (Jer. xlv. 4), as "shame" (Jer. xii. 14; Hos. ix. 10). As considered with reference to Jehovah, they are "other gods" (Josh. xxiv. 2. 16), "strange gods" (Deut. xxvii. 16), "new gods" (Judg. vi. 8), "devils, — not God" (Deut. xxix. 17; Cor. x. 20, 21); and, as denoting their foreign origin, "gods of the foreigner" (Josh. xxiv. 14, 15). Their powerlessness is indicated by describing them as "gods that cannot save" (Is. xiv. 20), "that made not the heavens" (Jer. x. 11), "nothing" (Is. xxiv. 1; Cor. vii. 4), "wind and emptiness" (Is. xxii. 28), "vanities of the heathen" (Deut. xxv. 24; Acts xvii. 31) and yet while their deity is denied, their personal existence seems to have been acknowledged (Kurtz, Gesch. d. A. B. ii. 86, &c.), though not in the same manner in which the preponderance of heathen deities were reciprocally recognized by the heathen (1 K. xx. 23, 25; 2 K. xxiv. 21). Other terms of contempt are employed with reference to idols, דנדנונ, הלאים (Lev. xiv. 4), and גנפננ, גלאים (Deut. xix. 17), to which different meanings have been assigned, and many which indicate ceremonial uncleanness. [Isa., p. 1118 b.]

Idolatry, therefore, being from one point of view a political offence, could be punished without infringement of civil rights. No penalties were attached to mere opinions. For aught we know, theoretical speculation may have been as rife among the Hebrews as in modern times, though such was not the tendency of the Satanic mind. It was not, however, such speculations, heterodox though they might be, but overt acts of idolatry, which were made the subjects of excommunication (Michaelis, Lives of Moses, arts. 245, 246). The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was to be driven to destruction (Ex. xxiii. 20); his nearest relatives were not only bound to denounced him and deliver him up to punishment (Deut. xiii. 2-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (Deut. xvii. 2-5).

To attempt to deceive others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (Deut. xiii. 6-10). An idolatrous rite shared a similar fate. No facts are more strongly insisted on in the O. T. than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (Ex. xxxiv. 13; Deut. vii. xxii. 24-xxvi. 17), and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (Jer. ii. 17). A city guilty of idolatry was looked upon as a cancer of the state; it was considered to be in rebellion, and treated according to the laws of war. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were put to death. No spoil was taken, but everything it contained was burnt with itself; nor was it allowed to be rebuilt (Deut. xxi. 13-18; Josh. vi. 26). Soul lost to the kingdom, Achan his name, and Hiel his family, for transgressing this law (1 Sam. xvi.; Josh. vii. 1; 1 K. xxi. 34). The silver and gold with which the idols were covered were accused (Deut. xvii. 26). And not only were the Israelites forbidden to serve the gods of Canaan (Ex. xxxii. 24), but even to mention their names, that is, to call upon them or any form of prayer (Ex. xxxii. 9). In the A. V. the terms שֵׁי "say, strange," and שֵׁי or שֵׁי, מֵאָר or מֵאַר, "foreign," are not uniformly distinguished, and the point of a passage is frequently lost by the interchange of one with the other, or by rendering both by the same word. So Ps. lxxxi. 9 should be. "There shall not be in thee a strange god, nor shall thou worship a foreign god."
13: Josh xiii. 7). On taking possession of the land they were to obliterate all traces of the existing idolatries; statues, altars, pillars, idol-temples, every person and everything connected with it were to be swept away (Ex. xxix. 29; Deut. vii. 5, 23, xii. 1–3, xx. 17), and the name and worship of the idols blotted out. Such were the precautions taken by the framers of the Mosaic code to preserve the worship of Jehovah, the true God, in its purity. Of the manner in which his descendants have put a "fence" about the law, with reference to idolatry, many instances will be found in the Mishnah (de b. b. l.). They were prohibited from using vessels, scarlet garments, bracelets, or rings, marked with the sign of the sun, moon, or dragon (vii. 10); trees planted or stones erected for idol-worship were forbidden (viii. 5, 10); and, to guard against the possibility of contamination, if the image of an idol were found among other images intended for ornament, they were all to be cast into the Dead Sea (vii. 10).

IV. Much indirect evidence on this subject might be supplied by an investigation of proper names. Mr. Layard has remarked, "According to a custom existing from time immemorial in the East, the name of the Supreme Deity was introduced into the names of men. This custom prevailed from the banks of the Tigris to the Phoenician colonies beyond the Pillars of Hercules; and we recognize in the Sumeriakal of the Assyrians, and the Hanunial of the Carthaginians, the identity of the religious system of the two nations, as widely distinct in the time of their existence as in their geographical position" (Virt. ii. 459). The hint which he has given can be but briefly followed out here. Traces of the sun-worship of the ancient Canaanites remain in the nomenclature of their country. Beth-shemesh, "house of the sun," En-shemesh, "spring of the sun," and Ir-shemesh, "city of the sun," whether they be the original Canaanitish names, or their Hebrew renderings, attest the reverence paid to the source of light and heat, the symbol of the fertilizing power of nature. Samson, the Hebrew national hero, took his name from the same luminary, and was born in a mountaine-village above the modern Ain Sheous (En-shemesh): Thompson, Israel and Jude, ii. 301. The name of Baal, the sun-god, is one of the most common occurrences in compound words, and is often associated with places consecrated to his worship, and of which perhaps he was the tutelary deity. Ramoth-Baal, "the high-places of Baal," Bad-hermon, Beth-Baal-meon, Baal-gad, Baal-hamon, in which compound the names of the sun-god of Phoenicia and Egypt are associated, Baal-Tamar, and many others, are instances of this. Nor was the practice confined to the names of places: proper names are found with the same element. Esh-izrael, Ish-bal, etc., are examples. The Amorites, xebon Joshua did not drive out, dwelt on Mount Heres, in Aijalon, "the mountain of the sun" (Timnath-heres). Here and there we find traces of their attempt made by the Hebrews, on their conquest of the country, to extirpate idolatry. Thus Bashalah or Kirjath-baal, "the town of Baal," became Kirjath-pearim, "the town of forests" (Josh. xv. 60). The Moon, Ashtar or Ashtarto, gave her name to a city of Bashan (Josh. xiii. 12, 31), and it is not improbable that the name Jericho may have been derived from being associated with the worship of this goddess. [I. E. R.]

The name which was bestowed upon Jerusalem (Gen. iv. 17) is peculiar, and the name under which the Chaldaean worshipped the Moon or the planet Mercury, enters into many compounds: Neb-nazarad, Samgar-nebo, and others. Were Babylon of Semitic origin, it would probably be derived from Bals-Adam, or Atlantis, the Phoenician deity to whose worship Jer. xxvii. 18 seems to refer; but it has been connected with the name of the Indo-Germanic root. Habad, Habdelaer, Benhadad, are derived from the tutelary deity of the Syrians, and in Nergardshezer are recognized the god of the Cushites. Chenoum, the fire-god of Moab, appears in Carchemish, and Peor in Beth-peor. Malabou, a name which occurs but once, and then of a Moabite by birth, may have been connected with Melch and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites. A glimpse of star-worship may be seen in the name of the city Chesil, the Semitic Orion, and the month Chisheu, without recognizing in Kalab "the glittering fragments of the sea-snake trailing across the northern sky". It would perhaps be going too far to trace in En-gedi, "spring of the kid," any connection with the goat-worship of Mesopotamia, or any relics of the wars of the giants in Babylon and Ethiopia. Thus, indeed, recognized in Idel, Yemun or Astarle, the goddess of fortune, and identical with God (I. E. mel, s. v.). But there are fragments of ancient idolatry in other names in which it is not so palpable. Isheshbeth is identical with Ish-baal, and Jeri-besheth with Jeribbaal, and Mephibesheth and Meribbaal are but two names for one person (cf. Jer. xi. 13). The worship of the Syrian Rimmon appears in the names Hashal-rimmon, and Tabrimmon; and, if, as some suppose, it be derived from ḫmn, Rinnin, "a pomegranate-tree," we may connect it with the towns of the same name in Judah and Benjamin, with En-Rinnom and the prevailing tree-worship. It is impossible to pursue this investigation to any length: the hints which have been thrown out may prove suggestive.

W. A. W.

IDU'EL (ἰδουέλ: Eccleston), 1 Esdr. viii. 19. [AREEL, l.]

IDUME'A or IDUMÉ'A (יוֹדֵמֵא; red. frequently יִדומֵא: Ishmael, Edom), Is. xxxv. 5, 6; Ez. xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5; 1 Mac. iv. 15, 20, 61, v. 3, vi. 31; 2 Mac. xii. 32 Mark iii. 18. [Edom.]

IDUME'ANS or IDUMÉ'ANS (יוֹדֵמֵא: Ishmael), 2 Mac. x. 15, 16. [Edomites.]

IGAL (יגאל [known God redounds or avenges]), 1. (Iqqal: Alex. Iqal: Igal). Son of Joseph, of the tribe of Issachar, chosen by Moses to represent that tribe among the spies who went up from Kadesh to search the Promised Land (Num. xi. 7).

a That temples in Syria, dedicated to the several deities, did not be found in names of the places where they stood, is evident from the testimony of Leechman, as Assyrian himself. His derivation of Hera from the temple of the Assyrian Hera shows that he was familiar with the circumstance (de Dea Syr. c. 1). Balansapes ( = Beth-shemesh), a town of Arabia, derived its name from the sun-worship (Vossius, de Theol. Gent. ii. c. 8), like Kir Heres (Jer. xvi. 31) of Moab.
IGDALIÁH (יִגְדַּלְיָה), also Igda'lu or Igdaliahu. This name is identical with Igdalihu, a son of Shemaiah, a descendant of the royal house of Judah (1 Chr. iii. 32). It is fourth in descent from Zerubbabel, and, according to Lord A. Hervey’s plausible alteration, is the son of Shimea, brother to Zerubbabel, and therefore but one generation distant from the latter (Genealogy of our Lord, pp. 107-109). The name is identical with Igal (2 Sam. xxii. 36). It is given to Joel, son of Zared (2 Chr. xxvii. 2). The Targum Pseudojon. by Gizeh, possibly pointing to sheep-shearing in the holy land. In its usual sense, all of the text has given it as Joel.

Igal (יְגוֹל, [Heb. גַּל], a town in the extreme south of Judah, named in the same group with Beer-sheba, Hormah, etc. (Josh. xv. 29). The Peshito Syriac version has Elin, אֵילֶּן. No trace of the name has yet been discovered in this direction.

ILLYRICUM (Iλλύρικον), an extensive district lying along the eastern coast of the Adriatic from the boundary of Italy on the north to Epirus on the south, and contiguous to Moesia and Macedonia on the east: it was divided by the river Drino into two portions Illyris Barbara, the northern, and Illyris Graea, the southern. Within these limits was included Pithonitis, which appears to have been used indifferently with Illyricum for a portion, and ultimately for the whole of the district. St. Paul records that he preached the gospel “round about unto Illyricum” (Rom. xv. 19). He probably uses the term in its most extensive sense, and the port visited (if indeed he crossed

ILLYR'ICUM
the boundary at all) would have been about Dyrachium.

W. L. B.

* In Rom. xv. 19 Paul speaks of his having preached the gospel "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum." We have no account in the Acts of the Apostles of any journey to that province. But this sort of interlacings of the two literature which we can insert this journey in the history so as to bring the Acts and the Epistles into accordance with each other on this point. Illyricum lay on the Adriatic, west of Macedonia. Paul now was in Macedonia only three times during his ministry. He could not have gone to Illyricum when he was there first: for the course of his journey at that time is minutely traced in the Acts from his landing at Neapolis to his leaving Corinith on his return by sea to Palestine. In going south on that occasion he moved along the eastern side of the peninsula, and was kept at a distance from Illyricum (Acts xvi. 12 ff.). Nor, again, could it have been when he passed through Macedonia on his return thither from Greece at the time of his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 1 ff.); for the excursion to Illyricum must have preceded this return. He had then written the Epistle to the Romans, in which he speaks ofhaving already been to Illyricum; and that epistle he wrote at Corinth just before his departure thence for Macedonia (see Rom. xvi. i. 23, and comp. 1 Cor. i. 14). His only other visit to Macedonia was the intermediate one when he came to that region from Troas on the way to southern Greece (Acts xx. 1. 2). No mention is made of Illyricum at that time, but in describing the circuit of the Apostle's labors here, Luke employs the comprehensive expression "those parts" (τὰ ἐμπρος ἐκεῖνα). We may assume, therefore, that one of the "parts," or regions, was Illyricum, which was adjacent to Macedonia; and so much the more, because the chronology of this portion of Paul's life allows us to assign the ample time of three or four months to just these labors in Northern Greece before he proceeded to Achata or Corinth. Thus the epistle and the history, so incomplete and obscure apart from each other, form a perfect whole when brought together, and that by a combination of circumstances, of which the two writers could have had no thought when they penned their different accounts. Lardner pronounces this geographical and historical coincidence sufficiently important to authenticate the entire narrative of Paul's travels as related in the Acts of the Apostles.

H.

IMAGE

IMMANUEL
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* IMAGERY, CHAMBERS OF, or chambers of images (Ezok. viii. 12). The Hebrew is הָרִישֵׁיתִּים יִונות דִּוָּנִים ָּוָּו, and of this a literal translation would be: "Each one in the chamber or apartment of his image." Many of the commentators transfer the suffix pronoun to the first noun, and render: " Each one in his apartment of images" (see Rosenmüller, Maurer, and others). But the pronoun may perhaps be added to the last noun to show that different persons had different objects of worship. The whole passage (vv. 7-12 inclusive) represents a scene of idolatrous worship which was disclosed to the prophet as through a secret door of entrance (vv. 7, 8). On the walls of the apartment were portrayed "every form of creeping thing and abominable beasts, and all the Ẓed of the house of Israel" (ver. 10); and seventy men of the elders of the house of Israel (according to the number of the Sanhedrin), with their president (Jaaazaniah) stood before these pictures, each with his censer in his hand, and offered incense (ver. 11). That this idol worship was introduced from Egypt is plain from the kind of objects portrayed, as indicated in ver. 10; whilst in subsequent verses idle and profane practices which had their origin from Phoenicia (ver. 14) and Ezra (ver. 16), are brought to view. A similar chamber of imagery is referred to in Ez. xxviii. 14: "Where she sat men portrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans portrayed with vermillion," etc. Representations found among the ruins of Nineveh, as well as in Egypt, furnish good illustrations of the practices here referred to.

R. D. C. R.

IMLA (ימלך) [filled, full; or fullford]: יִשְׂרָאֵל: [Ez. i. 14.] Alex. Ἰώσ : Jerusalem, father or progenitor of Miasiah, the prophet of Jehovah, who was consulted by Ahab and Jehoshaphat before their fatal expedition to Ramoth-gilead (2 Chr. xviii. 7, 8). The form —

IMLAH (יִמלֵה) : יִשְׂרָאֵל; [Ez. i. 14., i. 14:] Alex. Ἰώσ : Jerusalem, is employed in the parallel narrative (1 K. xxii. 8, 9).

IMMANUEL (יִמְנַעְל) [with us God], or in two words in many MSS. and editions יְמִנְעָל: יְמִנְעָא: Emmanuel), the symbolical name given by the prophet Isiaiah to the child who was announced to Ahaz and the people of Judah, as the sign which God would give of their deliverance from their enemies (Is. vii. 14). It is applied by the Apostle Matthew to the Messiah, born of the Virgin (Matt. i. 23). By the LXX. in one passage (Is. vii. 14), and in both passages by the Vulg., Syr., and Targ., it is rendered as a proper name; but in Is. vii. 8 the LXX. translate it literally μεθ' ἰδων καὶ ἐπερ. The verbs in question have been the battle-field of critics for centuries, and in their discussions there has been no lack of the odium theologorum. As early as the times of Justin Martyr the Christian interpretation was attacked by the Jews, and the position which they occupied has of late years been assumed by many continental theologians. Before proceeding to a discussion, or rather to a classification of the numerous theories of which this subject has been the fruitful source, the circumstances under which the prophecy was delivered claim especial consideration.

In the early part of the reign of Ahaz the kingdom of Judah was threatened with annihilation by the combined armies of Syria and Israel. A hundred and twenty thousand of the choice warriors of Judah, all "sons of might," had fallen in one day's battle. The Edomites and Philistines had thrown off the yoke (2 Chr. xxviii.). Jerusalem was menaced with a siege; the hearts of the king and of the people shook, as the trees of a forest shake before the wind" (Is. vii. 2). The king had gone to "the conduit of the upper pool," probably to take measures for preventing the supply of water from being cut off or falling into the enemy's hand, when the prophet met him with the message of consolation. Not only were the designs of the hostile armies to fail, but within sixty-five years the kingdom of Israel would be overthrown. In confirmation of his words, the prophet bids Ahaz ask a sign of Jehovah, which the king, with pretended
humility, refused to do. After administering a severe rebuke to Ahaz for his obstinacy, Isaiah announces the sign which Jehovah himself would give unveiled: "Behold! the virgin (Virgo) is with child and shall bear a son, and he shall be called IMMANUEL." The interpreters of this passage are naturally divided into three classes, each of which admits of subdivisions, as the differences in detail are numerous. The first class consists of those who refer the fulfillment of the prophecy to a historical event, which followed immediately upon its delivery. The majority of Christian writers, till within the last fifty years, form a second class, and apply the prophecy exclusively to the Messiah, while a third class, almost equally numerous, agree in considering both these explanations true, and hold that the prophecy had an immediate and literal fulfillment, but was completely accomplished in the miraculous conception and birth of Christ. Among the first are numbered the Jewish writers of all ages, without exception. Jerome refutes, on chronological grounds, a theory which was current in his day amongst the Jews, that the prophecy had reference to Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, who from a comparison of 2 K. xvi. 2 with xviii. 21, must have been nine years old at the time it was delivered. The force of Jerome's argument is somewhat weakened by the evident obscurity of the numbers in the passages in question, from which we must infer that Ahaz was eleven years old at the time of Hezekiah's birth. By the Jews in the middle ages this explanation was abandoned as unceaseable, and in consequence some, as Jarchi and Menahem, refer the prophecy to a son of Isaiah himself, and others to a son of Ahaz by another wife, as Kimchi and Michaelis. In this case, the 'almah is explained as the wife or betrothed wife of the prophet, or as a later wife of Ahaz. Kelle (Genes. Comm. iiber den Jesus) degrades her to the third rank of ladies in the harem (comp. Cant. vi. 8). Hitzig (des Prophet. Jesu) rejects Gesenius's application of 'almah to a second wife of the prophet, and interprets it of the prophetess mentioned in viii. 3. Hengstwurck (des Prophet. Jesu) follows Gesenius. In either case, the prophet is made to fulfill his own prophecy. In Ahaz's day, a pupil of Michaelis, defended the historical sense with considerable learning, and suffered unworthy persecution for expressing his opinion. The 'almah in his view was some Hebrew girl who was present at the colloquy between Isaiah and Ahaz, and to whom the prophet pointed as he spoke. This opinion was held by Baer, Cebot, and Rosenmüller (1st ed.). Michaelis, Eichhorn, Paulus, and Anselm give her merely the existent existence; while Umbreit allows her to be among the bystanders, but explains the pregnancy and birth as imaginary only. Interpreters of the second class, who refer the prophecy solely to the Messiah, of course understand by the 'almah the Virgin Mary. Among these, Vitringa (Ons Ster, v. e. 1) vigorously opposes those, who, like Grutius, Pellicanus, and Trinatus, conceded to the Jews that the reference to Christ was not direct and immediate, but by way of typical allusion. For, he maintains, a young married woman of the time of Ahaz and Isaiah could not be a type of the Virgin, nor could her issue by her husband be a figure of the child to be born of the Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Against this hypothesis of a solely Messianic reference, it is objected that the birth of the Messiah could not be a sign of deliverance to the people of Judah in the time of Ahaz. In reply to this, Theodoret advances the opinion that the birth of the Messiah involved the conservation of the family of Jesse, and therefore by implication of the Jewish state. Calvinists argue on the same side, that the sign of the Messiah's birth would intimate that in the interval the kingdom and state of the Jews could not be alienated from God, and besides it confirms ver. 8, indicating that before the birth of Christ Judah should not be subject to Syria, as it was when Acheleans was removed and it was reduced to the form of a Roman province. All these explanations Vitringa disapproves, and states his own conclusion, which is also that of Michaelis, is as follows: In vv. 14-16, the prophet gives a sign to the pious in Israel of their deliverance from the impending danger, and in ver. 17, &c., announces the evils which the Assyrians, not the Syrians, should inflict upon Ahaz and such of his people as resembled him. As surely as Messiah would be born of the Virgin, so surely would God deliver the Jews from the threatened evil. The principle of interpretation here made use of is founded by Calvin on the custom of the prophets, who confirmed special promises by the assurance that God would send a redeemer. But this explanation involves another difficulty, besides that which arises from the distance of the event predicted. Before the child shall arrive at years of discretion the prophet announces the desolation of the land whose kings threatened Ahaz. By this Vitringa understands that no more time would elapse before the former event was accomplished than would intervene between the birth and youth of Immanuel, an argument too far-fetched to have much weight. Hengstenberg (Christologia, ii. 44-66, Eng. trans.) supports to the full the Messianic interpretation, and closely connects vii. 14 with ix. 6. He admits frankly that the older explanation of vv. 15, 16, has exposed itself to the charge of being arbitrary, and confidently proclaims his own method of removing the stumbling-block. "In ver. 14 the prophet had seen the birth of the Messiah as present. Holding fast this idea and expanding it, the prophet makes him who has been born accompany the people through all the stages of its existence. We have here an ideal anticipation of the real incarnation . . . . What the prophet means, and intends to say here is, that, in the spiritual, the birth of the holy kingdom would already have taken place. As the representative of the contemporaries, he brings forward the wonderful child who, as it were, formed the soul of the popular life. . . . In the subsequent prophecy, the same wonderful child, grown up into a warlike hero, brings the deliverance from Assur, and the world's power represented by it."
in the case of Asshur, but denies its application to Immanuel. It would be hard to say whether text or commentary be the more obscure. In view of the difficulties which attend these explanations of the prophecy, the third class of interpreters are led to have recourse to a theory which combines the two preceding, namely, the hypothesis of the double sense. They suppose that the immediate reference of the prophet was to some contemporary occurrence, but that his words received their true and full accomplishment in the birth of the Messiah. Jerome (Comm. in Ewewm. vii. 14) mentions an interpretation of some Judaeans that Immanuel was the son of Isaiah, born of the prophetess, as a type of the Saviour, and that his name indicates the calling of the nations after the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. Something of the same kind is proposed by Dahse: in his opinion the miracle, while it immediately respected the times of the prophet, was a type of the birth of Christ of the Virgin Mary." Dr. Pye Smith conjectured that it had an immediate reference to Hezekiah, "the virgin" being the queen of Ahaz, but, like some other prophetic testimonies, real and fiction, and a designed reference to some remoter circumstance, which when it occurred would be the real fulfillment, answering every feature and filling up the entire extent of the original delineation (Scrip. Test. to the Messiah, i. 357, 3d ed.). A serious objection to the application of the prophecy to Hezekiah has already been mentioned. Kennicott separates ver. 16 from the three preceding, applying the latter to Christ, the former to the son of Isaiah (alluded to in Vs. vii. 13-16).

Such in brief are some of the principal opinions which have been held on this important question. From the manner in which the quotation occurs in Matt. i. 23, there can be no doubt that the Evangelist did not use it by way of accommodation, but as having in view its actual accomplishment. Whatever may have been his opinion as to any contemporary or immediate reference it might contain, this was completely obscured by the full conviction that burst upon him when he realized its completion in the Messiah. What may have been the light in which the promise was regarded by the prophet's contemporaries we are not in a position to judge; the hypothesis of the double sense satisfies most of the requirements of the problem, and as it does less violence to the text than the others which have been proposed, and is at the same time supported by the analogy of the Apostle's quotations from the O. T. (Matt. ii. 15, 18, 23; iv. 15), we accept it as approximating most nearly to the true solution. W. A. W.
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of the perfumes stacte, onycha, galbanum, and pure frankincense. All incense which was not made of these ingredients was called ḳabōth ẓirah (בתולה צירה), Ex. xxx. 9, and was forbidden to be offered. According to Rashi on Ex. xxx. 34, the above-mentioned perfumes were mixed in equal proportions, seventy manehs being taken of each. They were compounded by the skill of the apothecary, to whose use, according to rabbinical tradition, was devoted a portion of the temple, called, from the name of the family whose especial duty it was to prepare the incense, "the house of Abinetes." So in the large temples of India "is retained a man whose chief business it is to distill sweet waters from flowers, and to extract oil from wood, flowers, and other substances" (Roberts, Oriental Illustrations, p. 82).

The priest or Levite to whose care the incense was intrusted, was one of the fifteen ᵇᵉƚᵉⁿⁱⁿᵃ版权归ו (memunavo), or prefects of the temple. Constant watch was kept in the house of Abinetes that the incense might always be in readiness (Buxtorf, Lextr. Talm., s. v. דְּנֵנְסַנְנֶנָנָך). In addition to the four ingredients already mentioned, Jarchi enumerates seven others, thus making eleven, which the Jewish doctors affirm were communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai. Josephus (B. J. v. 5, § 5) mentions thirteen. The proportions of the additional spices are given by Maimonides (Veʾem haʾmanitshab, ii. 2, § 9) as follows:

- Of myrrh, cassia, spikenard, and saffron, sixteen manehs each.
- Of costus, twelve manehs.
- Of cinnamon, nine manehs.
- Of sweet balsam, sweet balsam, and myrrh, two manehs each.

The weight of the whole confection was 368 manehs. To these was added the fourth part of a cab of salt of Solomon, with amber of Jordan, and an herb called "the smoke-raiser" (בַּעֲרֵב הַשְׁעָל, moḥaṭ ahbaḥ), known only to the cunning in such matters, to whom the secret descended by tradition. In the ordinary daily service one maneh was used, half in the morning and half in the evening. Allowing then one maneh of incense for each day of the solar year, the three manehs which remained were again pounded, and used by the high-priest on the day of atonement (Lev. xxvi. 12). At night it was constantly kept in the temple (Jos. B. J. vi. 8, § 3).

The incense possessed the threefold characteristic of being salted (not tempered as in A. V.), pure and holy. Salt was the symbol of incorruptness, and nothing, says Maimonides, was offered without it, except the wine of the drink-offerings, the blood, and the wool (cf. Lev. ii. 19).

The expression ṭבּוּב תִּבּוּב (beḥel habōb), Ex. xxx. 34, is interpreted by the Chaldeans "weight by weight," that is, an equal weight of each (cf. Jarchi, in loc.); and this rendering is adopted by our version. Others however, and among them Aleni Ezra and Maimonides, consider it as signifying that each of the spices was separately prepared, and that all were afterwards mixed. The incense thus compounded was specially set apart for the service of the sanctuary: its desecration was punished with death (Ex. xxx. 37, 38); and in some part of India, according to Michaelis (Mosaisch. Recht, art. 249), it was considered high treason for any person to make use of the best sort of Cymbellon, which was for the service of the king in India.

The second temple of the office devoted upon the inferior priests, from among whom one was chosen by lot (Mishna, Yoma, ii. 4; Luke i. 9), each morning and evening (Abarnel on Lev. x. 1). A peculiar blessing was supposed to be attached to this service, and in order that all might share in it, the lot was cast among those who were "new to the incense," if any remained (Mishna, Yoma, l. c.; Barcena in Tanum, v. 2). Uzziah was punished for his presumption in attempting to infringe the prerogatives of the descendants of Aaron, who were consecrated to burn incense (2 Chr. xxvi. 16-21; Jos. Ant. ix. 10, 4). The officiating priest appointed another, whose office it was to take the fire from the brazen altar. According to Maimonides (Tumid, iii. 8, l. c. 5) this fire was taken from the second pile, which was over against the S. E. corner of the altar of burnt-offering, and was of fig-tree wood. A silver shovel (תַּנְכָּה, maḥatḥah) was first filled with the live coals, and afterwards emptied into a golden one, smaller than the former, so that some of the coals were spilled (Mishna, Tanum, v. 5, Yoma, iv. 4; cf. Rev. viii. 5). Another priest cleared the golden altar from the cinders which had been left at the previous offering of incense (Mishna, Tanum, iii. 6, 9, vi. 1).

The times of offering incense were specified in the instructions first given to Moses (Ex. xxx. 7, 8). The morning incense was offered when the lamps were trimmed in the holy place, and before the sacrifice, when the watchman set for the purpose announced the break of day (Mishna, Yoma, iii. 1, 5). When the lamps were lighted "between the evenings," after the evening sacrifice and before the drink-offerings were offered, incense was again burnt on the golden altar, which "belonged to the oracle" (1 K. vi. 22), and stood before the veil which separated the holy place from the Holy of Holies, the throne of God (Rev. viii. 4; Philo, de Anim. lib. § 3).

When the priest entered the holy place with the incense, all the people were removed from the temple, and from between the porch and the altar (Maimon. Tumid. Umus. iii. 3; cf. Luke i. 10). The incense was then brought from the house of Abinetes in a large vessel of gold called ṭבּוּב (cypar), in which was a phial (תַּנְכָּה, bezale, properly "a soler") containing the incense (Mishna, Tanum, v. 4). The assistant priests who attended to the lamps, the clearing of the golden altar from the cinders, and the fetching fire from the altar of burnt-offering, performed their offices singly, bowed towards the ark of the covenant, and left the holy place before the priest, whose lot it was to offer incense, entered. Profound silence was observed among the congregation who were praying without (cf. Rev. viii. 1); and at a signal from the high-priest the incense on the fire (Mishna, Tanum, vi. 3), and bowing reverently towards the Holy of Holies retired slowly backwards, not prolonging his prayer that he might not alarm the congregation, or cause them to fear that he had been struck dead for offering unworthily (Lev. xvi. 13; Luke i. 21: Mishna, Yoma, v. 1). When he came out he pronounced the blessing in Num. vi. 24-26, the "magpopshah," said, and the Levites burst forth into song, accompanied by the full swell of the temple music, the sound of which, say the Rabbins, could be heard as far as Jericho (Mishna, Tanum, iii. 8). It is possible that this may be
The priest then emptied the censer in a clean place, and hung it on one of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering.

On the day of atonement the service was different. The high-priest, after sacrificing the bullock as a sin-offering and the ram for his own sin-offering, took incense in his left hand and a golden censer filled with live coals from the west side of the brazen altar (Jarchi on Lev. xvi. 12) in his right, and went into the Holy of Holies. He then placed the censer upon the ark between the two bars. In the second temple, where there was no ark, a stone was substituted. Then sprinkling the incense upon the coals, he stayed till the house was filled with smoke, and walking slowly backwards came without the veil, where he prayed for a short time (Maimonides, *Vayikra*; quoted by Ainsworth on Lev. xvi. Outram de S. Scitificis, i. 8, § 11).

The offering of incense has formed a part of the religious ceremonies of most ancient nations. The Egyptians burnt resin in honor of the sun at its rising, myrrh when in its meridian, and a mixture called Kuphi at its setting (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. v. 315). Polybius (iv. 24, i. 31, 80) describes Kuphi as a mixture of sixteen ingredients "in the temple of Siva incense is offered to the Lingam six times in twenty-four hours" (Roberts, Oriental, Illus. p. 468). It was an element in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (Jer. xii. 12, 17, xviii. 35; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 25).

With regard to the symbolic meaning of incense, opinions have been many and widely differing. While Maimonides regarded it merely as a perfume designed to counteract the effluvia arising from the beasts which were slaughtered for the daily sacrifice, other interpreters have allowed their imaginations to run riot, and vied with the wildest speculations of the Midrashim. Philo (Qv. ver. deo. hcr. sit. § 41, p. 501) conceives the stacte and onycha to be symbolic of water and earth; galbanum and frankincense of air and fire. Josephus, following the traditions of his time, believed that the ingredients of the incense were chosen from the products of the sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the earth, to indicate that all things are of God and for God (B. J. v. 5, § 5). As the temple or tabernacle was the palace of Jehovah, the theocratic king of Israel, and the ark of the covenant his throne, so the incense, in the opinion of some, corresponded to the perfumes in which the luxurious monarchs of the East delighted. It may mean all this, but it must mean much more.

Grotius, on Ex. xxx. 1, says the mystical significance is "suraum halenda corda." Cornelius a Lapide, on Ex. xxx. 34, considers it as an apt emblem of propitiation, and finds a symbolic meaning in the several ingredients. Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*, ii. 320), with many others, looks upon prayer as the reality of which incense is the symbol, founding his conclusion upon Ps. cxii. 2.; Rev. v. 8, viii. 3, 4. Bähr (*Symb. d. Mose Cult. vol. i., vi. § 4) opposes this view of the subject, on the ground that the chief thing in offering incense, is not the producing of the smoke, which presses like prayer towards heaven, but the spreading of the fragrance. His own exposition may be summed up as follows: Prayer, among all oriental nations, signifies calling upon the name of God. The offering of incense is doubtless a commemoration of the several titles of God. The Scripture places incense in close relationship to prayer, so that offering incense is synonymous with worship.

Hence incense itself is a symbol of the name of God. The ingredients of the incense correspond severally to the perfections of God, though it is impossible to decide to which of the four names of God each belongs. Perhaps stacte corresponds to עַלְפִיָּה (laphpha), onycha to לָשׁוֹנָה (lashonah), gallanum to אַלְפִּיָּה (alapha), and frankincense to עַלְפִּיָּה (alapha).

Such is Bähr's exposition of the symbolism of incense, rather ingenious than logical. Looking upon incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritual, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ. In Rev. viii. 3, 4, the incense is spoken of as something distinct from, though offered with, the prayers of all the saints (cf. Luke i. 10); and in Rev. v. 8 it is the golden vials, and not the odors or incense, which are said to be the prayers of saints. Ps. cxii. 2, at first sight, appears to militate against this conclusion; but if it be argued from this passage that incense is an emblem of prayer, it must also be alluded that the evening sacrifice has the same symbolic meaning.

W. A. W.

**INDIA** (हिन्दू, i.e. హిందు; जिन्दु: India)

The name of India does not occur in the Bible before the book of Esther, where it is noticed as the limit of the territories of Ahasuerus in the east, as Ethiopia was in the west (I. 1; viii. 9); the names are similarly connected by Herodotus (vii. 9). The Hebrew form "Hindu" is an abbreviation of "Hinduva," which is identical with the indigenous names of the river Indus, "Hindu," or "Sindhu," and again with the ancient name of the country as it appears in the Vendidad, "Hapta Hindu." The native form "Sindhu" is noticed by Pliny (vi. 23). The India of the book of Esther is not the peninsula of Hindostan, but the country surrounding the Indus—the Panjik, and perhaps Seicle—the India which Herodotus describes (iii. 88) as forming part of the Persian empire under Darius, and the India which at a later period was conquered by Alexander the Great. The name occurs in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Nakshish-I-Istum, but not in those of Bishistin (Rawilson, Herod. ii. 483). In 1 Macc. viii. 8, India is reckoned among the countries which Emenees, king of Pergamus, received out of the former possessions of Antiochus the Great. It is clear that India proper cannot be understood, insomuch as this never belonged either to Antiochus or Emenees. At the same time none of the explanations offered by commentators are satisfactory: the Eneti of Ephphagnia have been suggested, but these people had disappeared long before (Strab. xii. 534); the India of Xenophon (Cyrop. i. 5, § 3, ii. 2, § 25), which may have been above the Carian stream named Indus (Ibn. v. 29, probably the Calis), is more likely; but the enumeration "Mysia and Ionia" for *India et India*, offers the best solution of the difficulty. (*DONIA.*).

A more authentic notice of the country occurs in 1 Macc. vii. 37, where Indians are noticed as the drivers of the war-elephants introduced into the army of the Syrian king. (See also 1 Esdr. iii. 2; Esth. xiii. 1; xvi. 1.)

But though the name of India occurs so seldom, the products and introductions of that country must have been tolerably well known to the Jews. There is undoubted evidence that an active trade was carried on between India and Western Asia: the
INFIDEL

Tyrants established their depots on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and procured "horns of ivory and ebony," "broidered work and rich apparel" (Ex. xxvii. 15, 24), by a route which crossed the Arabian desert by land, and then followed the coasts of the Indian ocean by sea. The trade opened by Solomon with "Ophir through the Red Sea chiefly consisted of Indian articles, and some of the names even of the articles, adjutianum, "smoked wood," kudjia, "apex," liucrtin, "peacocks," are of Indian origin (Humboldt, Kosmos, ii. 133); to which we may add the Hebrew name of the "topaz," "pithah," derived from the Sanscrit pitah. There is a strong probability that productions of yet greater utility were furnished by India through Syria to the shores of Europe, and that the Greeks derived both the term karakrtios (comp. the Sanscrit karatira), and the article it represents, "tin," from the coasts of India. The connection thus established with India led to the opinion that the Indians were included under the etiological title of Cush (Gen. x. 6), and hence the Syrian, Chaldean, and Arabic versions frequently render that term by India or Indus, as in 2 Chr. xvi. 16; Is. xi. 19, xviii. 1; Jer. xiii. 23; Zeph. iii. 10. For the connection which some have sought to establish between India and Paradise, see EwN [See on this word Keil's 12th, ed. Gen. Tich. p. 83.—II.]

W. L. B.

INFIDEL, known to our Bible phraseology only in 2 Tim. vi. 15, and 1 Tim. v. 8. Instead of this positive term the privative "unbeliever" (ἀπιστός) is more correct, a distinction elsewhere observed in the rendering. The A. V. misses also the alliteration in the former of the above passages.

II.

INHERITANCE. [HEIR.]

INK, INK-HORN. [WRITING.]

INK (יוֹם, mid.: קְתָלָא, παρδ庭审). The Hebrew word thus rendered literally signifies "a lodging-place for the night." A "inn" in our sense of the term, were, as they still are, unknown in the East, where hospitality is religiously practiced. The khans, or caravanserais, are the representatives of European inns, and these were established but gradually. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to them in the Old Testament. The "hunting-place of a caravan" was selected originally on account of its proximity to water or pasture, by which the travellers pitched their tents and passed the night. Such was undoubtedly the "inn," at which occurred the incident in the life of Moses, narrated in Ex. iv. 24. It was probably one of the halting-places of the Israelitish merchants who traded to Egypt, with their camels-loads of spices. Moses was on his journey from the land of Midian, and the merchants in Gen. xxxix. are called indiscriminately Israelites and Midianites. At one of these stations, too, the first which they reached after leaving the city, and no doubt within a short distance from it, Joseph's brethren discovered that their money had been replaced in their wallets (Gen. xlii. 27).

Increased commercial intercourse, and in later times religious enthusiasm for pilgrimages gave rise to the establishment of more permanent accommodation for travellers. On the more frequented routes, remote from towns (Jer. ix. 2), caravanserais were in course of time erected, often at the expense of the wealthy. The following description of one of those on the road from Baghdad to Babylon will suffice for all: "It is a large and substantial square building, in the distance resembling a fortress, being surrounded with a lofty wall, and flanked by round towers to defend the inmates in case of attack. Passing through a strong gateway, the guest enters a large court, the sides of which are divided into numerous arched compartments, open in front, for the accommodation of separate parties and for the reception of goods. In the centre is a spacious raised platform, used for sleeping upon at night, or for the devotions of the faithful during the day. Between the outer wall and the compartments are wide vaulted arcades, extending round the entire building, where the beasts of burden are placed. Upon the roof of the arcades is an excellent terrace, and over the gateway an elevated tower containing two rooms—one of which is open at the sides, permitting the occupants to enjoy every breath of air that passes across the heated plain. The terrace is tolerably clean; but the court and stables below are ankle-deep in chopped straw and filth." (Letts, Chabba, p. 13.)

The great khans established by the Persian kings and great men, at intervals of about six miles on the roads from Baghda to the sacred places, are provided with stables for the horses of the pilgrims. "Within these stables, on both sides, are other cells for travellers." (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 478, note.) The "stall" or "stallier," mentioned in Luke ii. 7, was probably in a stable of this kind. Such khans are sometimes situated near running streams, or have a supply of water of some kind, but the traveller must carry all his provisions with him (Onsea, Trav. in Persia, i. 241, note). At Damascus the khans are many of them, substantial buildings; the small rooms which surround the court, as well as those above them which are entered from the sides, are used by the merchants of the city for depositing their goods (Porter's Damascus, i. 33). The erebeks of modern Egypt are of a similar description (Lane, Maf, Fig. ii. 10). "The house of paths" (Prov. viii. 2, fr obov διδον, Tur. Test.), where Wisdom took her stand, is understood by some to refer appropriately to a khan built where many ways met and frequented by many travellers. A similar meaning has been attached to ἕλαμ, ἐλαμ, ge'ran Chimah, "the hostel of Chimham" (Jer. xi. 17), beside Bethlehem, built by the liberality of the son of Kirzilii for the benefit of those who were going down to Egypt. (Noy, 8, p. 163; App. § 90.) The Targum says, "which David gave to Chimham, son of Kirzilii the Gileadite" (comp. 2 Sam. xix. 37, 38). With regard to this passage, the ancient versions are strangely at variance. The LXX. had evidently another reading with διδον and διδος, which they left untranslated απαθονομος, Alex. due to the same cause. Paulus, the friend of Jerome, built several on the road to Bethlehem; and the Scotch and Irish residents in France erected hospitals for the use of pilgrims of their own nation, on their way to Rome. (Brunnermann, Hist. of Inv. ii. 457). Hence Auspit, hostis, and Famili hostis.
A. inmfell on the road and was left by his com-
rades at an inn, under the charge of the hostess
(γηνηγεκσαυαυ), pündelth = παντεκυπτρια). On their
return to inquire for their friend, the hostess told
them he was dead and buried, but they refused to
believe her till she produced his staff, wallet, and
roll of the law. In Josh. ii. 1, Ἱουαθ, zînâth, the
term applied to Rahab, is rendered in the Targum of
Jonathan נונקיס, pündelth, "a woman who keeps an inn." So in Judg. xi. 1, of the
mother of Jephthah; of Delilah (Judg. xvi. 1) and the two women who appealed to Solomon (1 K. iii.
16). The words, in the opinion of Kimchi on Josh.
ii. 1, appear to have been synonymous.

In some parts of modern Syria a nearer approach
has been made to the European system. The people
of el-Salih, according to Hurkarth, support four
taverns (Menšel or Melḫiya) at the public expense.
At these the traveller is furnished with everything
he may require, so long as he chooses to remain,
provided his stay is not unreasonably protracted.
The expenses are paid by a tax on the heads of
families, and a kind of landlord superintends the
establishment (Trav. in Syria, p. 36).

W. A. W.

The statement ascribed above to Hurkarth is not strictly correct. In modern Syria, in all
villages not provided with a khân, there is a house,
usually the dwelling of the sheikh, which is called
the menzoul, which is the place of entertainment
of all strangers who are not visiting at the houses
of friends. One of the officials is officially desig-
nated as the khowit or caterer, and his business
is to direct strangers to the menzoul, to supply them
with provisions and folder if required, to keep off
the intrusive visits of children and idlers, and to
provide a place of safety for the animals at night.
It is not customary for the village to furnish these
supplies gratis, but the traveller pays for them at
usual rates, the caterer being the referee in case of
a dispute between the buyer and seller. The caterer
receives a compensation for his services proportioned
to the generosity of the traveller.

G. E. P.

INSTANT, INSTANTLY. A word employed by
our translators in the N. T. with the
force of urgency or earnestness, to render five
distinct Greek words. We still say "at the instance
of," but as that sense is no longer attached to
"instant"—though it is still to the verb "insist,"
and to other compounds of the same root, such as
"persist," "constant"—it has been thought ad-
visable to notice its occurrences. They afford an
interesting example, if an additional one be needed,
of the close connection which there is between the
Authorized Version and the Vulgate; the Vulgate
having, as will be seen, suggested the word in three
out of its five occurrences.

1. στουσαίον—"they besought Him instantly"
(Luke vii. 4). This word is elsewhere commonly rendered "earnestly," which is very suitable here.

2. ετέκειατο, from ετέκειαμαι, to lie upon:—
"they were instant with loud voices" (Vulg. in-
stantam), Luke xxii. 23. This might be rendered
"they were pressing" (as in ver. 1).

3. εν έκτενειας, "instantly serving God" (Acts
xxvi. 7). The metaphor at the root of this word
is that of stretching—or the stretch. Elsewhere
in the A. V. it is represented by "fervently:"

4. προσπαθετούντες, "continuing instante" (Rom.
ii. 12), Vulg. instantes. Here the adjective

Eastern inn or caravanserai.
INWARD

is hardly necessary, the word being elsewhere rendered by "continuing" — or to preserve the rhythm of so familiar a sentence — "continuing steadfastly." (as Acts ii. 42).

b. Εἰσπέρτητι, from ἐσπέρταν, to stand by or upon — "be instant in season, out of season." (2 Tim. iv. 2). Vulg. "intera." Four verses further on it is rendered, "as is hand." The sense is "stand ready," "be alert" for whatever may happen. Of the five words this is the only one which contains the same metaphor as "instant.

In Luke ii. 38, "that instant" is literally "that same hour," — ἐκείνης ἑκείνης.

* INWARD is used in the expression "my inward friends," for "familiar," "confidential." (A. V.) Job xix. 19 (借用浙江省, lit. men of my intimacy). The patriarch complains that those with whom he had been most familiar, to whom he had made known his most secret thoughts, had turned against him and abhorred him.

II. * INTEREST. [Loan; Usury.]

* INTERPRETER. [Prophef; Magic.]

IO'NIA ([Semitic] JT. JAVAN, which see) Ιονία. The substitution of this word for 7 I&Η-ηη in 1 Mace. viii. 8 (A. V. "India") is a conjecture of Grotius, without any authority of MSS. It must be acknowledged, however, that the change removes a great difficulty, especially if, as the same commentator suggests, ουραnia [MYRIA] be substituted for Μυσία or Μυδία in the same context. The passage refers to the cession of territory which the Romans forced Antiochus the Great to make: and it is evident that India and Media are nothing to the purpose, whereas Ionia and Mydia were among the districts cia Τουρας, which were given up to Eumeus.

As to the term Ionia, the name was given in early times to that part of the western coast of Asia Minor which lay between Eolis on the north and Paros on the south. These were properly ethnological terms, and had reference to the tribes of Greek settlers along this shore. Ionia, with its islands, was celebrated for its twelve, afterwards thirteen, cities; five of which, Ephesus, Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos, are conspicuous in the N. T. In Roman times Ionia ceased to have any political significance, being absorbed in the province of Asia. The term, however, was still occasionally used, as in Joseph. Ant. xvi. 2, § 3, from which passage we learn that the Jews were numerous in this district. This whole chapter in Josephus is very interesting, as a geographical illustration of that part of the coast. [JAVAN.] J. S. H.

IPHEDETAH [4 syll] Ἰφηδέται, [whom Jod- borh fires]: Ιηφαδίας; [Vat. Ἰηφαδεα]: Alex. φεδήτα, a descendant of Benjamin, one of the Bene-Shoshak (1 Chr. viii. 25); specially named as a chief of the tribe, and as residing in Jerusalem (comp. ver. 28).

IR (י) [city, town]: יר, as if יר: Alex. ייר; [Vat. om.; Comp. ייר] Ἰερ, 1 Chr. vii. 12. [Itv.]

IRA (י) [vigilant, Dietr.; or watch]: יְר (

a. For a copious note on this textual question, see Fritzsch's Ἰερουσαλημ, zu den Apostrophen, ii. 124. Unless the text be corrupt, it is impossible to acquit the writer of Shaela of gross inaccuracy. Drusmi and

IRAM

I, (Ira, [Vat.] Alex. Epar.) "The Iariate," named in the catalogue of David's great officers (2 Sam. xx. 26) as "priest to David." (8:2: A. V. "a chief ruler"). The Pesach version for "Iariate" has "from Jathir," i.e., probably JATRUS, where David had found friends during his troubles with Saul. [JATRUS] If this can be maintained, and it certainly has an air of probability, then this Ira is identical with —

2. (Irap, [Vat.: Epar, Irap] Alex. Epar, [Irap]) "Ira the Ihlrite" (II 77: A. V. omits the article), that is, the Jatrine, one of the heroes of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 38; 1 Chr. xi. 40). [JATRUS; JATRUS; JATRUS]

3. (Irap, [Vat.: Epar, Irap] Alex. Irap; [in 1 Chr. xxvii.]: Οθονια, Alex. Erap, Comp. [Irap] Θυρα.) Another member of David's guard, a Tekoite, son of Ikkesh (2 Sam. xxiii. 26; 1 Chr. xi. 28). Ira was leader of the sixth monthly course of 24,000, as appointed by David (1 Chr. xxvii. 9).

IRAD (יִרְאָד [fleet, reign, Dietr.]: Ira'd in both MSS.; Joseph. Ἰαρίδης; Syn. Idr; Ira'd), son of Enoch, grandson of Cain, and father of Mehujud (Gen. iv. 18).

IRAM (יִרְאָם [watchful, Dietr.]: Zaph'or; [Alex. Zaph'ori, Ἱραμ; Vat. in Chr. Zaph'or; Hiram;] belonging to a city, Ges.), a leader (117: LXX. ἵγραμος; "phyllarch," A. V. "duke") of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi. 43; 1 Chr. i. 54), i.e., the chief of a family or tribe. He occurs in the list of "the names of the duke [that came] of Edom, according to their families, after their places, by their names" (Gen. xxxvi. 40-43); but none of these names is found in the genealogy of Esau's immediate descendants; the latter being separated from them by the enumeration of the sons of Seir and the kings of Edom, both in Gen. and Chr. They were certainly descendants of Esau, but in what generation is not known; evidently not in a remote one. The sacred records are generally confined to the history of the chosen race, and the reason of the exclusion of the Edomite genealogy beyond the second generation is thus explicable. In remarking on this gap in the genealogy, we must add that there appears to be no safe ground for supposing a chronological sequence of sons and grandsons of Esau, sons of Seir, kings of Edom, and lastly descendants of Esau again, ruling over the Edomites. These were probably in part, or wholly, contemporaneous: and ἴραμ, we think, should be regarded as signifying a chief of a tribe, etc. (as rendered above), rather than a king. The Jewish assertion that these terms signified the same rank, except that the former was uncrowned and the latter crowned, may be safely neglected.

The names of which "Iram is one are according to their families, after their places (or towns," כֵּֽלַּת, by their names" (ver. 49); and again (ver. 43), "These [are] the dukes of Edom, according to their habitations in the land of their possession.") These words imply that tribes and others had suggested the change of names before Grotius. It has been thought possible also that the error may have crept into the text in the process of transmission from the Aramaic.
places were called after their leaders and founders, and tend to confirm the preceding remarks on the descendants of Esau being chiefs of tribes, and probably more or less contemporaneous with each other, and with the kings and Horites named together with them in the same records. It has been suggested that the names we are considering are those of the tribes and places founded by Esau's immediate descendants, mentioned earlier in the record; but no proof has been adduced in support of this theory.

The time of the final destruction of the Horites is uncertain. By analogy with the conquest of Canaan (cf. Deut. ii. 12, 22) we may perhaps infer that it was not immediate on Esau's settlement. No identification of Iram has been found.

E. S. P.

IR-HA-HERES, in A. V. THE CITY OF

DESTRUCTION (םָיִּֽוֹּלְַּיִּֽוֹ, var. סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ: פָּלְאָיִּֽוֹ וֹיֵֽלֹא; F. A. π. σαρήούυου; Comp. π. ἁνέρες) (Civitae Solis), the name or an appellation of a city in Egypt, mentioned only in Is. xxx. 18.

The reading סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ is that of most MSS. the Syr. Aq. and Theod., the other reading, סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, is supported by the LXX., but only in form, by Symm. who has פָּלְאָיִּֽוֹ וֹיֵֽלֹא, and the Vulg. Gesenius (Thes. pp. 391 n, 522) prefers the latter reading. There are various explanations: we shall first take those that treat it as a proper name, then those that suppose it to be an appellation used by the prophet to denote the future of the city.

1. סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, city of the sun, a translation of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, generally called in the Bible On, the Hebrew form of its civil name על (On), and once בֶּת-שָּם-שָּם, "the house of the sun" (Jer. xiii. 18), a more literal translation than this supposed one of the sacred name בֶּת-שָּם-שָּם.

2. סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, or סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, the city of the sun, a transcription in the second word of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, הַוָיִּֽוֹ, "the abode (lit. house) of the sun." This explanation would necessitate the omission of the article. The LXX. favor it.

3. סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, a city destroyed, lit. "a city of destruction," in A. V. "the city of destruction," meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be destroyed, according to Isaiah's idiom.

4. סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ, a city preserved, meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be preserved. Gesenius, who proposes this construction, if the second word be not part of the name of the place, compares the Arabic حَرَسَة, "he guarded, kept, preserved," etc. It may be remarked that the word הַוָיִּֽוֹ or הַוָיִּֽוֹ in ancient Egyptian, probably signifies "a guardian." This rendering of Gesenius is, however, merely conjectural, and seems to have been favored by him on account of its directly contradicting the rendering last noticed.

The first of these explanations is highly improbable, for we find elsewhere both the sacred and the civil names of Heliopolis, so that a third name, merely a variety of the Hebrew rendering of the sacred name, is very unlikely. The name בֶּת-שָּם-שָּם is, moreover, a more literal translation in its first word of the Egyptian name than this supposed one. It may be remarked, however, as to the second word, that one of the towns in Palestine called בֶּת-שָּם-שָּם, a town of the Lord over against the borders of Judah and Dan, was not far from a Mount Heres, סָּמְּרַּיִּֽוֹ (Judg. i. 35), so that the two names as applied to the sun as an object of worship might probably be interchangeable. The second explanation, which we believe has not been hitherto put forth, is liable to the same objection as the preceding one, besides that it necessitates the exclusion of the article. The fourth explanation would not have been noticed had it not been supported by the name of Gesenius. The common reading and old rendering remains, which certainly present no critical difficulties. A very careful examination of the sixth chap. of Isaiah, and of the xviiith and xxith, which are connected with it, has inclined us to prefer it. Egypt and Ethiopia were then either under a joint rule or under an Ethiopian sovereignty. We can, therefore, understand the connection of the three subjects comprised in the three chapters. Chap. xviii. is a prophecy against the Ethiopians, xix. is the Burden of Egypt, and xx., delivered in the year of the capture of Ashdod by Tartan, the general of Sargon, predicts the leading captive of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, probably the garrison of that strong stronghold, as a warning to the Israelites who trusted in them for aid. Chap. xixii. ends with an indication of the time to which it refers, speaking of the Ethiopians —as we understand the passage—as sending "a present" to "the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the mount Zion" (ver. 7). If this is to be taken in a proper and not a tropical sense, it would refer to the conversion of Ethiopians by the preaching of the Law while the Temple yet stood. That such had been the case before the gospel was preached is evident from the instance of the eunuch of Queen Candace, whom Philip met on his return homeward from worshipping at Jerusalem, and converted to Christianity (Acts viii. 26-39). The Burden of Egypt seems to point to the times of the Persians and sovereigns over that country. The civil war agrees with the troubles of the Decadency, then we read of a time of bitter oppression by a "cruel lord and [or 'even'] a fierce king," probably pointing to the Persian conquests and rule, and specially to Cambyses, or Cambyses and Darius, and then of the drying of the sea (the Red Sea, comp. xiii. 15) and the river and canals, of the destruction of the water-plants, and of the failure of the grain of the men of the river, the princes and counsellors are to lose their wisdom and the people to be filled with fear, all which calamities seem to have begun in the desolation of the Persian rule. It is not easy to understand what follows as to the dread of the land of Judah which the Egyptians should feel, immediately preceding the mention of the subject of the article: "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of the Canaanites; and among the land of Egypt shall one shall be called Ir-heres. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a savior
the early date of the one passage and the non-existence and incomplete state of the other, this is perhaps not irreconcilable.

No trace of the name of Ir-nahash attached to any site has been discovered. Jerome's interpretation (Qu. Hebr. ad loc.)—whether his own or a tradition he does not say—is, that Ir-nahash is Bethlehem, Nahash being another name for Jesse.

Nahash.

IRON (יִרְוֹן,firm, perh. God-fearing): kepēq; Alex. Ἰαπρώς; [Vmp. Ἱπρώς; Ἱρώς] Jecon, one of the cities of Naphtali, named between En-hazor and Migdal-el (Josh. xvi. 38); bitherto unknown, though possibly Verum. G.

IRON (יֶרֶבֶן, compares: Χθ. Νιβηρί, πορφύρα: εἰδώλος), mentioned with brass as the earliest of known metals (Gen. iv. 22). As it is rarely found in its native state, but generally in combination with oxygen, the knowledge of the art of forging iron, which is attributed to Tubal-Cain, argues an acquaintance with the obstacles which attend the smelting of this metal. Iron melts at a temperature of about 3200° Fahrenheit, and to produce this heat large furnaces supplied by a strong blast of air are necessary. But, however difficult it may be to imagine a knowledge of such appliances at so early a period, it is perfectly certain that the use of iron is of extreme antiquity, and that therefore some means of overcoming the obstacles in question must have been discovered. What the process may have been is left entirely to conjecture; a method is employed by the natives of India, extremely simple and of great antiquity, which though rude is very effective, and suggests the possibility of similar knowledge in an early stage of civilization (Urc, Dict. Acts and Sciences, art. Steel). The smelting furnaces of Ethiopia, described by Dioscorides (v. 15), correspond roughly with the modern bloomery, remains of which still exist in this country (Napier, Metehology of the Bible, p. 140). Malleable iron was in common use, but it is doubtful whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. The allusions in the Bible supply the following facts.

The natural wealth of the soil of Canaan is indicated by describing it as a land whose stones are iron" (Dent. vii. 9). By this Winer (Rohde, art. Eisen) understands the basalt which constitutes much of the hills of the Hauran, is the material of which Or's bedstead (Deut. iii. 11) was made, and contains a large percentage of iron. It is more probable that the expression is a poetical figure. Pharaoh's (xxvi. 11), who is quoted as an authority, says indeed that basalt is "terrei eodias atque duritas," but does not hint that iron was ever extracted from it. The book of Job contains passages which indicate that iron was very well known. Of the manner of procuring it, we learn that "iron is taken from dust" (xxviii. 2). It does not follow from Job xix. 24, that it was used for a writing implement, though such may have been the case, any more than that adamant was employed for the same purpose (Jer. xvii. 1), or that shoes were made with iron and brass (Deut. xxxii. 25). Indeed, iron so frequently occurs in poetic figures, that it is difficult to discriminate between its literal and metaphorical sense. In such passages as the following in which a "pole of iron" (Dent. xxviii. 18) designates hard service; a "rod of iron" (Ps. ii. 9), a stern government; a "pillar of iron" (Jer i 18),

The or IR (יִרְוֹן or יִרְבָּן) [healer of Jehovah, Dict.; Jehovah is watcher, First]; ὑψίπατρος [Vmp. παιράττων; Ἱρώς] Jecon, one of the cities of Naphtali, mentioned with brass as the earliest of known metals (Gen. iv. 22).

The or IR (יִרְוֹן or יִרְבָּן) [healer of Jehovah, Dict.; Jehovah is watcher, First]; ὑψίπατρος [Vmp. παιράττων; Ἱρώς] Jecon, one of the cities of Naphtali, mentioned with brass as the earliest of known metals (Gen. iv. 22).
a strong support; and "breathing instruments of iron" (Am. i. 3); the means of cerebral oppression; the hardness and heaviness (Ecclesi. xiii. 13) of iron are so clearly the prominent ideas, that it may have been used for the instruments in question; such usage is not of necessity indicated.

The "furme of iron" (Deut. iv. 20; 1 K. viii. 51) is a figure which vividly expresses hard bondage, as represented by the severe labor which attended the operation of smelting. Iron was used for chisels (Deut. xxvii. 5), or something of the kind; for axes (Deut. xiv. 22; 2 K. vi. 5, 6); Is. x. 24; Hym. ii. 485); for harness and saws (2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chr. xx. 3); for nails (1 Chr. xxi. 3), and for war-chariots (Josh. xvii. 16, 18; Judg. i. 19, iv. 13, 13). The latter were plated or studded with it. Its usage in defensive armor is implied in 2 Sam. xxii. 7 (cf. Lev. ix. 9), and as a safeguard in peace it appears in letters (Ps. cv. 18), prison-gates (Acts xii. 10), and bars of gates or doors (Is. xvi. 16; Is. xvi. 2), as well as for surgical purposes (1 Tim. iv. 2). Sheet-iron was used for cooking utensils (Ex. iv. 3; cf. Lev. vii. 9), and bars of hammeret iron are mentioned in Job xl. 18, though here the LXX. pervertedly render σιγμιπος χερας, "cast iron." That it was plentiful in the time of David appears from 1 Chr. xxii. 3. It was used by Solomon, according to Josephus, to clamp the large rocks with which he built up the Temple mount (Ant. xv. xi. 3); and by Hezekiah's workmen to boul out the conduits of Gihon (Ecclesi. xviii. 17). Images were fastened in their niches in later times by iron brackets or clamps (Wisd. xiii. 15). Agricultural implements were early made of the same material. In the treaty made by Porsena was inserted a condition like that imposed on the Hebrews by the Philistines, that no iron should be used except for agricultural purposes (Plin. xxxiv. 39).

The market of Tyre was supplied with bright or polished iron by the merchants of Dan and Javan (Ex. xxvii. 19). Some, as the LXX. and Vulgate render this "wrong iron:" so De Wette "geladene Eisen." The Tarqum has "bars of iron," which would correspond with the scripture of Pliny (xxxiv. 41). But Kinkel (Lex. s. v. expounds ἴλαστος, "polished," as "pure and polished." (Cf. Span. aceiter, steel), in which he is supported by R. Sol. Pachon, and by Ben Zeb, who gives "glimnend" as the equivalent (comp. the Homeric ἄλοξ ἀλπος, H. vii. 473). If the Javan alluded to were Greece, and not, as Bochart (Phls. icq. ii. 21) seems to think, some place in Arabia, there might be reference to the iron mines of Mesopotamia, which belonged to the decree of Enamis Panaus (Liv. xiv. 29); but Bochart urges, as a very strong argument in support of his theory, that, at the time of Ezekiel's prophecy, the Tyrians did not depend upon Greece for a supply of cassia and cinnamon, which are associated with iron in the merchandise of Dan and Javan, but that rather the contrary was the case. Pliny (xxxiv. 41) awards the palm to the iron of Serbia, that of Parthia being next in excellence. The Chalybes of the Pontus were celebrat3ed as workers in iron in very ancient times (Ech. Prom. 733). They were identified by Strabo with the Chalchei of his day (xii. 549), and the mines which they worked were in the mountains skirting the sea-coast. The produce of their labor is supposed to be alluded to in Jer. xv. 12, as being of superior quality. Iron mines are still in existence on the same coast, and the ore is found in "small nodular masses in a dark yellow clay which overlies a limestone rock" (Smith's Geog. Dict. art. Chalybes).

It was for a long time supposed that the Egyptians were ignorant of the use of iron, and that the allusions in the Pentateuch were anachronisms, as no traces of it have been found in their monu-

ments; but in the sepulchres at Thebes butchers are represented as sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their aprons, which from its blue color is presumed to be steel. The storied weapons on the tombs of Rameses III. are also painted blue; those of bronze being red (Willkinson, Anc. Enq. ii. 247). One iron mine only has been discovered in Egypt, which was worked by the ancients. It is at Hammam, between the Nile and the Red Sea; the iron found by Mr. Burton was in the form of specular and red ore (Id. iii. 246). That no articles of iron should have been found is easily accounted for by the fact that it is easily destroyed by exposure to the air and moisture. According to Pliny (xxxiv. 43) it was preserved by a coating of white lead, gypsum, and liquid pitch. Bitumen was probably employed for the same purpose (xxxv. 52). The Egyptians obtained their iron almost exclusively from Assyria proper in the form of bricks or pigs (Layard, Nin. ii. 415). Specimens of Assyrian iron-work overlaid with bronze were discovered by Mr. Layard, and are now in the British Museum (Nin. and Rob. p. 291). Iron weapons of various kinds were found at Nimroud, but fell to pieces on exposure to the air. Some portions of shields and arrow-heads (Id. 194, 596) were rescued, and are now in England. A pick of the same metal (Id. 194) was also found, as well as part of a saw (195), and the head of an axe (557), and remains of scale-armour and helmets inlaid with copper (Nin. i. 340). It was used by the Etruscans for offensive weapons, as bronze for defensive armor. The Assyrians had daggers and arrow-heads of copper mingled with iron, and hardened with an alloy of tin (Layard, Nin. ii. 418). So in the days of Homer war-clubs were shod with iron (H. vii. 141); arrows were tipped with it (H. iv. 123); it was used for the axes of chariots (H. v. 723), for litters (Id. i. 294), for axes and bills (H. iv. 485; Od. xxxi. 3, 81). Ardrastus (H. vi. 48) and Ulysses (Od. xxi. 19) reckoned it among their treasures, the iron weapons being kept in a chest in the treasury with the gold and brass (Od. xxxi. 61). In Od. i. 184, Menthe calls Telemaeus that he is travelling from Taphos to Tarsus to procure brass in exchange for iron, which Eustathius says was not obtained from the mines of the island, but was the product of piratical excursions (Millin, Mineral. Hom. p. 115, 2d ed.). Pliny (xxxiv. 4) mentions iron as used symbolically for a statue of Hercules at Thebes (cf. Dan. iii. 24, v. 4), and goleths of iron as among

Tuch, Haverluck, Hiltai, Fürst, Generat. 60 Aufl. See addition at the end of the art. I. H
the offerings in the temple of Mars the Avenger, at Rome. Abhats the Lydian dedicated to the oracle at Delphi a small goblet of iron, the workmanship of Chares of Chios, to whom the discovery of the art of smelting this metal is attributed (Her. i. 25). The goblet is described by Pausanias (x. 16). From the fact that such offerings were made to the temples, and that Achilles gave as a prize of contest a rudely-shaped mass of the same metal (II. xxiii. 825), it has been argued that in early times iron was so little known as to be greatly esteemed for its rarity. That this was not the case, the time of Lycurgus is evident, and Homer attaches to it no epithet which would denote its preciousness (Millin, p. 106). There is reason to suppose that the discovery of brass preceded that of iron (Lecr. v. 122), though little weight can be attached to the line of Hesiod often quoted as decisive on this point (Op. et Dics. 150). The Dactylic label of trete were supposed by the ancients to have the merit of the first to discover the properties of iron (Plin. vii. 57; Diod. Sic. v. 24), but the Cyclops were said to have invented the iron-smith's forge (Plin. vii. 57). According to the Armenian marbles, iron was known b.c. 1370, while Larcher (Chron. d. Herod. p. 570) assigns a still earlier date, b.c. 1557. Enough has been said to prove that the allusions to iron in the Pentateuch and other parts of the O. T. are not anomalous.

There is considerable doubt whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. The rendering given by the LXX. of Joh xi. 18, as quoted above, seems to imply that some method nearly like that of casting was known, and is supported by a passage in Didymus (v. 13). The inhabitants of Anthia traded with pig-iron in masses like large sponges to Diancia and other norths, where it was bought by the smiths and fashioned into various moulded forms (παραβάτη χρωματίων).

In Exeles, xxxviii. 28, we have a picture of the interior of an iron-smith's (ls. xliii. 12) workshop: the smith, perched with the smoke and heat of the furnace, sitting beside his anvil and contemplating the unwrought iron, his ears deafened with the din of the heavy hammer, his eyes fixed on his model, and never sleeping till he has accomplished his task. [Steel.]

W. A. W.

The iron or quality for quality is mentioned worked at the present day near the village of Daimor in Mount Lebanon. It is especially valuable for shoeing bears of burden, and is greatly sought for through Northern Syria. It is probable that the merchants of Dan, who had possessions in the extreme north of Palestine in the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, derived from this source the "bright iron," which is probably to be translated "of the iron" (comp. iv. 13, 29).

This view commends itself the more if we suppose Java to be in Arabia, as the mention of the two places together makes it probable that they had at least a common entrepot for their wares. This would be possible at the junction of the roads of Cilicia-Syria from the north, with those from Gilead on the east in the possessions of Dan, and would explain the circumstance that to Tyre Dan was "laden with supplies of iron from Mount Lebanon, and of cedars and cedars from Arabia."

Still further, the geographical position of this entrepot corresponds with the language of the context. In ver. 18 the prophet speaks of Damascus: a ver. 19, of Dan with its trade with Javan; in ver. 20, of the caravans from Dedan, which would come in toward Tyre to the southward of Iam; finally, ver. 21, of those from Arabia, which would come from a still more southerly direction.

G. E. P.

IRPEEL (יאריפל), [among God heads, or God requires, babbles]: Kadofa: [Lit.] Alex. Ιφέαδη, one of the cities of Benjamin (Jos. viii. 27), occurring in the list between Gelen and Farah. So trace has yet been discovered of its situation. It will be observed that the Ir in this name is radically different from that in the names Ir-mahalath, Ir-shemesh, etc. Taken as a Hebrew name it is Irpeel = "restored by God."

IR-SHEMESH (יאר-שמש) = city of the sun: πόλεις Σαμάνας: Alex. πόλεις Σαμηνός, a city of the Danites (Jos. xix. 41), probably identical with Beth-shemesh, and, if not identical, at least connected with Mount Heeres (Judg. i. 35), the "mount of the sun." Beth-shemesh is probably the later form of the name. In other cases Beth appears to have been substituted for other older terms (see Basalmon, etc.), such as Ir or Ar, which is unquestionably a very ancient word.

G.

IRU (יארו) [watch, First]: Ἰρα, Alex. Ηρα: [Comp. Ιαρός] Ἱρα, the eldest son of the great Philistine Goliath (1 Chr. iv. 15). It is by some supposed that this name must be Ir, the vow at the end being merely the conjunction - and, properly belonging to the following name.

* It is true, 7 more frequently connects the nouns in such an enumeration; but that reason for changing Ir to Ir is not decisive. The copula may also be emitted between them (see 1 Chr. iv. 20, 24, &c.).

ISAAC (יאוסף) or יִשְׂאָל), daughter [mocker, laughter, First]: Izadka: [Izare], the son whom Sarah, in accordance with the Divine promise, bore to Abraham in the thirtieth year of his age, at Gerar. In his infancy he became the object of Ishmael's jealousy; and in his youth (when twenty-five years old, according to Joseph. Ant. l. 13, § 2) the victim, in intention, of Abraham's great sacrificial act of faith. When forty years old he married Rebekah his cousin, by whom, when he was sixty, he had two sons, Esau and Jacob. In his seventy-first year he and his brother Ishmael buried their father Abraham in the cave of Machpelah. From his ashes by the well Lainai-roi, in the South Country — a barren tract, comprising a few pastures and wells, between the hills of Judæa and the Arabian desert, touching at its western end Philistia, and on the north Hebron — Isaac was driven to by God (Gen. xxvi. 24), and there Jehovah appeared to him and bade him dwell there and not go over into Egypt, and renewed to him the promises made to Abraham. Here he subjected himself, like Abraham in the same place and under like circumstances (Gen. xx. 2), to a rebuke from Abimelech the Philistine king for an equivocation. Here he acquired great wealth by his flocks, but was repeatedly harassed by the Philistines of the wells, to which he sank at convenient stations. At Beersheba Jehovah appeared to him by night and blessed him, and he built an altar there: there, too, like Abraham, he received a visit from the Philistine king Abimelech, with whom he made a covenant of peace. After the death of which Jacob
 ascended his father's blessing, Isaac sent his son to seek a wife in Padanaram; and all that we know of him during the last forty-three years of his life is that he saw that son, with a large and prosperous family, return to him at Hebron (xxxv. 27) before he died there at the age of 189 years. He was buried by his two sons in the cave of Machpelah.

In the N. T. reference is made to the offering of Isaac (Heb. xi. 17; and James ii. 21) and to his blessing his sons (Heb. xi. 29). As the child of the promise, and as the progenitor of the children of God, he is contrasted with the seed of Ishmael (Gen. xvi. 7, 10; Gal. iv. 28; Heb. xi. 18). In our Lord's remarkable argument with the Sadducees, his history is carried beyond the point at which it is left in the O. T., into and beyond the grave. Isaac, of whom it was said (Gen. xxxv. 20) that he was gathered to his people, is represented as still living to God (Luke xx. 38. d. c.); and by the same Divine authority he is proclaimed as an acknowledged heir of future glory (Matt. viii. 11, d. c.).

II. Such are the facts which the Bible supplies of the last-lived of the Patriarchs, the last migratory, the last prolific, and the last favored with extraordinary divine revelations. A few events in this quiet life have occasioned discussion.

(1.) The signification of Isaac's name is thrice alluded to (Gen. xvii. 17, xviii. 12, xxi. 3). Josephus (Ant. i. 12, § 2) refers to the second of those passages for the origin of the name: Jerome (Quast. Heb. in Gen.) vehemently confounds it to the first; Ewald (gr. i. 429), without assigning reasons, gives it as his opinion that all three passages have been added by different writers to the original record.

(6.) It has been asked what are the persecutions sustained by Isaac from Ishmael to which St. Paul refers (Gal. iv. 29)? If, as generally supposed, he refers to Gen. xxi. 9, then the word πανοράμα, πανοράμασα, may be translated mollis, as in the A. V.; or, insinuating, as in xxi. 14, and in that case the trial of Isaac was by means of "cruel mockings" (ἰσταμένων), in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 3). Or the word may include a different signification from mocking; as in Ex. xxxii. 6, or fighting, as in 2 Sam. ii. 14. These three significations are given by Jeremi, who relates a Jewish tradition (quoted more briefly by Wetstein on Gal. iv. 2) of Isaac suffering personal violence from Ishmael, a tradition which, as Mr. Elliott thinks, was adopted by St. Paul. [Hagar, Amer. ed.] The English reader who is content with our own version, or the scholar who may prefer either of the other renderings of Jeremi, will be at no loss to connect Gal. iv. 2 with Gen. xxi. 9. But Origen (in Gen. Hom. vii. § 3), and Augustine (Sermon iii.), and apparently Professor Jowett (on Gal. ii. 29), do not observe that the gloss of the LXX. and the Latin versions "playing with his son Isaac" forms no part of the simple statement in Genesis, and that the words γεγυνότα, πανοράμασα are not to be confined to the meaning "playing, seem to doubt (as Mr. Elliott does on other grounds), whether the passage in Genesis bears the construction apparently put upon it by St. Paul. On the other hand, Rosenmüller (Schol. in Gen. xxi. 9) even goes so far as to characterize Isaac — "persecuted" — as a very excellent interpretation of γεγυνότα. (See Drusius on Gen. xxi. 9 in Crit. Sac., and Estius on Gal. iv. 29.)

(c.) The offering up of Isaac by Abraham has been viewed in various lights. It is the subject of five dissertations by Frischenh in the Theol. Thesi. Philol. p. 197 (attached to Crit. Sacri). By Bishop Warburton (Disc. Leg. b. vi. § 5) the whole transaction was regarded as "merely an information by action" (compare Jer. xxvi. 7; xxvii. 21). He interprets it instead of words, of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ's day." This view is adopted by Dean Graves (On the Pentateuch, pt. iii. § 4), and has become unpopular. But it is pronounced to be unsatisfactory by Parvison (Praehist. Sacrificii, pt. iv. § 2), who, pleading for the progressive communication of the knowledge of the Christian sacrament, protests against the assumption of a contemporary disclosure of the import of the sacrifice to Abraham, and points out that no expiation or atonement was joined with this emblematic oblation, which consequently symbolized only the act, not the power or virtue of the Christian sacrifice. Mr. Maurice (Patriarcha et Longivere, iv.) draws attention to words of St. Jerome, and quotes similar passages from the Romanized Jews, and others in his Life as slips of the pen of a Jewish transcriber. Even the merit of novelty cannot be claimed for such views, which appear to have been in some measure forestalled in the time of Augustine (Sermon ii. de Tentatione Abraham). They are, of course, irreconcilable with the declaration of St. James, that it was a work by which Abraham was justified. Eusebius (Prop. Evang. iv. 10, and i. 10) has preserved a singular and remarkable version of the offering of Isaac in an extract from the ancient Phcenian historian Sanchothoni; but it is absurd to suppose that the widely-spread (see Ewald, Afterhauener, p. 79, and Thomson's Babylon Lectures, 1853, p. 38) heathen practice of sacrificing human beings received any encouragement from a sacrifice which Abraham was forbidden to accomplish (see Waterland, Works, iv. 203). Some writers have found for this transaction a kind of parallel — it amounts to no more — in the classical legends of Iphigenia and Phrixus. The story of Iphigenia, which inspired the devout Athenian dramatist with sublime notions of the import of suffering and suffering (Esch. Agam. 147 ff.), supplied the Roman husband only with a keen taunt against religion (Lucert. i. 102); just as the great trial which perfected the faith of the offering of Isaac and made the character of Isaac, drawn from the Romanized Jew of the first century a rhetorical exhibition of his own uneasiness in the meaning of sacrifice (see Joseph. Ant. i. 13, § 3).

(2d) No passage of his life has produced more reproach to Isaac's character than that which is recorded in Gen. xxvi. 9-11. Abraham's conduct while in Egypt (xli.) and in Canaan (xxvi. 2-9) shows that he concealed the close connection between himself and his wife, which was implied by Isaac in Gerar. On the
ISAAC

one hand, this has been regarded by avowed adversaries of Christianity as involving the guilt of "lying and endeavoring to betray the wife's chastity," and even by Christians, undoubtedly zealous for truth and right, as the conduct of "a very poor putty earthenworm, displaying cowardice, selfishness, readiness to put his wife in a terrible hazard for his own sake." But, on the other hand, with more reverence, more-kindness, and quite as much probability, Waterland, who is no indiscernible apologist for the errors of good men, after a minute examination of the circumstances, concludes that the patriarch did riots erect the difficulty so low as that it could be fully excused, and to await and see whether Divine Providence might not, some way or other, interpose before the last extremity. The event answered. God did interpose." (Scripture Vindicated, in Works, iv. 188, 190.)

(v.) Isaac's tact acquiescence in the conduct of his sons has been brought into discussion. Perhaps Fairbairn (Topology, i. 334) sees scarcely justified by facts in his conclusion that the later days of Isaac did not fulfill the promise of his earlier; that, instead of reaching to high attainments in faith, he fell into general feebleness and decay, moral and bodily, and made account only of the natural element in judging of his sons. The inept transla-
tion (to modern ears) of "\textit{yea} prout taken in hunting, by a vision" (Gen. xxv. 28), may have contributed to form, in the minds of English readers, a low opinion of Isaac. Nor can that opinion be supported by a reference to xxvii. 4; for Isaac's desire at such a time for savory meat may have sprung either from a dangerous sickness under which he was laboring (Blunt, \textit{Olden Times}, p. i. ch. vi.), or from the same kind of impulse preceding inspiration as prompted Elisha (2 K. iii. 14) to demand the soothing influence of music before he spoke the word of the Lord. For sadness and grief are enumerated in the Genarr among the impediments to the exercise of the gift of prophecy (Smith's \textit{Select Discourses}, vi. 215). The reader who bears in mind the peculiarities of Isaac's character, will scarcely infer from those passages any fresh accession of mental or moral force to his case.

III. Isaac, the gentle and dutiful son, the faithful and constant husband, became the father of a house in which order did not reign. If there were any very prominent points in his character they were not brought out by the circumstances in which he was placed. He appears less as a man of action than as a man of suffering, from which he is generally delivered without any direct effect of his own. Thus he suffers as the object of Edom's mockery, of the intended sacrifice on Meriah, of the rapidity of the Philistines, and of Jacob's snatching. But the thought of his sufferings is effaced by the ever-present tokens of God's favor; and he suffers with the calmness and dignity of a conscious heir of heavenly promises, without uttering any complaint, and generally without committing any action by which he would forfeit respect. Free from violent passions, he was a man of constant, deep, and tender affections. Thus he mourned for his mother till her place was filled by his wife. His sons were nurtured at home till a late period of their lives; and neither his grief for Isaac's marriage, nor the cares in which he was involved in consequence of Jacob's deceit, estranged either of them from his affectionate care. His life of solitary blandness must have been sustained by strong habitual piety such as showed itself at the time of Rebekah's barrenness (xxv. 21), in his special intercourse with God at Gerar and Beer-sheba (xxvi. 2, 20), in the solemn burnt-offering he offered after his escape from his brother.

But it was sufficiently marked and consistent to win respect and envy from his contemporaries. By his posternity his name is always joined in equal honor with those of Abraham and Jacob, and so it was even used as part of the formula which Egyptian magicians in the time of Origen (\textit{Contra Celsud, i. 22}) employed as efficacies to blind the demons whom they adjured (comp. Gen. xxxi. 45, 53).

If Abraham's enterprising, unsettled life fore-
shadowed the early history of his descendants; if Jacob was a type of the careful, commercial, un-
warlike character of their later days, Isaac may represent the middle period, in which they lived apart from nations, and enjoyed possession of the fertile kind of promise.

IV. The typical view of Isaac is barely referred to in the N.T., but it is drawn out with minute particularity by Philo and those interpreters of Scripture who were influenced by Alexandrian philosophy. Thus in Philo, Isaac = laughter = the most exquisite enjoyment = the Soother and cheerer of peace-loving souls, is fore-shadowed in the facts that his father had attained 100 years (the perfect number) when he was born, and that he is specially designated as given to his parents by God. His birth from the mistress of Abraham's household symbolizes happiness proceeding from pre-dominant wisdom. His attachment to one wife (Rebekah = perseverance) is contrasted with Abra-
ham's multiplied connections and with Jacob's toil-
Bom wives, as showing the superiority of Isaac's heaven-born, self-sufficing, wisdom, to the accumu-
lated knowledge of Abraham and the painful expe-
riences in which he intended to have been raised. Philo sees only a sign that laughter = rejoicing = is the prerogative of God, and is a fit offering to Him, and that He gives back to obedient man as much happiness as is good for him. Clement of Rome (ch. 31), with characteristic solicitude, merely refers to Isaac as an example of faith in God. In Tertullian he is a pattern of meekness and a type of Christ bearing the cross. But Clement of Alex-
andria finds an allegorical meaning in the incidents which connect Abimelech with Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. xxxii. 8) as well as in the offering of Isaac. In this latter view he is followed by Origen, and by Augustine, and by Christian expositors generally.

The most minute particulars of that tran-
saction are invested with a spiritual meaning by such writers as Gregorius Nazianzen, \textit{in Gen.} iii. 3. Abraham is made a type of the first Person in the blessed Trinity, Isaac of the Second; the two serv-
ants dismissed are the Jewish sects who did not attain to a perception of Christ in his humiliation; the ass bearing the wood is the Jewish nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God which they failed to understand; the three days are the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations; the ram is Christ on the cross, the thicket they
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who placed him there. Modern English writers hold firmly the typical significance of the transaction, without extending it into this detail (see Pearson on the Creed, i. 243, 251, ed. 1843; Fairbairn's Typology, i. 332). A recent writer (A. Jukes, Types of Genesis), who has shown much ingenuity in attaching a spiritual meaning to the characters and incidents in the book of Genesis, regards Isaac as representing the spirit of submision, in a series in which Adam represents human nature, Cain the carnal mind, Abel the spiritual, Noah regeneration, Abraham the spirit of faith, Jacob the spirit of service, Joseph suffering or glory. With this series may be compared the view of Ewald (Gesch. i. 387–400), in which the whole patriarchal family is a prefigurative group, comprising twelve members with seven distinct modes of relation: (1.) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, respectively personifying active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles, distinguished from the rest as Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses among the heroes of the Iliad, or as the Trojan Anchises, Aeneas, and Ascanius, and mutually related as Romulus, Rемus, and Numa; (2.) Sarah, with Isaac as mother and mistress of the household; (3.) Isaac as child; (4.) Isaac withachel as nurse and protector (comp. Abr. 19, xxviii. 2; Gen. xlviii. 23); (5.) Leah and Rachel the plurality of coeval wives; (6.) Deborah as nurse (compare Ann. and Caees., Ets. iv. 634, and vii. 1); (7.) Eliezer as steward, whose office is compared to that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

V. Jewish legends represent Isaac as an angel made before the world, and descending to earth in human form (Origins, in Journ. ii. § 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eissenmenger, Ent. Jud. i. 343, 864). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Shem (Jarchi, on Gen. xxv.). The ordinance of evening prayer is ascribed to him (Gen. xxiv. 63), as that of morning prayer to Abraham (xix. 27), and night prayer to Jacob (xxxi. 11) (Eissenmenger, Ent. Jud. i. 433).

The Arabian traditions included in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, a righteous person inspired with grace to do good works, observe prayer, and give alms (ch. 21), endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, children, and wealth (ch. 19). The promise of Isaac and the offering of Isaac are also mentioned (ch. 11, 58). Faith in a future resurrection is ascribed to Abraham; but it is connected, not as in Heb. xi. 19 with the offering of Isaac, but with a fictitious miracle (ch. 2).

W. T. B.

* A few additional words should be said on some of the points introduced or suggested in the foregoing article.

It is well to notice in regard to the origin of Isaac's name, that while it was given by divine command (Gen. xvii. 19), the reason for giving it is not explicitly stated. The historian employs the word on which the name is founded just before (ver. 17), in speaking of Abraham's joy on being assured that the child of promise was about to be born after so long a delay: and again, shortly after that (xviii. 12), in speaking of Sarah's incredulity as to the possibility of her becoming a mother at an advanced age. We may infer, therefore, that the name was designed to embody and conmemorate these incidents in the family-history. It

represents, indeed, very different states of mind but no violence is done thereby to the Hebrew word, which readily admits of the twofold combination. No doubt Sarah refers once more to the signification of the name, on the occasion of formally giving it to the child at the time of circumcision (Gen. xxi. 3 f.); but in that instance her object was simply to recognize in the better sense of the name a symbol and pledge of joy both to herself and to the multitude of others who should be blessed in the promised seed. Such reasons for the name are certainly not inconsistent with each other, and, still less, are they so inconsistent as to discredit the narrative as one made up from contradictory sources. For some good remarks on the significance of 'birth-names,' the reader may consult Wilkinson's Person and Name of the Bible, pp. 290–312 (Loud. 1885).

It will be noticed above that some of the opinions respecting the typical character of Abraham's offering up of Isaac extend the analogy to numerous and very minute correspondences. It is of some importance here to distinguish between such opinions of interpreters and the explicit teaching of Scripture on this subject: so as not to make the sacred writers answerable for views or principles of human imagination. Every effort has been made to follow the various lines of investigation in order to trace the facts by which in the hands of some expositors have led to very fanciful conclusions. It seems unreasonable to deny altogether a symbolic significance to this sacrificial act and its concomitants, both on account of its suitableness in itself considered to shadow forth Christian ideas and relations, and also on account of some hints given by Paul which point in that direction. The most extended reference to Isaac in the N. T. is that in Col. iv. 21–31. Yet the intimations there in regard to his typical character, leave it questionable whether the Apostle meant to recognize the general facts of his history as in a strict sense prophetic of the N. T. dispensation, or simply to use the facts for the purpose of illustration. The points of comparison which the Apostle draws out in that passage are the following: As Ishmael was born in accordance with the law of nature, so the Jews are a natural seed; but Christians who obtain justification in conformity with the promise made to Abraham, are the true promised seed, even as Isaac was. Further, as in the history of Abraham's family, Ishmael persecuted Isaac, the child of promise, so it should not be accounted strange that under the Gospel, the natural seed, that is, the Jews, should persecute the spiritual seed, that is, Christians. And finally, as Isaac was acknowledged as the true heir, but Ishmael was set aside, so must it be as to the difference which exists between Jews and believers. The former, or, in other words, those who depend on their own merit for obtaining the favor of God, will be rejected, while those who seek it by faith shall obtain the heavenly inheritance. It may be remarked that this parallelism (whether illustrative only or typical) enables the Apostle skillfully to recapitulate the prominent doctrines of the whole epistle, and thus to leave them so associated in the minds of the Galatians with a familiar and striking portion of sacred history, that the teachings of the epistle could never be easily forgotten.

No mention is made in Genesis of Ishmael's persecuting Isaac; but Ishmael's mocking at the feast of weaning (Gen. xxii. 8, 9) reveals the spirit out of which an active hostility would be expected to
grow in due time. In all probability Paul refers to such effects of that spirit, well known to the Jews of his time, from traditioinal sources. For other examples of traditions thus recognized as true, see under Abraham (Amer. ed.). Peab (Leben Abraham's, pp. 49, 170) shows that the Jews found in Isaiah's "mocking" a significant indication of the alienation and strife which marked the subsequent relations of the two brothers to each other.

Of the precise age of Isaac at the time of the great trial of Abraham's faith, we obtain no knowledge. That he was not tender a child, but was at least approaching his manhood, is evident from the fact that the wood was laid on him, as the father and the son went up the mountain. He is called at that time a lad in the A. V. (Gen. xxvii. 5), but the same Hebrew term (�א) is applied also to the servants who accompanied Abraham on this journey. When Josephus speaks of him as twenty-five years old (Ant. i. 13, § 2), it is a conjecture only, without any proof from Scripture or elsewhere to warrant so precise a statement. The full consent of Isaac to the wishes and design of Abraham must be taken for granted, as otherwise it could have been made by the stronger to the weaker, rendering it difficult to bind the victim to the altar. It is evident from Heb. xi. 19, that the pious Hebrews regarded this trial of Abraham's character as illustrating not so much a blind submission to the will of God, whatever this might seem to require, as an unwavering faith in the power and willingness of God to bring back the son to life if the father's hand must stay him. The question of the place of sacrifice is discussed under Mount (Amer. ed.). The view maintained there, that it was some mount near Jerusalem, in all probability the temple-mount itself (2 Chron. iii. 1), is also that of Baumgarten (Pentateuch, i. 227); Knobel (Die Genesis erklart, p. 174); Fuch (Gesch. i. 476, comp. iii. 313 f., 3d Ed.); Hengstenberg (Atheologie des Pent. ii. 295 f.); Winzer (Reeder, ii. 198); Delitzsch (Genesis, p. 467 f.); and Edlins transl. in: Kurz (Geschichte der A. V. und der A. B., i. 213 f.), and others.

It has been made an objection to the accuracy of the Biblical history of the patriarchs that so many similar events and so many identical names of persons and places occur in the account of the different men. But it is not to be forgotten that the dissimilarity in what is related of them is incomparably greater than the agreement. Their personal characteristics are unlike, bearing unmistakable marks of originality and individuality. Isaac never goes beyond the boundary of Palestine, though Abraham and Jacob ranged from one extreme part of the East to another. The domestic events also of their respective families were as diverse as the vicissitudes of human condition could well permit. Abraham's lack of seizure of the wives of the two strangers (Gen. xx. 2 f., and xxxi. 6 ff.) proves only that the same passions became stronger with successive generations, and prompt to the same acts in the presence of the same temptations. That, leading as they all did a nomadic life, they should occasionally visit the same places, was natural and inevitable. Abraham and Isaac appear at different times at Gedor and Beer-sheba, but the fertility of those places, or the opportunity in obtaining water, accounts for that coincidence, the recurrence of the same personal names, e.g.,

Abimelech and Phichol, in the intercourse of Abra-
ham and Isaac with the Philistines, has its perfect
analog in the present customs of the East. It is
generally allowed that Abraham, like Pharaoh in Egypt, and Caesar among the Ro-
mans, was a royal title, and not the name of a
single individual. But Phichol also, says Thom-
son (Land and Book, ii. 352, "may have been
a name of office, as vakkir or wukir now in this
country. If one of these officers is spoken of, his
name is rarely mentioned."

For an outline of the events in Isaac's life, and a discussion of some of the historical and exegetical questions which the narrative presents, the reader may see Kurtz's Geschichte des A. Landes, i. 218-229. This writer regards the ground-type of Isaac's character as a certain elasticity of endurance which does not resist evil, does not contend against it, but overcomes it by patience and consecration (see Gen. xxvi. 17-22); and, in this respect, Isaac is truly great and worthy of admiration. That this greatness of men is usually unrecognized and abused, detracts nothing from its worth. And in Isaac also it was mocked and marred by a degree of weakness and want of self command" shows that human virtue has its unavoidable limitations. Heng has sketched the patriarch's life with mingled praise and censure in his Geschichte der Patriarchen, ii. 3-64. Vahlen has a brief article on Isaac in Herzog's Real-Enzy.
cycl. vili. 81-83; and also Wunderlich, in Zeller's Bild. Wörterb. i. 738 ff. The perimetry of Isaac's life, as this latter writer remarks, does not indeed impress us as that of an extraordinary personality; but, on the other hand, we are to remember that the design of Scripture here is, not to present men to us, even the elect ones, as they should be, but as they are. A spirit of humility and honesty must stamp itself on biography so written. It is not to be forgotten that what we know of the faults of Isaac can be harmonized with the great reprof-

* ISAAC, twice used (Am. viii. 9, 16, where the form is וים, as a poetic synonym for Israel, I. f. the ten tribes. Hence "the high-places
The verses in the book of Isaiah are profound and complex, discussing topics such as the judgments of God, the intercession of the prophet, the adherence of the people, and the judgment of the nations. For instance, the verse "For indeed—3. Isaiah must have been an old man at the close of Hezekiah's reign. The ordinary chronology gives 758 B.C. for the date of Jotham's accession, and 688 for that of Hezekiah's death. This gives us a period of 69 years. And since his ministry commenced before Uzziah's death (how long we know not), supposing him to have been more than 24 years old when he began to prophesy, he would have been 83 or 99 at Manasseh's accession.

The circle of hearsers upon whom his ministry was immediately designed to operate is determined to be "Judah and Jerusalem." True, we have in the book prophecies relating to the kingdom of Israel— as also to Moab, Bab-lon, and other heathen states; but neither in the one case nor in the other was the prophecying designed for the benefit of these foreign states, or meant to be communicated to them, but only for Judah, now becoming the sole home of Hebrew blessings and hopes Every other interest in the prophet's inspired view moves round Judah, and is connected with her.

5. It is the most natural and obvious supposition that the "visions" are in the main placed in the correct chronological order; and this supposition it would be arbitrary to set aside without more solid reasons than the mere impulses of subjective fancy. We grant that this presumption might be overruled, if good cause were shown; but till it is shown, we have no warrant for rejecting the principle that the present arrangement is in the main founded upon chronological propriety, only departed from in cases where similarity of character occasioned the grouping together of visions which were not uttered at the same time.

6. If then we compare the contents of the book with the description here given of it, we recognize prophecies which are certainly to be assigned to the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah; but we cannot so certainly fix any belonging to the reign of Manasseh. The form of the expression in vi. 1, "the year that King Uzziah died," fixes the time of that vision to the close of Uzziah's reign, and not to the commencement of Jotham's. What precedes ch. vi. may be referred to some preceding part of Uzziah's reign; except perhaps the first chapter; this may be regarded as a general summary of advice founded upon the whole of what follows,— a kind of general preface; corresponding at the commencement of the book to the parenthesis of the nine chapters at its close. Ch. vii. brings us at once from "the year that King Uzziah died" to "the days of Ahaz." We have then nothing left for Jotham's reign, unless we suppose that some of the group of "burdens" in xiii.—xxiii. belong to it, or some of the perhaps miscellaneous utterances in xxiv.—xxv. It may be that prophecies then spoken were not recorded, because applying to a state of things similar to what obtained in the latter part of Uzziah, they were themselves of a similar strain with chs. ii.—v.

7. We naturally ask, Who was the compiler of the book? The obvious answer is, that it was Isaiah himself aided by a scribal; comp. the very interesting glimpse afforded us by Jer. xxxvi. 1—5, of the relation between the utterance of prophecies and their writing. Isaiah we know was otherwise

Slocum on the slopes of Ophel, below the S. K. wall of Jerusalem.
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no author; for in 2 Chr. xxvi. 22 we read: "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah first and last did Isaiah the son of Amoz the prophet write:" and though that historical work has perished, the fact remains to show that Isaiah's mind was not alien from the cares of written composition (comp. also 2 Chr. xxxiii. 32; and observe the first person used in viii. 1-5). The organic structure of the whole book also, which we hope to make apparent, favors the same belief. On the whole, that Isaiah was himself the compiler, claims to be accepted as the true view. The principal objection deserving of notice is founded upon xxvi. 8. It has been alleged (Höber to loc. cit.) that Semachoth's murder took place B.C. 696, two years after Manasseh's accession; others, however, question this (comp. Havernick's Einleitung): at all events the passage is quite reconcilable with the belief of Isaiah's being the compiler, if we suppose him to have lived two or three years after Manasseh's accession, even without having recourse to the expedient of attributing the verse in question and the one before it to a later hand. The same case occurs in xxvi. 11, 13, to the Hebrew spoken in Jerusalem, "the Jew's language," מֵאֲמֹר. There is no evidence of a later age; it is perfectly conceivable that while the written language remained the same in both kingdoms, as is evidenced by the prophetical and spoken dialect (comp. Judg. xii. 6) of the kingdom of Judah may have diverged so far from that of the (now perished) kingdom of Israel as to have received a distinct designation; and its name would naturally, like that of the kingdom itself, be drawn from the tribe which formed the chief constituent of the population. As we are seeking for objective evidence, we may neglect those wild hypotheses which some have indulged in, respecting an original work and its subsequent modifications; for since they originate in the denial of divine inspiration, conjoined with reliance on a merely subjective appreciation of the several writings, such hypotheses must be assigned to the region of fancy rather than of historic investigation.

8. In this introductory verse we have yet to notice the description which it gives of Isaiah's prophecies: they are "the vision which he saw." When we speak of visions we are apt to think of a mental condition in which the mind is drawn altogether from the perception of objects actually present, and contemplates, instead of these, another set of objects which appear at the moment sensibly present—a sort of dream without sleep. Such a vision was that of St. Peter at Joppa. Such again we recognize in Is. vi.—the only instance of this kind of pure vision in the book: in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, they abound. But Isaiah's mental condition was quite different. His visions are not visionary of the mind. He saw things which to have been different from this. Outward objects really present were not withdrawn from his perception, but appear to have blended to his view, at times, with the spiritual which was really present, though not recognizable except to the eye of faith (e. g., the presence of Jehovah); at times, with the future, whether sensible or spiritual, which seemed to the prophet as if actually present. In this view his prophecies are not to be regarded as utterances, in the delivery of which the Holy Ghost employed the intellectual and physical organs of the prophet as mere instruments wielded by itself, but as vision, i. e., the description by the prophet himself under divine direction (2 Tim. iii. 16): of the which at the time he seemed to himself to see. If this view be just, it follows that in the description of the prophet the gift of which appeared to be before him, we cannot be at once sure, whether he is describing what was actually objectively present, or whether the objects delineated as present belonged to the future. For example: at first sight the description given of the condition of Judah in i. 5-9, portraying an invasion, might be understood of what was actually present, and so might lead us either to supplement the history of 2 K. with a hypothetical invasion, or put forward the time of the prophecying to Ahaz or Hezekiah. But recollect that it is the mind which it may be taken as simply predictive and threatening, and therefore as still spoken in Uzziah's reign. Similarly iii. 8, v. 13, xx. 28-32, are all predictive. So in the second part is xiv. 11. Further, it would be only in accordance with this method of predictive sight if we found the prophet describing some future time as if present, and from that standing-point announcing some more distant future, sometimes as future, and sometimes as present. And in fact it is thus that Isaiah represents the coming fortunes of God's people in the second part of his prophecy. Comp. xiii. 13-17, xlv. 18, xlvi. 1-4, iii. 3-10, 11, 12, xlii. 1-6, as illustrations of the manner in which the relations of the present, past, and future time are in vision blended together.

It has been remarked above as characteristic of Isaiah's ordinary prophetic vision, that the actually present is not lost to view. In fact this was essential to his proper function. His first and immediate concern was with his contemporaries, as the recoverer of sin, and to build up the piety of believers. Even when his vision the most contemplates the future, he yet does not lose his reference to the present, but (as we shall see even in the second part) he makes his prophecies tell by exhortation and reproach upon the state of things actually around him. From all this it results, that we often find it difficult to discriminate his predictions from his rebukes of present disorders. His contemporaries, however, would be under no such difficulty. The idolatrous and uncovetous Hebrew would promptly recognize his own description; the pious would be confirmed and cheered.

II. In order to realize the relation of Isaiah's prophecies not only to his own contemporaries, we need to take account both of the foreign relations of Judah at the time, and internally of its social and religious aspects. Our materials are scanty, and are to be collected partly out of 2 K. and 2 Chr., and partly out of the remaining writings of contemporary prophets, Joel (probably), Obadiah, and Micah, in Judah; and Hosea, Amos, and Jonah, in Israel. Of these the most assistance is obtained from Micah.

1. Under Uzziah the political position of Judah had greatly recovered from the blows suffered under Amaziah; the fortifications of Jerusalem itself were restored; castles were built in the country; new arrangements in the army and equipment of defensive artillery were established; and considerable successes in war gained against the Philistines and the Edomites. [UZZIAH.] This prosperity continued during the reign of Jothan, except that, towards the close of this latter reign, troubles threatened from the alliance of Israel and Syria. [JOTHAN.] The consequence of this prosperity was an influx of wealth, and this with the increased means of military strength withdrew men:
here, we are met by the fact that this same vision is found in very nearly the same words in Micah iv. 1-3. the two prophets were contemporaries, and one may very well have heard the other, and adopted his words. Compare a nearly similar phenomenon in 1 pet. v. 5-9, compared with 1 peter iv. 13. their Peter and paul in their public reforms as well as to fulfill the work which belongs to religious teachers in edifying God's true servants and calling the irreligious to repentance. Accordingly our prophet steps forward into public view with the divine message, dressed after the manner of prophets in general — girded in coarse and black, or at least dark colored, hair-cloth (comp. is. xx. 2. 1. 3; 2 k. i. 8; zech. xiii. 4) — emblematically indicating by this attire of mourning that Jehovah spoke to his people in grief and resentment. [sackcloth] from his house, which appears to have been in jerusalem (comp. vi. 3, xxvii. 5), he goes forth to places of general concourse, chiefly no doubt, as christ and his apostles afterwards did, to the colonnades and courts of the temple, and proclaims in the audience of the people "the word of Jehovah." what is this? what is the tenor of his message in the time of uzziah and jotham? this we read in chs. i.-v. chap. i. is very general in its contents. in perusing it we may fancy that we hear the very voice of the seer as he stands (perhaps) in the court of the israelites denouncing to nobles and people, then assembling for divine worship, the whole estimate of their character formed by Jehovah, and his approaching chastisements. "they are a sinful nation; they have provoked the holy one of israel to anger. flourishing as their worldly condition now appears, the man whose eyes are opened sees another scene before him (1-9) — the land laid waste, and zion left as a cottage in a vineyard — a picture realized in the syro-ephraimitish war, and more especially in the Assyrian invasion — the great event round which the whole of the first part of the book revolves. men of solon and comorrah that they are, let them hearken: they may go on if they will with their ritual worship, 'trampling' Jehovah's courts; nevertheless, he loathes them: the stain of innocent blood is on their hands; the weak are oppressed; there is bribery and corruption in the administration of justice. Let them reform; if they will not, Jehovah will burn out their sins in the smelting fire of his judgment. zion shall be purified, and thus saved, whilst the sinners and reprobates from Jehovah in her shall perish in their much-loved loditudes." this discourse suitably heads the book; it sounds the key-note of the whole; fires of judgment destroying, but purifying a remnant — such was the burden all along of Isaiah's prophecies.

of the other public utterances belonging to this period, chs. ii.-iv. are by almost all critics considered to be one prophesying — the leading thought of which is that the present prosperity of Judah should be destroyed for her sins, to make room for the real glory of piety and virtue; while ch. v. forms a distinct discourse, whose main purport is that Israel, God's vineyard, shall be brought to desolation. the idolatry denounced in these chapters is to be taken as that of private individuals, for both uzziah and jotham served Jehovah. they are prefixed by the vision of the exaltation of the man of the rock, which in the world view above all other views, to become the source of light and moral transformation to all mankind (li. 2-4).
God's works of judgment, with which the prophets threatened them (comp. the similar association of revelling with hardened unbelief in Israel, Am. v. 28, vi. 3-4); against those who confessed moral distinctions; against self-connected skeptics; and against profligate perverters of judicial justice. In fury of wrath Jehovah stretches forth his hand. For here is an awful vagueness in the image of terror which the prophet accompanies, till at length out of the cloud and mist of wrath he hears Jehovah his for the stern and irresistible warriors (the Assyrians), who from the end of the earth should crowd forward to spoil,—after which all distinctness of description again fades away in vague images of sorrow and despair.

What effect (we may ask) would such denunciations produce upon the mass of Hebrew hearers? It was not from Isaiah only that the same persons heard them. Oppression, denounced by him (iii. 14, 15, v. 7-10), was denounced also by Micah (ii. 1, 2); maladministration of justice (Is. i. 23, v. 13) is noted also by Micah (iii. 1-3, 9-11, vii. 3); the combination of idolatry, diviners, and horses found in Is. ii. 6-8, 13, is paralleled in Mic. v. 10-13.

This concurrence of prophetic testimony would not be without weight with those who had still some faith in Jehovah. But the worldly-minded, however silent when flagrant immorality was censured, might find what they would count plausible ground for demurring, when the prophet put the multiplication of gold, silver, horses, and chariots, in the same category with idols, or when with unsparing satire he particularized articles of female adornment as objects of Jehovah's wrath. But God's enemies through these woes had given similar injunctions (Dent. xv. 16, 17); and what in general there is not a single page of the prophetic books in which the Pentateuch is not again and again referred to. The Hebrew commonwealth was not designed to be a commercial state, but a system of small hereditary land-owners under a theocracy. Material progress and ever heightening embitter- ment, whether in the court or in society in general, with the men or with the women, removed it further and further from its original condition, and from Jehovah its God. Something resembling Spartan plainness belonged essentially to the idea of the Hebrew state.

3. In the year of Uzziah's death an ecstatic vision fell upon Isaiah, which, in compiling his prophecies long after, he was careful to record, both for other reasons, and also because he had then become aware of the failure of his ministry in reference to the bulk of his contemporaries, and of the desolation, yet not without hope, which awaited his people. We see in the case of St. Peter at Joppa (Acts v. 9-19) that such a state of certesla, though unquestionably of divine origin, yet in its form adapts itself to the previous condition, whether corporal or psychological, of the patient. Isaiah at this period (as we must infer from the placing of the prophecy) had been already for some time engaged in his ministry; and we may venture to surmise he hankered his little success. Seeing what he saw around him, and foreseeing what he foresaw, could he do otherwise than feel deeply how little he was able to effect for the welfare of his beloved country? In this vision he saw Jehovah, in the Second Person of the Godhead (John xii. 41; comp. Mal. iii. 1), enthroned aloft in his own earthly abode, attended by seraphim, whose praise filled the sanctuary as it were with the smoke of incense.

As John at Patmos, so Isaiah was overwhelmed with awe; he felt his own sinfulness and that of all with whom he was connected, and cried "woe" upon himself as if brought before Jehovah to receive the reward of his deeds. But, as at Patmos, the Man of Sin, hist hand upon John saying, "Fear not," so, in obedience evidently to the will of Jehovah, a seraph with a hot stone taken from the altar touched his lips, the principal organ of good and evil in man, and thereby removing his sinfulness, qualified him to join the seraphim in whatsoever service he might be called to. And now the condescending invitation of the Great King is heard: "Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?" "Here am I! send me." Had he not foreseen Jehovah's commission before? No doubt he had; yet now, with the intense sense of the reality of divine things which that hour brought him, he felt as if he had not. What heaven-taught minister does not understand this? And what was to be the nature of his work? "Make the understanding of this people (not "my people") topid; dull their ears; close up their eyes; the more they hear thy word, the more hardened they shall become: they must not, they shall not, receive the message so as to repent." A heart-crushing commission for the life of the prophet.

This, the prophet, though humble in spirit, did not think, for the moment, of grief at length finds utterance: "Lord, how long?" "Till the land be desolate—saving a small remnant, utterly desolate—a remnant of a holy seed, which will be a stock to sprout forth, but again and again to be cut back and burnt, and yet still to survive."

This vision, in the main, was another mode of representing what, both in previous and in subsequent prophecies, is so continually denounced—the almost utter destruction of the Hebrew people, with yet a purified remnant. But while this prediction was its principal purport, we are sure that the inspired editor of his prophecies so many years after, beheld in it also the sketch of the fruits of his ministry, which at the time when the revelation was made to him must have had no small effect upon his own private feelings. He goes at last almost speechless, despairing of the present, yet with seraph-like zeal, ardent and heaven-purged, and not without hope too, for the time to come. The "holy seed" was to be the "stock." It was to be his business to form that holy seed.

It is a touching trait, illustrating the prophet's own feelings, that when he next appears before us, some years later, he has so renowned Shearjashub, "Remnant—shall return." The name was evidently given with significance: and the fact discovers alike the sorrow which ate his heart, and the hope in which he found solace.

4. Some years elapsed between chs. vi. and vii., and the political scenery has greatly altered. The Assyrian power of Nineveh now threatens the Hebrew nation: Eighth-pleaser has already spelled the doom of Tekalah, one of the fairest parts of his dominions—of the country east of Jordan and the vale of the Sea of Galilee, removing the inhabitants probably to people the wide and as yet uninhabited space indeed by the walls of Nineveh (n. c. 746). After the Assyrian army was withdrawn, the Syrian kingdom of Hanunus rises into notice: it monarch, Ziza, combines with the now weakened king of Israel, and probably with other states. The most similar, and which shall confront Assyria. Abaz keeps aloft
and becomes the object of attack to the allies: he has been already twice defeated (2 Chr. xiii. 5, 8); and now the allies are threatening him with a combined invasion (741). The news that "Aram is encamped in Ephraim" (Is. vii. 2) fills both king and people with consternation, and the king is gone forth from the city to take measures, as it would seem, to prevent the upper reservoir of water from falling into the hands of the enemy. Under Jeho- vah's direction Isaiah goes forth to meet the king, surrounded no doubt by a considerable com- pany of his officers and of spectators. The prophet is directed to take with him the child whose name, Shear-jashub, was so full of mystical promise, to add greater emphasis to his message. "Fear not," he tells the king, "Damascus is the head of Syria, and of Syria only; and Rezin head of Damascus, and not of Jerusalem; and within sixty years Ephraim shall be broken, to be no more a kingdom: so far shall Ephraim be from annexing Judah. Samaria again is head only of Ephraim, and Genediah's son only of Samaria. If ye will be established, believe this!" "Dost thou hesitate? Ask what sign thou wilt to assure thee that thus it shall be." The young king is already resolved not to let himself into the line of policy which Isaiah is urging upon him: he is bent upon an alliance with Assyria. To ask a sign might prove embarrassing; for, if it should be given — 2 Ahaz therefore, with a half-mocking show of reverence, declines to "tempt Jehovah." "O house of David, are ye not satisfied with trying the patience of an honest and wisely advising prophet, that you will put this contempt also up to the God who speaks through me? Jehovah him- self, irrespective of your deservings, gives you a guarantee that the commonwealth of Israel is not yet to perish. Behold, the Virgin is with child, and is bearing a son, and thou. O mother (comp. Gen. xvi. 11), shall call his name Immanuel. I seem to see that Child already born! Behold Him there! Cream and honey, abundance of the best food, shall he eat, when, ten or twenty years hence, he comes to the age of discretion; the devastating invasions of Syria and Israel shall be past then; for before that, the land of the two kings thou holdest so formidable shall have been subdued, and the hand of the Lord mingled with the promise in Sheer-jashub appears — upon thy people and upon thy family, not only in thy lifetime, but afterwards, Jehovah will bring an enemy more terrible than Jacob has ever known, Assyur—Asshur, whom thou wouldst fain hire to help (v. 20), but who shall prove a razor that will shave but too keenly; he shall so desolate the land that its inhabitants shall be sparse and few."

Again Isaiah predicts the Assyrian invasion; comp. ch. xxx. 6.

5. As the Assyrian empire began more and more to threaten the Hebrew commonwealth with utter overthrow, it is now that the prediction of the Messiah, the Restorer of Israel, becomes more positive and clear. Micaeh (v. 2) points to Bethlehem as the birthplace, and (v. 3) speaks of "her that travaileth " as an object to prophetic vision seeming almost present. Would not Micaeh and Isaiah confer with each other in these dark days of prevailing unbelief, upon the cheering hope which the Spirit of Christ that was in them suggested to their minds? (comp. Mal. iii. 16).

The king was bent upon an alliance with Assyria. This Isaiah steadfastly opposes (comp. x. 28). In this a theocracy the messenger of Jehovah would frequently appear as a political adviser. "Neither fear Aram and Israel, for they will soon perish; nor trust in Asshur, for she will be thy dire oppressor." Such is Isaiah's strain. And by divine direction he em- ployed various expedients to make his testimony the more impressive. He procured a large tablet (viii. 1), and with witnesses (for the purpose of attesting the fact, and displaying its especial significance) he wrote thereon in large characters suited for a public notice the words e Hasten boust Spedspoi, which tablet was no doubt to be hung up for public exhibition (w. x.). But even in this manner the Temple (comp. "priest," ver. 2). And further: his wife—who, by the way, appears to have been herself possessed of prophetic gifts, for "prophetess" always has this meaning and nowhere indicates a prophet's wife merely—just at this time apparently gave birth to a son. Jehovah bids the prophet give him the name Hastenboust Speedspoi, adding, what Isaiah was to avow on all occasions, that before the child should be able to talk, the wealth of Damascus and the booty of Samaria should be carried away before the king of Assyria.

The people of Judah was split into political fac- tions. The court was for Assyria, and indeed formed an alliance with Tiglath-pilesar; but a popular party was for the Syro-Ephraimitic connection formed to resist Assyria—partly actuated by their fears of a confederacy from which they had already suffered and severely and partly imbued by the sympathetic kindred race, drawing them to Israel, and even to Aram, in opposition to the more foreign Assyria. "Fear none but Jehovah only! fear Him, trust Him; He will be your safety." Such is the purport of the discourse viii. 5—ix. 7; in which, however, he augurs coming distress through the rejection of his counsels, but refreshes himself with the thought of the birth of the Great Deliverer. 6

2 The reader will observe the particular specification of the place, indicating the authenticity of the nar- rative. (Comp. Blum's Undeceived Coincidences, p. iii. no. i.)

6 That the birth of the Messiah is here pointed to cannot be doubted; indeed even Ewald sees this. But the very interpretation of vv. 15, 16 is hard to de- termine. That given above is in the main Hengsten- berg's (Curialogia, vol. ii.). The great difficulty which attaches to it is that the prophet represents Christ as already appearing, reckoning from his birth at the then present time, forward to the desolation of Syria and Israel within a few years. This difficulty is, how- ever, alleviated by the consideration that the prophet states the future as he existed to him in "vision," and in such prophetic vision the distances between events in point of time are often unperceived by the seer; who perhaps might sometimes in his own private interpre- tation of the vision (comp. 1 Pet. i. 10) have miscon- ceived the relations of time, in regard to events. The very clearness with which the future event was ex- hibited to him might deceive him in judging of its nearness. In the N. T. we have a somewhat similar phenomenon in the estimate formed by the Apostles and others of the relation of time between Christ's coming to judge Jerusalem and his second coming at the end of the world.

e A. V. Maher-shalal-hash-baz; by Luther rendered Rauschender, Elbers.

f With reference to Tiglath-pilesar's having recently removed the population of Galilee, the prophet specifies that "as the former time brought humiliation in the direction of Zebulun and Naphtali," located on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, "so the latter time-
The inspired advice was not accepted. Unbelief not discerning the power and faithfulness of Jehovah would argue that isolation was ruin, and accordingly involved Judah in alliances which soon brought her to almost utter destruction.

6. A prophecy was delivered at this time against the kingdom of Israel (xx. 8–x. 4), consisting of four strophes, each ending with the terrible refrain: "for all this, his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still." It announces that all expedients for recovering the power which Israel had lately lost were nugatory: they had forsaken Jehovah, and therefore God-forsaken (x. 4) they should perish. As Isaiah's message was only to Judah, we may infer that the object of this utterance was to check the disposition shown by many in Judah to connect Judah with the policy of the sister kingdom.

7. The utterance recorded in x. 5–xii. 6, one of the most highly wrought passages in the whole book, was probably one single outpouring of inspiration. It stands wholly disconnected with the preceding in the circumstances which it presupposes; and to what period to assign it, is not easy to determine. To allay the dread of Assyria which now prevailed, Isaiah was in God's mercy to his people inspired to declare, that though heavy judgment would be the bulk of the nation, yet the spirit of the Lord should go before the armies of Assyria; that the remnant should be delivered; that the remnant should return to his own land; that in Shearjashub! the remnant should indicate; that in svii. 20–22; and that the Assyrian should be overthrown in the very hour of apparently certain success by agency whose precise nature is left in awful mystery (x. 33, 34). From the destruction of Judah's enemies thus representatively foreshadowed, he then takes wing to predict the happy and peaceful reign of the "Twig which was to come forth from the stem of Jesse," when the united commonwealth of Judah and Ephraim should be restored in glory, and JAH JEHOWAH should be celebrated as the proved strength of his people. Here again is set forth a great deliverance, possibly the foreshadowing of xxxvii.

8. The next eleven chapters, xiii.–xxiv., contain chiefly a collection of utterances, each of which is styled a "burden." As they are detached pieces, it is possible they have been grouped together without strict observance of their chronological order.

(xx.) The first (xiii. 1–xiv. 27) is against Babylon; placed first, either because it was first in point of utterance, or because Babylon in prophetical vision, particularly when Isaiah compiled his book, headed in importance all the earthly powers opposed to God's people, and therefore was to be first struck down by the shaft of prophecy. As yet, not Babylon but Nineveh was the imperial city; but Isaiah possessed not a mere forerushing drawn from political sagacity, but an assured knowledge, that Babylon would be the seat of domination and a leading antagonist to the theoretic people. Not only did he tell Hezekiah a few years later, when Nineveh was still the seat of empire, that his sons should be carried captive "to Babylon," but in this "burden" he also foretells both the towering ambition and glory of that city, and its final overthrow. The ode of triumph (xiv. 5–23) in this burden is among the most poetical passages in all literature. It is remarkable that the overthrow of Babylon is in xv. 24, 25, associated with the Idow prediction of the Ninevite empire in the destruction of Senachemar's army (for here again this great miracle of divine judgment bounds out into the prophet's view), which very disaster, however, probably helped on the rise of Babylon at the cost of its northern rival. The explanation seems to be that Babylon was regarded as merely another phase of Asshur's sovereignty (comp. 2 K. xxiii. 29), so that the overthrow of Senachemar's army was a harbinger of that more complete destruction of the power of Asshur which approach. The destruction of Senachemar's army is the centre object of the first part of the book: and the action of predictive prophecy, and of miracle in relation to it, cannot be gainsaid without setting aside the authenticity of the narrative of other.

b This remarkable word, נבש, "lifting up," is variously understood, some taking it to refer to evils to be borne by the parties threatened, others as a lift—<ref>See our remarks in p. 1109. Even if this were coned to be the production of a later prophet than Isaiah (which there is no just cause whatever for believing), the problem which it presents to skeptics would be as hard as ever; for whom would its author learn that the ultimate condition of Babylon would be such as is here delineated? (xiii. 19–22)? In no time of Hebrew literature was there reason to anticipate this of Babylon in particular more than of other cities. In vain does skeptics dispute upon the 11th nothing is said there of the ultimate condition of Damascus; and it is obvious enough that any such blow as that (e. g.) inflicted by Tighth-piles would make Damascus for a while appear to be "no city" compared with what it had been, and would convert many of its streets into desolation. How different the language used of Babylon! And how wonderfully verified by time! We have the parallel language and verification in reference to Damascus (xxxiv.).</ref>
this burden announces. This prophecy is a note of preparation for the second part of the book; for the picture which it draws of Babylon, as having Jacob in captivity, and being compelled to relinquish her prey (xiv. i-3), is in brief the same as is more fully delineated in xlvii.; while the concluding verses about Sennacherib’s army (24-27) stand in somewhat the same relation to the rest of the “burden,” as the full history in xxxvi., xxxvii stands to xl-xlviii.

(b.) The short and pregnant “burden” against Philistia (xiv. 25-28) in the year that Azah died, was occasioned by the fall of the Philistines from Judah and their successful inroad, recorded 2 Chr. xxviii. 18. “If Judah’s rule was a serpent, that of Assyria would prove a basilisk—a flying dragon; let their gates howl at the smoke which announced the invading army! Meanwhile Zion would repose safe under the protection of her king;”—language plainly predictive, as the compiler in giving the date evidently felt; comp. xxxviii.

(c.) The burden of Zion (xv., xvi. i) is remarkable for the eloquent strain in which the prophet bewails the disasters of Moab, and for the dramatic character of xvi. 1-6, in which 3-5 is the petition of the Moabites to Judah, and ver. 6 Judah’s answer. a For Moab’s relation to Israel see Mrv. u.

(d.) Chapters xvi., xvii. This prophecy is headed “the burden of Damascus;” and yet after ver. 3 the attention is withdrawn from Damascus and turned to Israel, and then to Ethiopia. Israel appears as closely associated with Damascus, and indeed dependent upon her, and as having adopted her religious rites, “strange slips,” ver. 10 (comp. 2 K. xvi. 10, of Azah), which shall not profit her. This brings us to the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic alliance; at all events Ephraim has not yet ceased to exist. Chap. xvii. 12-14, as well as xviii. 1-7, point again to the event of xxxvii. But why this here? The solution seems to be that, though Assyria would be the ruin both of Aram and of Israel, and though it would even threaten Judah (“us,” ver. 14), it should not then conquer Judah (comp. turn of xiv. 31, 32). And with this last thought ch. xviii. is inseparably connected; for it is a call of congratulation to Ethiopia (“wos” in ver. 1 of A. V. should be “holo” as lv. 1; also in ver. 2 omit “saying”), whose deputies, predictively imagined as having come to Palestine to learn the progress of the Assyrian invasion (comp. xxxvii. 9), are sent back by the prophet charged with the glad news of Assyria’s overthrow described in vv. 4-6. In ver. 7 we have the conversion of Ethiopia: for “the people tall, and shorn” is itself “the present” to be brought unto Jehovah. (Comp. Acts viii. 20-40, and the present condition of Ethiopia.)

These repeated predictions of Zion’s deliverance from Asshur, in conjunction with Asshur’s triumph over Zion’s enemies, entered deeply into the essence of the prophet’s public ministry: the great aim of which was to fix the dependence of his countrymen entirely upon Jehovah.

(a) A good deal of this burden is an enlargement of Num. xxi. 27-30, from the imitation of which the coloring of its style in part arises. It in turn resembles an enlarged edition in Jer. xviii. The two concluding verses (is. xvi. 13, 14), which furnish no real ground for doubting whether Isaiah wrote the whole prophecy of this sort of old time the purport of this denunciation has been decreed (namely, in Num. xxi. and xxiv. 17), but that within three years it

(e.) In the “burden of Egypt” (xiv. the prophet seems to be pursuing the same object. Both Israel (xxi. 26-40, and Judah (xv. xvi. 1-14) were naturally disposed to look towards Egypt for succor against Assyria. Probably it was to counteract this tendency that the prophet is here directed to prophesy the utter helplessness of Egypt under God’s judgments: she should be given over to Asshur (the “cruel lord” and “fierce king” of ver. 4, not Psammethichus), and should also suffer the most dreadful calamities through civil dissensions and through foreign invasion—unless through the peculiar usefulness of the Nile and the veneration with which it was regarded (1-15). But the result should be that numerous cities of Egypt should own Jehovah for their God, and be joined in brotherhood with his worshippers in Israel and in Asshur;—a reference to Messianic times.

(f.) In the midst of these “burdens” stands a passage which presents Isaiah in a new aspect, an aspect in which he appears in this instance only. It was not uncommon both in the O. T. and in the New (comp. Acts xxii. 11) for a prophet to add to his spoken word an action symbolizing its import. Sargon, known here only, was king of Assyria, probably between Shahunmeser and Sennacherib. His armies were now in the south of Palestine besieging Ashdol. It has been plausibly conjectured that Tirhakah, king of Meroe, and Sethos, the king of Egypt, were now in alliance. The more emphatically to enforce the warning already conveyed in the “burden of Egypt”—not to look thitherward for help—Isaiah was commanded to appear in the streets and temple of Jerusalem stripped of his sackcloth mantle, and wearing his vest only, with his feet also bare. “Thus shall Egyptians and Ethiopians walk, captives before the king of Assyria.” For three years was he directed (from time to time, we may suppose) thus to show himself in public view,—to make the lesson the more impressive by constant repetition.

(g.) In “the burden of the desert of the sea,” a poetical designation of Babylonia (xii. 1-10), the images in which the fall of Babylon is indicated are sketched with Eschylean rapidity, and certainly not less than Eschylean awfulness and grandeur. As before (xii. 17), the Medes are the captors. It is to comfort Judah sighing under the “treacherous spoiling” (v. 2) and continual “thirsting” (v. 10) of Asshur—Ninivite and Babylonian—that the Spirit of God moves the prophet to this utterance:

(h.) “The burden of Dumah,”—in which the watchman can see nothing but night, let them ask him as often as they will,—of Arabia (xiii. 11-17), relate apparently to some Assyrian invasion.

(i.) In “the burden of the valley of vision” (xiii. 1-14), it is doubtless Jerusalem that is thus designated, and not without sadness, as having been so long the home of prophetic vision to so little result. The scene presented is that of Jerusalem should begin to be fulfilated. It was not completely fulfilled even in Jeremiah’s time.

b Comp. the close of the “burden of Tyre.” The “city of destruction” (xix. 15) is supposed by many to be Beth-shemesh of Jer. xiii. 15, specified because hitherto an especial seat of idolatry. Onias’s misuses which the prophet so well knew of (see 1 Macc. x. 1-6) agree.

c In vv. 3 and 4 the poet dramatically represents the feelings of the Babylonians.
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Juring an invasion; in the hostile army are named Ham and Kir, nations which no doubt contributed troops both to the Ninevite and to the Babylonian armies. The latter is probably here contemplated. The _homiletic_ purpose of this prediction in reference to Isaiah's contemporaries, was to incite a pious and humble dependence upon Jehovah in place of any mere fleshly confidence.

(6.) The passage xxiii. 15-21 is singular in Isaiah as a prophecy against an individual. Comp. the word of Amos (vii.) against Amaziah, and of Jere- niah (xx.) against Pashur. Shobnah was probably as ungodly as they. One of the king's highest functionaries, he seems to have been leader of a party opposed to Jehovah (v. 23, "the burden that is upon it"). Himself a stranger in Jerusalem—perhaps an alien, as Ewald conjectures from the un-Hebrew form of his name—he may have been introduced by Hezekiah's predecessor Ahaz; he made great parade of his rank (ver. 18; comp. 2 Sam. xv. 1), and presumed upon his elevation so far as to hew out a tomb high up in the cliffs (probably on the western or southwestern side of Jerusalem, where so many were excavated), as an ostentations display of his greatness (comp. 3 Chr. xxiii. 33, _margin_). We may believe him to have been engaged with this business outside the walls, when Isaiah came to him with his message. Shobnah succies his power securely rooted; but Jehovah will roll him up as a ball and toss him away into a far distant land, — _disgust that he is to his master!_ his stately robes of office, with his broad magnificent girdle, shall invest another, Elishiam. Ch. xxvii. 3, seems to indicate a decline of his power, as it also shows Elishiam's promotion to Shobnah's former post. Perhaps he was disgraced and exiled by Hezekiah, after the event of xxxvi., when the sinners in Zion were overawed and great ascendency for a while secured to the party which was true to Jehovah. If his fall was the consequence of the Assyrian overthrow, we can better understand both the demeanssment against the individual and the position it occupies in the record.

(l.) The last "burden" is against Tyre (xxvii.). The only cause specified by Isaiah for the judgment upon Tyre is the pride (ver. 9; comp. Ez. xviii. 2, 6); and we can understand how the Tyrians, proud of their material progress and its outward displays, may have looked with contempt upon the plainer habits of the theocratic people. But this was not the only ground. The contagion of her idolatry reached Jerusalem (1 K. xi. 5, 33; 2 K. xi. 18, xxii. 13). Otherwise also she was an injurious neighbor (Ps. lx. iii. 7; Joel, iv. 6; Am. i. 9). It therefore behoved Jehovah, both as avengeing his own worship, and as the guardian and avenger of his peculiar people, to punish Tyre Shalmaneser appears to have been foiled in his five years' siege; Nebuchadnezzar was more successful, capturing at least the main body of the city; and to this latter circumstance ver. 13 refers. In vv. 15-17 it seems to be intimated that when this pressure of Assyrian should be removed (by the Medo-Persian conquest), Tyre should revive. Her bitter destruction is not predicted by Isaiah as it afterwards was by Ezekiel. Ver. 18 probably points to Messianic times: comp. Matt. vii. 26; Acts xxi. 3; Enseh. _H. E._ x. 4.

9. The next four chapters, xxiv.-xxvi., form one prophecy essentially connected with the preceding ten "burdens" (xiii.-xxiii.), of which it is in effect a general summary; it presents previous denunciations in one general demeanssment which includes the theocratic people itself, and therewith also the promise of blessings, especially Messianic blessings, for the remnant. It no longer particularizes (Moab, xx. 10, represents all enemies of God's people, as Edom does in xi. 1), but speaks of judgments upon lands, cities, and oppressors in general terms, the reference of which is to be gathered from what goes before.

The latter part of xxv. is interrupted at ver. 13 by a glance at the happy remnant (ver. 15, _fires probably means cost_), but is resumed at ver. 16, till at ver. 21 the dark night passes away altogether to usher in an inexpressibly glorious day.

In xxv., after commemorating the destruction of all oppressors ("city" ver. 2, contemplates Babylon as type of all), the prophet gives us in vv. 6-9 a most glowing description of Messianic blessings, which connects itself with the vision of the future by numberless links, indicating the union of the prophet's Spirit ("the Spirit of Christ," 1 Pet. i. 11), with that which dwells in the later revelation.

In xxvi., ver. 12-18 describe the new, happy state of God's people as God's work wholly (comp. 13, "by thee only"); all their efforts were fruitless till God graciously interposed. The new condition of Israel is figuratively a restoration (comp. Ezekiel's vision of dry bones, Ez. xx. 1), the glad tidings of a triumphant agency: as indeed the glorified state of the Church hereafter will be literally a resurrection.

In xxvii. 1, "Leviathan the gleening serpent, and Leviathan the twisting serpent, and the dragon in the sea," are perhaps Nineveh and Babylon—two phases of the same Assyrian—and Egypt (comp. ver. 13); all, however, symbolizing adverse powers of evil. The reader will observe that in this period of his ministry, Isaiah already contemplates the
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xxxv. deliverance of his people as a restoration from captivity, especially from Assyria, vv. 12, 13 (comp. xi. 11, 16), as he does in the second part; — Babylon being a second phase of Assyria.

10. Ch. xxviii.—xxxv. The former part of this section makes nothing of a temporary character, being, as Hengstenberg with much probability conjectures, the substance of discourses not fully communicated, and spoken at different times. The latter part hangs more closely together, and may with considerable certainty be assigned to the time of Sennacherib's invasion. At such a season the spirit of prophecy would be especially awake.

Ch. xxvii. 1-6 is clearly predictive; it therefore presumes uninterrupted continuance of public relations, “the crown of pride” surmounting its beautiful hill, was destroyed. But the men of Judah also, ver. 7 (comp. ver. 14), are threatened. And here we have a picture given us of the way in which Jeho-ovah’s word was received by Isaiah’s contemporaries. Priest and prophet were drunk with a spirit of infatuation, — “they err’d in vision, they stumbled in judgment,” and therefore only scoff’d at his messages.

In the lips of these false prophets, prophesying, in proportion to its falsehood, would be exaggerated in the wildness and incoherency of the style. Hence the scoffing prophets and priests made it a matter of reproach against Isaiah that his style was so plain and simple — as if he were dealing with little children, ver. 9. And in mockery they accumulate monosyllables as infatuating its style (tev la-teav, teav la-teav, kar la-kar, kar la-kar, zeer sham, zeer sham, ver. 10). “Twist, my words” (Is. Isaiah’s reply) “into a mocking jabber if ye will; God shall in turn speak to you by the jabber of foreign invaders!” (comp. Deut. xxviii. 49). They trusted that they had made a “vision” — a compact with death and hell (vv. 15, 18, “agreement,” Hebrew. visyon), and that through the measures which they, seer and priest together, had adopted, no invasion should hurt them. But the stone which Jehovah lays in Zion (God’s own prophets) alone secures those who trust in it: ye shall perish (10-22). Ver. 16 is applied in the N. T. to Christ: he is now the prophet who saves those who believe in him. This glimpse into Hebrew life explains to us in part the cause of the failure of the prophetic ministry. The travesty of the “word of Jehovah” preoccupied men’s minds, or at least confused them; while further the conflicting voices of different prophets, the false and the true, would furnish them, as in all ages it does to the worldly and the skeptical, a ground for entire disbelief.

“Cannot ye wise men apply to the conduct of your affairs in relation to God that shrewdness and wisdom, which the fosterer displays in dealing with his various businesses, and which God has given alike to him and to you?” (23-29).

a "The priest and the prophet." There is no reason to understand these as connected with idolatry. There were always (it would seem) a numerous party who assumed the hair-worn mantle of the prophet ("wearing a hairy garment to deceive"); and these sable-clad men perhaps even swarmed in the streets of Jerusalem. [Ruth, p. 708, note e.] The priests, on the other hand, were the aristocracy of Judah, and, under the king, to a great extent ruled its policy. Like the coalition of strategos and orator at Athens, so priest and prophet plied into each other's hands. 4:10. Jesusism. Whatever public policy the priests advised, they would be seconded therein by prophets, "in the name of Jehovah." Isaiah’s contemporary shows us in what an unprincipled manner the prophets abused their function for their own advantage (Mic. iii. 5-7, 11): "The prophets prophesied falsely, and the priests bore rule by their means." (Jer. v. 31.) Hence prophets and priests are so often lumped together (comp. xxviii. 9, 10).

b In ver. 10, read "some days over a year shall ye be troubled." 16:10. In the reference to "the book of Jehovah," ver. 16 as containing this prediction, deserves notice. As the
Isaiah, xxxiv. has a general sense, so xxxv. indicates in general terms the deliverance of Israel as if out of captivity, rejoicing in their secure and happy march through the wilderness. It may be doubted whether the description is meant to apply to any deliverance out of temporal captivity, closely as the imagery approaches that of the second part. It rather seems to picture the march of the spiritual Israel to her eternal Zion (Heb. xvii. 10), and the approach of her Deliverer, Jehovah, in his long-sought and finally arrived salvation. The Assyrian was near with forces apparently irresistible. In the universal consternation which ensued, all the hope of the state centred upon Isaiah: the highest functionaries of the state,—Shalman too,—wait upon him in the name of their sovereign, confessing that they were now in the very extremity of danger (xxxvii. 3), and entreat his prayers:—a signal token this, of the approved fidelity of the prophet in the ministry which he had so long exercised. The short answer which Jehovah gave through him was, that the Assyrian king should hear intelligence which would send him back to his own land, there to perish. The event shows that the intelligence pointed to was that of the death of his array. Accordingly, Hezekiah communicated to Sennacherib, now at Lachish, his refusal to submit, expressing his assurance of being protected by Jehovah (comp. ver. 10). This drew from the Assyrian king a letter of defiance against Jehovah himself, as being no more able to defend Jerusalem, than other tutehry gods had been to defend the countries which he had conquered. On Hezekiah's sending this letter before Jehovah in the Temple for him to read and answer (ver. 17), Isaiah was commissioned to send a fuller reply to the pious king (21-35), the manifest object of which was the more completely to signalize, especially to God's own people themselves, the meaning of the coming event. How the deliverance was to be effected, Isaiah was not commissioned to tell; but the very next night (2 K. xix. 35) brought the appalling fulfilment. A divine inspiration so marvelous, so evidently miraculous, was in its magnificence worthy of being the kernel of Isaiah's whole book; it is, indeed that without which the whole book falls to pieces, but with which it forms a well-organized whole (comp. Is. lxvi. xvi. xlviii.).

prophet's spoken word was "the word of Jehovah." So his written word is here called "the book of Jehovah." It shows Isaiah's estimate of his prophetic writings. So xxx 8 points to an enduring record in which he was to deposit his testimony concerning Egypt. (In xxx. 5, for "That this is," etc., read "Because this is"")

"This is like Isaiah's style the whole passage is! xxxvii. 26 refers to the numerous predictions of prophetic writings of the context and overthrown found in preceding parts of the book (comp. xiv. 8; xvi. 9-11, &c.; comp. ver. 27 with xii. 2). "The" in ver. 30, as in xii. 11-16: There must be a remnant; therefore ye shall now be delivered. For further explanation, refer to the law in Lev. xxi. 5: 11: "Your condition this year will be like that of a Sabbath year; next year the land being even then not quite cleared of invaders like that of the jubilee year: as at the jubilee the Hebrew commonwealth starts afresh, restored to its proper condition, so now reformation, the fruit of affliction, shall introduce better days."

For Hezekiah's sickness was 15 years before his death, whereas the destruction of Sennacherib's army (so chronologies determine) occurred 12 or 13 years before the same date.

Since xxxvii. 9-20 is not in 2 K., and on the other hand in 2 K. are found many passages not found in Is. (e. g. 2 K. xviii. 14-20; xx. 4, 5, 9, &c.;), critics are generally agreed that neither account was drawn from the other, but both from the record mentioned in 2 Chr. xxxii. 22 as "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, found in (not, as in A. V., and in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel;" which record Isaiah adopted with modifications into the composition of his prophecies.

As it is for the benefit of God's own people that Isaiah writes, and not to affect heathen nations to whom he had no commission, the argument against idolatry, of which we have so much in this prophet, is to be ascribed to inbred tenacities among the Hebrews themselves, which ceased at the Captivity (for the deportation probably altogether affected chiefly the best disposed of the nation, especially the priests, of whom there appears to have been a disproportionate number left among those who were exiled and those who remained."

12. The hot 27 chapters form a prophecy, whose coherence of structure and unity of authorship are generally admitted even by those who deny that it was written by Isaiah. The point of time and situation from which the prophet here speaks, is for the most part that of the Captivity in Babylon (comp., e. g., lv. 10, 11). But this is adopted on a principle already noted as characterizing "vision," namely, that the prophet sees the future as if present. That the present with the prophet in this section was imagined and not real, is indicated by the specification of sins which are reeked: as neglect of sacrifices (xlvii. 22-24), unceaseable sacrifices (lxxvi. 3), vials of bitterness (xxiv. 10) sin belonging to a period before the exile, and not to the exile itself. But that this imagined time and place should be maintained through so long a composition, is unquestionably a remarkable phenomenon. It is, however, explained by the fact, that the prophet in these later prophecies is a writer rather than a public speaker, writing for the edification of God's people in those future days, in the manner of which Isaiah was aware. For the punishment of exile had been of old denounced in case of disobedience even by Moses himself (Lev. xxvi. 31-35), and thus contemplated by Solomon (1 K. viii. 46-50); moreover, Isaiah had himself often realized and predicted it, with reference repeatedly to Babylon in particular (xxxix. 6, 7, xviii. 12, xxi. 2, 10, xiv. 2, 5, xi. 11, 12, xii. 11, 12); which was also done by Micah (iv. 10, xii. 13). Apart therefore from the immediate suggestion of an inspiring afflatus, it was a thought already fixed in Isaiah's mind by a chain of foregoing revelations, that the Hebrews would be deported to Babylon, and that too within a generation or two. We dwell upon this, because it most
be acknowledged, and we have already made the remark, that "vision" even in its most heightened form still adapted itself more or less to the previous mental condition of the seer. We can understand, therefore, that the reader might be led to write prophecies, such as should serve as his ministerial bequest to his people when the hour of their captivity should have fallen upon them.

This same fact, namely, that the prophet is here, in the undisturbed retirement of his chamber, giving us a written prophecy, and not recording, as in the early part of the book, spoken discourses, goes far to explain the greater profusion of words, and the clearer, more complete and more comprehensive exposition of thoughts, which generally characterize this second part; whereas the first part frequently exhibits great abruptness, and a close compression and terseness of diction, at times almost enigmatical — as an ignorant man might speak among gain-sayers from whom little was to be hoped. This difference of style, so far as it exists (for it has been greatly exaggerated), may be further ascribed to the difference of purpose; for here Isaiah generally appears as the tender and compassionate comforter of the pious and afflicted: whereas before he appears rather as accuser and denounced. There exists after all sufficient similarity of diction to indicate Isaiah's hand (see Keil's Einleitung, § 72, note 7).

This second part falls into three sections, each, as it happens, consisting of nine chapters; the two first and with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith Jehovah (or 'my God ',' to the wicked," and the third with the same thought modified.

(1.) The first section (xl.-xlvi.) has for its main topic the comforting assurance of the deliverance from Babylon by Koresh ( Cyrus) who is even named twice (xli. 2, 3, 35, xliv. 24-28, xlv. 1-4, 13, xlvii. 3, xlviii. 14, 15).\(^a\) This section abounds with arguments against idolatry, founded mainly (not wholly, see the noble passage xlv. 9-23) upon the gift of prediction possessed by Jehovah's prophets, especially as shown by their predicting Cyrus, and even naming him (xlii. 26, xliv. 8, 24-28, xlv. 4, 10, 21, xlvii. 8-11, xlviii. 3-8, 15). Idols and heathen diviners are taunted with not being able to predict (xli. 1-7, 21-24, xlii. 8-13, xlv. 20-21, xlvii. 10-13). This power of foretelling the future, as shown in this instance, is insisted upon as the test of divinity. It is of importance to observe in reference to the prophet's standing-point in this second part, that in speaking both of the Captivity in Babylon and of the deliverance out of it, there is (excepting Cyrus's name) no specification of particular circumstances, such as we might expect to find if the writer had written at the end of the exile;

\(^a\) The point has been argued for, and the evidence seems satisfactory (Hüvernick, Hengst.), that Koresh. a word meaning Sun, was commonly in the East, and particularly in Persia, a title of princes, and that it was assumed by Cyrus, whose original name was Agdrades, on his ascending the throne. It stands, however, in history as his own proper name. This instance of particularizing in prophecy is paralleled by the specification of Josiah's name (I. K. xii. 2) some 590 years before his time.

\(^b\) It is difficult to acquire the passages above cited of impudent and indeed suicidal mendacity, if they were not written before Cyrus appeared on the political scene.

\(^c\) For the discussion and refutation of all expositions which understand by "the servant of Jehovah" here in the second section, the Jewish people, or the pious among them, or the prophetic order, or some other object than the Messiah, comp. Heinzenberg's Christologie, vol. ii.

\(^d\) In this passage Christ is called "Israel," as the concentration and consummation of the covenant-people — as he in whom its idea is to be realized.

\(^e\) That Jesus of Nazareth is the object which in "vision" the prophet saw in 1. 6, and in lii. 13, lxxvi. 12 (connecting lii. 13 with lii. 12 as one passage), will hardly be questioned amongst ourselves, except by those whose minds are prepossessed by the notion that predictive revelation is inconceivable. Meanwhile all will acknowledge the truth of Keil's remark: "In the Servant of Jehovah, so vividly sores before his view, the prophet discerns a new clear light shed abroad over all possible situations of that time; in him he finds the balm of consolation, the oil of

the delineation is of a kind, generally frequent from the history of Moses and Joshua. Let it be observed, in particular, that the language respecting the wilderness (e. g. xlii. 17-20), through which the people, for which they were to pass, is unmistakably ideal and symbolical.

It is characteristic of sacred prophecy in general, that the "vision" of a great deliverance leads the seer to glance at the great deliverance to come through Jesus Christ. This associating of ideas is found in several passages in the first part of Isaiah, in which the destruction of the Assyrian army suggests the thought of Christ (e. g. x. 24-xl. 11, xxxvi. 3-xl. 27). This principle of association prevails in the second part taken as a whole; but in the first section, taken apart, it appears as yet imperfectly. However, xli. 1-7 is a clear prediction of the Messiah, and that too as viewed in part in contrast with Cyrus: for the "servant" of Jehovah is meek and gentle (ver. 2, 3), and will establish the true religion in the earth (ver. 4). Nevertheless, since the prophet regards the two deliveries as referable to the same type of thought (comp. lix. 1-3), so the announcement of one (xl. 3-5) is held by all the four Evangelists, and by John Baptist himself, as predictive of the announcement of the other.

(2.) The second section (xlii.-lvi.) is distinguished from the first by several features. The person of Cyrus as well as his name, and the specification of Babylon (named in the first section four times), and of his gods, and of the Chaldeans (named before five times), disappear altogether. Return from exile is indeed repeatedly spoken of and at length (xlii. 9-26, lii. 9-liii. 12, lv. 12, lixiv. 14); but in such general terms as admit of being applied to the spiritual and Messianic, as well as to the literal restoration. And that the Messianic restoration (whether a spiritual restoration or not) is principally intended, is clear from the connection of the restoration promised in xlii. 9-25 with the Messiah portrayed in xli. 1-8;\(^d\) from the description of the suffering Christ (in I. 5, 6) in the midst of the promise of deliverance (I. 1-11); from the same description in lii. 12-liii. 12, between the passages li. 1-lii. 12, and liv. 1-17; and from the exhibition of Christ in lv. 4 (connected in ver. 3 with the Messianic promise given to David, forning the foundation on which is raised the promise of lv. 3-13. Comp. also the interpretation of lv. 13 given by Christ himself in John vi. 45, and that of ix. 1-3 in Luke iv. 18. In fact the place of Cyrus in the first section is in this second section held by his greater Antitype.\(^e\)

(3.) In the third section (lvii.-lxv.) as Cyrus
ISAIAH

nowhere appears, so neither does "Jehovah's servant" occur so frequently to view as in the second. The only delineation of the latter is in ix. 1-3 and in xiii. 1-6, 9. He no longer appears as suffering, but only as saving and avenging Zion. The section is mainly occupied with various practical exhortations founded upon the views of the future already set forth. In the second the parentheses is almost all consisting, taking in x. 17 the form of advice; only in lii. and towards the close in ix. 9-liii. 14 is the language accusing and minatory. In this third section, on the other hand, the prophesying is very much in this last-named strain (cf. lvii. 1-7, lx. 1-8, lxv. 16, lxvi. 1-17, 21); taking the form of national self-resentment in lx. 9-15 and lxii. 13-lxiv. 12. Still, interspersed in this admonition, accusation, and threatening, there are gleams, and even bright tracts, of more cheering matter; besides the conditional promises as arguments for well-doing in lxii. 8 and lxvi. 1, 2, we have the long passage of general and unconditional promise in lx. 20-lxvi. 6, and the shorter ones lxv. 17-23, lxvi. 7-14, 18-24; and in some of these passages the future of Zion is depicted with brighter coloring than almost anywhere else. The whole bearing on the whole the predominant feature of this section is exhortation with the view, as it should seem, of qualifying men to receive the promised blessings. There was to be "no peace for the wicked," but only for those who turned from ungodliness in Jacob; and therefore the prophet in such various forms of exhortations urges the topic of repentance, promising, advising, leading to confession (lxvi. 6-12); comp. Hos. xiv. 2-3); warning, threatening. In reference to the sins especially selected for rebuke, we find specified idolatry lxv. 3, 4, lxvi. 17 (as in the second section lvii. 3-10), bloodshedding, and injustice (lx. 1-5), selfishness (lxv. 5), and merely outward and ceremonial ceremonialism (lxvi. 1-5). If it were not for the place given to idolatry, we might suppose with Dr. Henderson that the spirit of God is already by prophetic anticipation rekindling the Judah consulting taking in x. 17 the name of Jesus Christ, — so accurately in many places are its features delineated as denounced in the N. T. But the specification of idolatry leads us to seek for the immediate objects of this parenthesis in the prophet's own time, when indeed the Pharisianism displayed in the N. T. already existed, being in fact in all ages the natural product of an unconverted, unspiritual heart combining with the observance of a positive religion, and in all ages (comp. e.g. Ps. 1) antagonistic to true piety.

While we can distinctly discern certain dominant thoughts and moods in each of these three sections, we must not, however, expect to find them pursued with the regularity which we look for in a modern sermon; such treatment is wholly alien from the spirit of prophecy, which always more or less is in the strict sense the disorder of book. But obviously, we find in these, as in the earlier portions of the book, the transitions sudden, and the exhortation every now and then varied by dramatic interlocu-

tion, by description, by odes of thanksgiving, by prayers.

III. Numberless attacks have been made by German critics upon the integrity of the whole book, different critics pronouncing different portions of the first part spurious, and many concurring to reject the second part altogether. A few observations, particularly on this latter point, appear here to be necessary.

1. The first writer who ever breathed a suspicion that Isaiah was not the author of the last twenty seven chapters was Koppe, in remarks upon ch. 1, in his German translation of Luth's Isaiah, published in the years 1772-1781. This was presently followed up by Därendel, especially in his Latin translation and commentary in 1783; by Eichhorn, who in a later period most fully developed his views on this point in his Hebräischen Propheten, 1810-1819; and the most fully and effectually by Justi. The majority of the German critics have given in their adhesion to these views: as Paulus (1793), Bertholdt (1812), De Wette (1817), Grosinis (1820, 1829), Hitzig (1833), Noth (1838), Umbreit and Ewald (1841). Defenders of the integrity of the book have not, however, been wanting — particularly Jahn in his Einleitung (1802); Müller in his De Authentia Prophetarum Juvenae (Copenhagen, 1825); Kleinert in his Excl. des Jesu (1829); Hengstenberg in his Christologie, vol. ii.; Harnack, Einleitung, B. iii. (1849); Steier in his Jesu nicht Physio-Jesu (1850); and Keil, Einleitung (1853), in which last the reader will find a most satisfactory compendium of the controversy and of the grounds for the generally received views.

2. The catalogue of authors who gainsay Isaiah's authorship of this second part is, in point of numbers, of critical ability, and of profound Hebrew scholarship, sufficiently imposing. Nevertheless when we come to inquire into their grounds of objection, we soon cease to attach much value to this formidable array of authorities. The circumstance mainly urged by them is the unquestionable fact that the author bows, to a considerable view taken his standing-point at the close of the Babylonish Captivity as if that were his present, and from thence looks forward into the subsequent future. Now is it possible (they ask) that in such a manner and to such a degree a seer should step out of his own time, and plant his foot so firmly in a later time? We must grant (they urge) that he might gaze upon a future not very distant, as if present, and represent it accordingly; but in the case before us infallible insight and prescience must be predicated of him: for this idea of an Isaiah who knows even Cyrus's name was not realized for two centuries later, and a chance hit is here out of the question. "This, however, is inconceivable. A prophet's prescience must be limited to the notion of foretelling (ivangi), and to the deductions from paternity — taken in combination with real or supposed truths. Prophets were bounded like other men by the horizon of their own age; they borrowed the object of their soothsaying from their

a *Restoration from captivity is spoken of in viii. 12. lx. 4-7, lix. 4, 5, 10: but for the most part in such general terms as might easily be understood as referring to spiritual restoration in this literal restoration pre-requisite requirement, this exhortation may be taken with a reference to literal restoration as well.
present: and excited by the relations of their present use they spoke to their contemporaries of what affected other people's minds or their own, occupying themselves only with that future whose rewards or punishments were likely to reach the same con- temporaries. For the exigesis the position is impeccably that the prophetic writings are to be interpreted in each case out of the relations belonging to the time of the prophet; and from this follows as a corollary the critical Canon: that that time, those time-relations, out of which a prophet is, and time-relations: — to that time he must be referred as the date of his own existence." (Hitzig, 248).

3. This is the main argument. Other grounds which are alleged are confessedly "secondary and external," and are really of no great weight. The most important of these is founded upon the difference in the conception of style which has already been noticed; this point will come into view again presently. A number of particulars of dictation said to be non-Islamic have been accentuated: but the reasoning founded upon them has been satisfactorily met by opposing evidence of a similar kind (see Keil, Einleitung, § 72). It is not, however, on such considerations that the chief stress is laid by the opponents of the Islamic authorship of this portion of Scripture: the great ground of objection is, as already stated, the incompatibility of those phenomena of prediction which are not, in the writings in question, with the subjective theories of inspiration (or rather non-inspiration) which the reader has just had submitted to him. The incompatibility is confessed. But where is the solution of the difficulty to be sought? Are those theories so certainly true that all evidence must give way to them? This is not the place for combating them; but, for our own part, we are so firmly convinced that the theory is utterly discredited by the facts exhibited to us in the Bible throughout, that we are content to lack in this case the countenance of its upholders. Their judgment in the critical question before us is determined, not by their scholarship, but avowelly by the prepossessions of their unbelief.

4. For our present purpose it must suffice briefly to indicate the following reasons as establishing the integrity of the whole book, and as indicating the authenticity of the second part:

(a.) Extenually. — The unanimous testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition — Ecclus. xiv. 24, which manifestly (in the words paremdéxen tois tivnwv, and ἐξεταζέων την ἐπίστασα, πρὸς τὸ παραγεννήθη εἰρέτες) is to this second part. The case apparently made of the second part by Jeremiah (x. 1-16, v. 25, xxx. 31, 1, 11, Ezekiel (xxiii. 40, 41), and Zechariah (ii. 15, iii. 10). The decree of Cyrus in Ezr. i. 2-4, which plainly is founded upon Is. xlvii. 28, xlvii. 13, ac- crediting Josephus's statement (Ant. xi. 1, § 2); that the Jews showed Cyrus Isaiah's predictions of him. The inspired testimony of the N. T., which speaks (Matt. iii. 3 and the parallel passages: Luke iv. 17; Acts viii. 28; Rom. x. 16, 29) quotes with specification of Isaiah's name prophecies found in the second part.

(b.) Internally. — The unity of design and con- struction which, as we have seen, connects these last twenty-seven chapters with the preceding parts of the book: — The choice of dictation which pervades the whole book. — The peculiar elevation and grandeur of style, which, as is universally acknowl- edged, distinguishes the whole contents of the second part as much as of the first, and which assigns their composition to the golden age of He- brew literature. — The absence of any other name than Isaiah's claiming the authorship. At the time to which the composition is assigned, a Zecha- riah or a Malachi could gain a separate name and book; how was it that an author of such transcendent gifts, as "The Great Unnamed" who wrote xl.-lxvi., could gain none? — The claims which the writer makes to the "first knowledge of the deliverance by Cyrus, which claims, on the opposing view, must be regarded as a fraudulent personation of an earlier writer. — Lastly, the predictions which it contains of the character, sufferings, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ: a believer in Christ cannot fail to regard these predictions as affixing to this second part the broad seal of Divine Inspiration; whereby the chief ground of objection against its having been written by Isaiah is at once am- hilated.α

IV. It remains to make a few observations on the death of the author. Those who feel compelled from internal evidence to ascribe the latter part of Isaiah to a writer who flourished in the time of the Captivity, do not on that account value the work the less, but regard this view of it as investing it with new interest. Thus Dr. Noyes calls the author "the greatest of all the Jewish prophets" (New Trans. of the Hebrew Prophets, 4th ed., i. p. xliii); Dean Stanley speaks of these chapters as "the most deeply inspired, the most truly Evangelical, of any portion of the Prophetic writings, whatever be their date, and whoever their author" (Hist. of the Jewish Church, ii. 115); and Dean Milman remarks: "It is well known that the later chapters of Isaiah are attributed, by the common consent of most of the profoundly learned writers of Germany . . . to a different writer, whom they call the great nameless Prophet, or the second Isaiah, who wrote during the exile. I must acknowledge that these chapters, in my judgment, read with infinitely greater force, subtlety, and reality under this view. If they lose, and I hardly feel that they lose, in those points of inspiration, meaning, and consolation they do not lose their power when we consider them specially adapted to the condition of his immediate contemporaries, rather than designed for the elucidation of the people 150 years or more after the
Isaiah's style; though in truth the abundance of the materials which offer themselves makes it a difficult matter to give anything like a just and definite view of the subject, without trespassing unduly upon the limits necessarily prescribed to us. On this point we cannot do better than introduce some of the remarks with which Ewald precedes his translation of such parts of the book as he is disposed to acknowledge as Isaiah's (Prophecies, ii. 166-179):

"In Isaiah we see prophetic authorship reaching its culminating point. Everything conspired to raise him to an elevation to which no prophet either before or after could as writer attain. Among the other prophets, each of the more important ones is distinguished by some one particular excellence, and some one peculiar talent; in Isaiah, all kinds of theologies and all beauteous of prophetic discourse meet together so as mutually to temper and qualify each other; it is not so much any single feature that distinguishes him as the symmetry and perfection of the whole.

"We cannot fail to assume, as the first condition of Isaiah's peculiar historical greatness, a native power and a vivacity of spirit, which even among prophets is a book which he met with, and rarely that we see combined in one and the same spirit the three several characteristics of — first, the most profound prophetic excitement and the purest sentiment; next, the most indefatigable and successful practical activity amidst all perplexities and changes of outward life; and, thirdly, that facility and beauty in representing thought which is the prerogative of the genuine poet; but this threefold combination we find realized in Isaiah as in no other man, nor can we see in the trances which we can perceive of the concealed joint-working of these three powers we must draw our conclusions as to the original greatness of his genius. — Both as prophet and as author Isaiah stands upon that calm, sunny height, which in each several branch of ancient literature one eminently favored spirit at the right time takes possession of; which seems as it were to have been waiting "for him and which, when he came and mounted the ascent, seems to keep and guard him to the last as its own right man. In the sentences which he expresses, in the topics of his discourses, and in the manner of expression, Isaiah uniformly reveals himself as the Kingly Prophet.

"In reference to the last named point, it cannot be said that his manner of representing thought is elaborate or artificial; it rather shows a lofty simplicity and an unconcern about external attractiveness, abandoning itself freely to the leading and requirement of each several thought; but nevertheless it always rolls along in a full stream which overpowers all resistance, and never fails at the right place to accomplish at every turn its object without toil or effort.

"The progress and development of the discourse is always majestic, achieving much with few words, which though short are yet clear and transparent; an overflowing, swelling fullness of thought, which might readily lose itself in the vast and indefinite, but which always at the right time with tight rein collects and tempers its exuberance; to the bottom exhausting the thought and completing the utterance, and yet never too diffuse. This severe self-control is the most admirably seen in those shorter utterances, which, by briefly sketched images and thoughts, give us the vague apprehension of something infinite, whilst nevertheless they stand before us complete in themselves and clearly delineated; c. g., viii. 6-ix. 8, xiv. 29-32, xviii. 1-7, xxi. 11, 12; while in the long piece, xxviii.-xxxii., if the composition here and there for a moment languishes, it is only felt itself up as in no other man, and then suddenly thrusts itself into perfect clearness; — a characteristic which belongs to this prophet alone, a freedom of language which with no one else so easily succeeds.

"The versification in like manner is always full, and yet strongly marked; while however this prophet is little concerned about anxiously weighing out to each verse its proper number of words; not infrequently he repeats the same word in two members (xxxi. 8, xxxii. 17, xii. 3, xiv. 13), as if, with so much power and beauty in the matter within, he did not so much require a painstaking finish in the outside. The structure of theストップはalways easy and beautifully rounded.

"Still the main point lies here, — that we cannot in the case of Isaiah, as in that of other prophets, specify any particular peculiarity, or any favorite

(Hist. of the Jews, i. 423, note, new Amer. ed.), David- ron, in his Introduction to the Old Testament (iii. 59), after a full discussion of the authorship, concludes as follows: Among all the prophetic writings, the first place in many respects is due to those of the younger Isaiah. . . . None has announced in such strains as his the downfall of all earthly powers; or [so] unfolded to the view of the sifting the transcendency of Jehovah in salvation which should arise upon the remnant of Israel, forsaken and persecuted. None has penetrated so far into the essence of the new dispensation. . . . There is majesty in his sentiments, beauty and force in his language, propriety and elegance in his imagery. . . . Delitzsch, one of the most orthodox and conservative of the modern German theologians, in his elaborate article on Isaiah in Fairbairn's Interpretative Dictionary, maintains that all the prophecies in the book which bear the name of Isaiah are solely ascribed to him; but also remarks that, on the contrary supposition, "the prophetic discourses in this book are written with such a style that they could not necessarily lose anything of their predictive character and of their incomparable value. Their anonymous author might pass for another prophet, or even for the greatest of the Old Testament. We have no doctrinal reasons which would forbid us to distinguish in the book of Isaiah prophecies of Isaiah himself, and prophecies of anonymous prophets annexed to these." Fairbairn, i. 165, 45. He is of opinion that the prophets of the Old Testament are the authors of the book of Proverbs, "where, under the name of Solomon, the golden pearls of different times and of several authors are arranged beside one another, just as in the last centuries of our own the pearls are collected under the burden of David, the father of lyric poetry." So Prof. Stuart observes, "It is little of no theological or doctrinal importance which way this question is decided" (Ort. Hist. of the Old Testament, p. 104). On this subject see also the excellent remarks of Stanley, in his Note "On the Authorship of the Books of the Old Testament," appended to vol. i. of his History of the Jewish Church.
color as attaching to his general style. He is not the especially lyrical prophet, or the especially elegiac prophet, or the especially oratorical and harangue prophet, as we should describe a Joel, a Hosea, a Micah, with which the orators of the ancients are so enigmatical to us. He can only make himself heard utterly by the means which he feels he possesses as his subject-matter. This calmsness, however, no way demands that the strain shall not, when occasion requires, be more vehemently excited and assails the hearer with mightier blows; but even the extremest excitement, which does here and there intervene, is in the main bridled still by the same spirit of calmsness, and, not overstepping the limits which that spirit assigns, it soon with lofty self-control returns back to its wonted tone of equality (ii. 10-12, i. xxvi. 11-23, xxix. 9-14). Neither does this calmsness in discourse require that the subject shall always be treated only in a plain, level way, without any variation of form: rather, Isaiah shows himself master in just that variety of manner which suits the relation in which his hearers stand to the matter now in hand. If he wishes to bring home to their minds a distant truth which they like not to hear, and to judge them by a sentence pronounced by their own mouth, he retreats back into a popular statement of a case drawn from ordinary life (vv. 1-5, xxviii. 23-29). If he will draw the attention of the otherwise to some new truth, or to some future prospect, he surpises them by a brief oracle clothed in an enigmatical dress, leaving it to their penetration to discover its solution (vii. 14-16, xxix. 1-8). When the unhappy temper of people's minds which nothing can amend leads to loud lamentation, his speech becomes for a while the strain of elegy and lament (i. 21-23, xiii. 4, 5). Do the frivolous leaders of the people mock? - he outdoes them at their own weapons, and crushes them under the fearful earnest of divine mockery (xxviii. 10-13). Even a single ironed word in passing will drop from the lofty prophet (xvii. 3, glory). Thus his discourse varies into every complexion: it is its soul and stern, didactic and threatening, mourning and again exulting in divine joy, mocking and earnest; but ever at the right time it returns back to its original elevation and reposes, and never loses the clear ground-color of its divine seriousness."

In this delineation of Isaiah's style, Ewald contemplates exclusively the Isaiah of i.-xxxix., in which part of the book itself, however, there are several passages of which he will not allow Isaiah to be the author. These are the following: xii., xiii. 2-xiv. 23, xxi. 1-10, xxiv.-xxvi., xxv., xxvi. In reference to all these passages, with the exception of the first, the ground of objection is obvious upon a moment's observation of the contents; on rationalistic views of prophecy, none of them can be ascribed to Isaiah. For the proof of their genuineness it is sufficient to refer to Dreschler's Prophet Jesaias, or to Keil's Einleitung. We cannot however dismiss without mention the argument which the honesty of Ewald's esthetic judgment forms the style of nearly all these passages. He pronounces the magnificent denunciation of Babylon, xiii. 2-xiv. 23, to be referable to the same author as the prediction of Babylon's overthrow in xxi. 1-10, and both as alike remarkable for "the poetical facility of the words, images, and sentiments," particularizing xiv. 6-29 especially as "an ode of high poetical melancholy with which he traces much that "rejoices words of the genuine Isaiah."

If we refer to that part of Ewald's Propheten which treats of xl.-lxi., which he ascribes to "the Great Unnamed," the terms in which he speaks of its style of composition do not fall far short of those which he has employed respecting the former part. "Creative as this prophet is in his views and thoughts, he is not less peculiar and new in his language, which at times is highly inspired, and carries away the reader with a wonderful power.

Although, after the general manner of the later prophets, the discourse is apt to be too diffuse in delineation; yet, on the other side, it often moves confusedly and heavily, owing to the over-crowding fullness of fresh thoughts continually streaming in. But whenever it rises to a higher strain, as e. g. xl., xli. 1-4, it then attains to such a pure luminous sublimity, and carries the hearer away with such a wonderful charm of diction, that one might be ready to fancy he was listening to another prophet altogether, if other grounds did not convince us that it is one and the same prophet speaking, only in different moods of feeling. In no prophet does the mood in the composition of particular passages so much vary, as throughout the three separate sections into which this part of the book is divided, while under vehement excitement the prophet presents the most diverse objects. It is his business at different times, to comfort, to exhort, to shame, to chasten; to show, as out of heaven, the heavenly image of the Servant of the Lord, and, in contrast, to sour the folly and base groveling of imageworship; to teach what conduct the times require, and to rebuke those who linger behind the occasion, and then also to draw them along by his own example, in his prayer, exhortation, confession, thus smoothing for the approach to the exalted object of the New Time. Thus the complexion of the style, although hardly anywhere passing into the representation of visions properly so called, varies in a constant interchange; and rightly to recognize these changes is the great problem for the interpretation." (Propheten, vol. ii. 407-409). For obvious reasons we have preferred citing the esthetic judgments of so accomplished a critic as Ewald, to attempting any original criticism of our own; and this all the more willingly, because the inference to be drawn from the above cited passages (the reader will please especially to mark the sentences which we have put into italics) is clear, that in point of style, after taking account of the considerations already stated by us, we can find no difficulty in recognizing in the second part the presence of the same plastic genius as well as in the first. And, altogether, the esthetic criticism of all the different parts of the book brings us to the conclusion substantiated by the evidence previously accumulated; namely, that the whole
of the book originated in one mind, and that mind
one of the most sublime and variously gifted in-
struments which the Spirit of God has ever em-
ployed to pour forth its voice upon the world.
V. The following are the most important works on Isaiah: Vitringa’s Commentarius in Librum
Prophetiarum Isaias, 2 vols. fol. 1714, a vast mine of materials; Rosenmüller’s Scholia, 1818–1820
[3d ed., 1821–34], or his somewhat brief Scholia in
Compendium reducta, 1831, which, though ra-
tionalistic, is [are] sober, and valuable in particular
for the full use which he makes of Jerome and the
Jewish expositors; Gesenius’s Philologisch-kritis-
er und historischer Commentar, 1821 [and
Übersetzung, 2 v. Aug., 1829]; Hitzig’s Prophet
Isaias überzett und ausgeg.’d, 1833, and Knobel,
1843 [3d ed. 1861], in the Kurzgeziefites Engel-
schen Handbuch zum Alten Testament, which are
all three decidedly skeptical, but for lexical and his-
torical materials are of very great value; Ewald’s
Propheten des Alten Bundes [1840–41, 2d Aug.,
1867–68], which, though likewise skeptical, is
absolutely indispensable for a just appreciation of
the poetry; the second volume of Hengstenberg’s Christ-
oblog, translated in Clark’s Foreign Theological
Library, 1856; Precherus’s Prophet Jesaias über
und erklärt, now in course of publication [com-
pleted after the author’s death by F. Delitzsch
and A. Hahn, and V. Thiele, 1848–57]. For
Jesaias nicht Darmest.-Jesaias, 1859–51, which is
a commentary on the last 27 chapters. The two
chief English works are Bishop Lowth’s Isaias, a
new translation, with Notes, Critical, Philological,
and Expository, 1778 [13th ed., 1842], (whose
incessant correction of the Hebrew text is con-
stantly to be mistrusted), and Dr. Eleazer Hen-
derson’s Translation and Commentary, 2d ed.,
1857.
* The strong internal evidence of the common
origin of the various writings attributed to Isaiah
is of a cumulative character, and (especially as re-
quiring often for its just presentation the aid of
exegesis) can only be adequately exhibited at con-
siderable length. A few of the more prominent
points of the argument, in addition to those above
given, may be here alluded to.
It is a consideration of no little weight, that
many of the representations which are most strik-
ingly characteristic of the second port are but fur-
tier developments of thoughts that are more or
less clearly suggested in the first. Thus the Cap-
tivity and the restoration, so largely and variously
dwelt upon in the disputed portions, are distinctly
predicted in ch. vi. 11–13, as well as intimated in
other passages of which Isaiah is unhesitatingly
admitted to be the author. Even the view pre-
sented of the Servant of Jehovah, which is perhaps
the most distinctive feature of the second port, and
which, combining as it does elements at first sight
wholly irreconcileable with one another, has always
been the stumbling-block of expositors, is, when
rightly regarded, but a further unfolding of the
conception which Gesenius, Ewald, and Knobel
find in ch. xi. of the organic relation subsisting be-
tween the (ideal) Messiah and his people — the same
conception, substantially, which Ewald, Hitzig,
and Knobel find in viii. 8 and ix. 6, and which Ewald
recognizes even in vi. 14.
In xlviii. 28–4x. 13 we find the thought expanded
and applied to Cyrus which occurs in another form
with a different application in x. 5–7. Compare
here also xlvii. 11, lv. 16. The elements of the
representation of the new heaven and the new earth
in lv. 17–25 are found in xvs. 6–9 and elsewhere.
The magnificent representations, ch. lx. and else-
where, of the glory of Jehovah being made the light
and the defense of his people, have their germ in lv. 5.
In like manner the predictions in xliii. 6, xlv.
22, and lvii. 20 are framework in xlv. 12. Compare
also xlv. 9–11 with xlv. 23, and xxix. 29, xlv.
9–20 with vi. 8; lviii. 17 with vi. 10.
One of the most prominent characteristics of
style, binding together the various portions of the
book, is the frequent occurrence of the expression,
The Holy One of Israel. This designation of
Jehovah is found out of Isaias but six times: 2 K. xiv.
22: Ps. xlvii. 12, xlviiii. 41, lxxvi. 18; Jer. i. 29,
l. 5. In the first of these passages it is put into
the mouth of the Servant himself. In the passages of
Jeremiah, the whole intermediate context exhibits
an expansion of the thoughts of Isaiah, sometimes
presented even in his own language, yet in such a
manner as to suggest that Jeremiah was not (as
Hengstenberg affirms) imitating, but only writing
with the impression full upon his mind of the
utterances of his great predecessor. It deserves to
be noticed that by such critics as Ewald, J. Ob-
hansen, and Hitzig, the Isaias where the expres-
sion occurs are all assigned to a period later than
the time of Isaiah. According to this view the
expression must in all probability have originated
with Isaias.
Another remarkable peculiarity observable in the
different portions of Isaiah is the frequent use of
the formula to be named in the sense of to be.
Such coincidences as these cannot have arisen in
accident, which Dr. De Wette substantially
agrees, attempting to account for them, con-
jectures that there may have been an imitation of
the earlier writer by the later, or, as he supposes
with more probability, an attempt by a later hand
to bring the various portions of the book into
mutual conformity. But the former supposition,
if consistently carried out and applied to all cases
of marked resemblance occurring in these writings,
must lead to results which no one capable of recog-
nizing the impress of independent thought can pos-
sibly admit. The latter supposition is simply ab-
surd. No proper parallel to such a procedure can
be found in the history of ancient literature. Ge-
seenius refers indeed to the traces of a conforming
and xxxii. 18–22. That there is a connection be-
tween these passages can hardly be denied. Nor is there any
room to question that the great conception embodied
in Isaias xiv is an original conception. We need not
affirm that in the later prophet there is any conscious
imitation. But in the many and varied repetitions of
Ezekiel we hear beyond all reasonable doubt the rever-
berations of that majestic strain in which Isaias
has described the descent of the king of Babylon to the
region of the dead.
D. S. T.
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vand in the punctuation of 81717 and 772 in the Pentateuch. But it is not necessary to point out how wide is the difference between the correction of what was supposed to be an error in a single letter, and the radical changes which upon the supposition in question must have been made by the "conforming hand" in such passages as lix. 5, lixi. 2, 4.

To say nothing of the difficulty there is in imagining an adequate motive for such a proceeding, the procedure itself implies a habit of critical observation which was wholly foreign to the spirit of the times. And those who can suppose a Jewish reader living two or three centuries before Christ, to have thus placed himself by anticipation at the stand-point of modern criticism, ought to find no difficulty in conceiving that a prophet writing in the time of Hezekiah should take his position amidst the scenes of the Captivity, and should announce the name of the deliverer. 9

While there are confessionally marked peculiarities, both of thought and diction, exhibited in the later portions of the prophetic writings attributed to Isaiah, and to some extent in the other portions also of which the genuineness has been called in question, the uncertain nature of the argument they furnish is sufficiently shown by a comparison of the widely different conclusions which different critics of the same school have formed in view of them. A very striking comparison of this kind is presented by Alexander in his Commentary, vol. i. pp. xxvii., xxviii.

The array of linguistic evidence in proof of a diversity of authorship, which has gradually grown within the last century into the formidable proportions in which it meets us in the pages of Knobel and others, rests very largely upon an assumption which none of these critics have the hardihood distinctly to vindicate, namely, that within the narrow compass of the Hebrew literature that has come down to us from any given period, we have the means for arriving at an accurate estimate of all the resources which the language at that time possessed. When we have eliminated from the list of words and phrases relied upon to prove a later date than the time of Isaiah, everything the value of which to the argument must stand or fall with this assumption, there remains absolutely nothing which may not be reasonably referred to the reign of Hezekiah. Indeed, considering all the circumstances of the times, it might justly have been expected that the traces of foreign influence upon the language would be far more conspicuous in a writing of this date than they actually are in the controverted portions.

It is to be remembered that the ministry of the prophet must have extended through a period, of the latest calculation, of nearly fifty years; 10 a period signalized, especially during the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, by constant and growing intercourse with foreign nations, thus involving continually new influences for the corruption of public morals and new dangers to the state, and making it incumbent upon him who had been divinely constituted at once the political adviser of the nation and its religious guide, to be habitually and intimately conversant among the people, so as to desery upon the instant every additional step taken in their downward course and the first approach of each new peril from abroad, and to be able to meet each successive phase of their necessities with forms of instruction, admonition, and warning, not only in their general purport, but in their very style and diction, accommodated to conditions hitherto unknown, and that were still perpetually changing. Now when we take all this into the account, and then imagine to ourselves the prophet, toward the close of this long period, entering upon work which in some respects a novel kind of labor, and writing out, with a special view to the benefit of a remote posterity, the suggestions of that mysterious Theopneustia to which his lips had been for so many years the channel of communication with his contemporaries, far from finding any difficulty in the diversities of style perceptible in the different portions of his prophecy, we shall only see fresh occasion to admire that native strength and grandeur of intellect, which have still left upon productions so widely remote from each other in the time and circumstances of their composition, so plain an impress of one and the same overmastering individuality.

Probably there is not one of all the languages of the globe, whether living or dead, possessing any considerable literature, which does not exhibit instances of greater change in the style of an author, writing at different periods of his life, than appears upon a comparison of the later prophecies of Isaiah with the earlier.

D. S. T.

(see Bertholdt, Ens. pp. 189, 185) that Isaiah and other prophets often transfer themselves in spirit into future times, lay great stress upon the alleged fact that the writer here deals exclusively with a period which in the age of Isaiah was yet future. But in addition to the considerations in relation to this point presented in the preceding article, see ib. pp. 1155, 1156, lxxiv. 11. May be added as plainly implying that at the time the prophet wrote, Jehovah had as yet for borne to punish his rebellious people, and that his for bearing had only been abused. The last clause of the first verse is also most naturally explained as containing an intimation of coming judgment. Still further, the only explanation of ver. 9 which satisfies all the demands of the passage makes it refer to the attempts of the people, in the age preceding the Captivity, to strengthen themselves by foreign alliances and these attempts are spoken of as being made by the contemporaries of the prophet. It is also strongly implied in lxi. 5, 7, and still more strongly in lxxvi. 3, 6, 20 (last clause), that the Temple was yet standing.

D. S. T.
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Stanley's description of Isaiah (Jewish Church, ii. 494-504) presents him as one of the greatest figures on the page of history. A few sentences may be quoted, showing the universality of Isaiah's ideas and sympathies and the reach of his prophetic vision. "First of the prophets, he and those who followed him seized with unreserved confidence the mighty thought, that not in the chosen people, so much as in the nations outside of it, was to be found the ultimate well-being of man, the surest favor of God. Truly might the Apostle say that Isaiah was 'very bold' — 'bolder beyond' (Acts xx. 29) all that had gone before him — in enlargeing the boundaries of the church; bold with that boldness, and large with that largeness of view which, so far from weakening the hold on things divine, strengthens it to a degree unknown in less comprehensive minds. For to him also, with a distinctiveness which makes all other anticipations look pale in comparison, a distinction which grew with his advancing years, was revealed the coming of a Son of David, who should restore the royal house of Judah and gather the nations under its sceptre. . . . Lineament after lineament of that Divine Rider was gradually drawn by Isaiah or his scholars, until at last a Figure stands forth, so marvelously combined of power and gentleness and suffering as to present in the unifying idea of his Prophecy the moral features of an historical Person, such as has been, by universal confession, known once, and once only, in the subsequent annals of the world."—H. and A.

ISCAR'IOI'T. [see who looks about, or peers]: Ἰςκαρ'ίότ (Isch. Ἰςκαρ'ίότ), daughter of Hanan the brother of Abram, and sister of Milcah and of Lot (Gen. xi. 21). In the Jewish traditions as preserved by Josephus (Ant. i. 6, § 5), Jerome (Quast. in genesh., and the Targum Pseudo-jonathan — not to mention later writers — she is identified with SARAH.

ISCAR'IOI'T. [Judah Iscariot].
ISDAEL

ISDAEL (Israel; Gaddathel), 1 Esdr. v. 33, [Giddel, 2].

ISH'BAH (ישב) [praising]: a 'Ishbâ: [Vat. Masreth; Alex. Iesbâ: leshbî], a man in the line of Judah, commemorated as the "father of Eshtemoa" (1 Chr. iv. 17); but from whom he was immediately descended is, in the very confused state of this part of the genealogy, not to be ascertained. The most feasible conjecture is that he was one of the sons of Mered by his Egyptian wife Bethulah. (See Bertheau, Chronik, ad loc.)

ISH'BAK (ישבך) [leaving behind]. Ishbâk: [Alex. in Chr., Israel: Jeoboc], a son of Abraham and Ketarah (Gen. xxv. 2: 1 Chr. i. 32), and the progenitor of a tribe of northern Arabia. The settlements of this people are very obscure, and we can only suggest as possible that they may have been recovered in the name of the valley called Sabak, or, it is said, Silah (סΪלא) in the Dahmah (אֶדמְחָה) and (Murskâh, s. v.). The Heb. root יִשְׁבַּךְ corresponds to the Arabic يِسْبَك سِبَق signifies: therefore identifications with names derived from the root ֶשְׁבַּך are improbable. There are many places of the latter derivation, as Shebek (שֵַּבָך), Shibik (שֵַּבָך), and Eshek (אֶשֶּבָך).

Shebak (אֶשֶּבָך): the last having been supposed (as by Rumsen, Biblebeek, i. pt. ii. 53) to preserve a trace of Ishbak. It is a fortress in Arabia Petraea; and is near the well-known fortress of the Crusader's times called El-Karak.

The Dahmah, in which is situate Sabak, is a fertile and extensive tract, belonging to the Benceneem, in Nejd, or the highland, of Arabia, on the northeast of it, and the borders of the great desert, reaching from the rugged tract (= "hazm") of Yensoo'ah to the sands of Yebreen. It contains much pasturage, with comparatively few wells, and is greatly frequented by the Arabs when the vegetation is plentiful (Meshkarâk and Murskâh, s. v.). There is, however, another Dahnah, nearer to the Ephraths (ib.), and some confusion may exist regarding the true position of Sabak; but either Dahnah is suitable for the settlements of Ishbak.

The first-mentioned Dahmah lies in a favorable portion of the widely-stretching country known to have been peopled by the Ketaranites. They extended from the borders of Palestine even to the Persian Gulf, and traces of their settlements must be looked for all along the edge of the Arabian peninsula, where the desert merges into the cultivable land, or (itself a rocky undulating plateau) rises to the wild, mountainous country of Nejd. Ishbak seems from his name to have preceded or gone before his brethren: the place suggested for his dwelling is far away towards the Persian Gulf, and penetrates also into the peninsula. On these, as well as mere etymological grounds, the identification is sufficiently probable, and every way better than that which connects the patriarch with Esh-bhâk, etc.

E. S. P.

ISH-BI-BENOB

ISH-BI-BENOB (ишь-беноб, Keri, ישיבנווב) [dwelling in rest]: Iesbi: [Alex. Iesi'eb or Nosbi: Jesb-benob], son of Kaplah, one of the race of Philistine giants, who attacked David in battle, but was slain by Abishai (2 Sam. xxii. 16, 17).

H. W. P.

ISH-BOSETH (ישבשׁ) [see infra]: Ishbô: [in 2 Sam. ii. Alex. Ishbôth or Esib, Comp. 'Iserbôth of Gihon in 2 Sam. vii. iv., Vat. Meuph-bôthi: Alex. Mephibôthi: Jebueth], the youngest of Saul's four sons, and his legitimate successor. His name appears (1 Chr. viii. 33, ix. 39) to have been originally Ish-ba'al, הַשָּׁבָאֵל, the son of Ral, whether this indicates that Ral was used as equivalent to Jehovah, or that the reverence for Ral still lingered in Israelish families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name (Ish-boseth, "the man of shame") by which he is commonly known, must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandalous sound of Ral from the name of an Israelite king, and superseding it by the contemptuous word "shame" (Boseth). This latter was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (Jer. iii. 24, 15; Hos. ix. 10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (Judg. viii. 35) into Jerubbâhešt, (2 Sam. xi. 21); Meribâl (2 Sam. iv. 4) into Mephiboseth (1 Chr. viii. 34, ix. 40). The last three cases all occur in Saul's family. He was 35 years of age at the time of the battle of Gihon (in which his father and three eldest brothers perished); and therefore, according to the law of Oriental, though not of European succession, ascended the throne, as the oldest of the royal family, rather than Mephiboseth, son of his elder brother Jonathan, who was a child of five years old. He was immediately taken under the care of Abner, his powerful kinsman, who brought him to the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim on the east of the Jordan, beyond the reaches of the victorious Philistines (2 Sam. ii. 8). There was a momentary doubt even in those remote tribes whether they should not close with the offer of David to be their king (2 Sam. ii. 7, iii. 17). But this was overruled in favor of Ish-boseth by Abner (2 Sam. iii. 17), who then for five years slowly but effectually restored the dominion of the house of Saul over the Transjordanite territory, the plain of Esdraelon, the central mountains of Ephraim, the frontier tribe of Benjamin, and eventually "over all Israel" (except the tribes of Judah, 2 Sam. ii. 9). Ish-boseth was then "40 years old when he began to reign over Israel, and reigned two years" (2 Sam. ii. 10). This form of expression is used only for the accession of a fully recognized sovereign (comp. in the case of David, 2 Sam. ii. 4, and v. 4).

During these two years he reigned at Mahanaim, though only in name. The wars and negotiations with David were entirely carried on by Abner (2 Sam. ii. 12, iii. 6, 12). At length Ish-boseth accused Abner (whether rightly or wrongly does not appear) of an attempt on his father's conscience, Rizpâh; which, according to oriental usage, amounted to treason (2 Sam. iii. 7; comp. 1 K. ii. 13; 2 Sam. xvi. 21, xx. 9). Abner resented this suspicion as a hint of treason, which, venturing itself in a solemn vow to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul to the house of David.
ISHI

Ishbosheth was too much cowed to answer; and when, shortly afterwards, through Abner’s negotiation, David demanded the restoration of his former wife, Michal, he at once tore his sister from her reluctant husband, and committed her to Abner’s charge (2 Sam. iii. 14, 15).

The death of Abner deprived the house of Saul of their last remaining support. When Ish-bosheth heard of it, “his hands were feeble and all the Ishmaelites were troubled” (2 Sam. iv. 1).

In this extremity of weakness he fell a victim, probably, to a revenge for a crime of his father. The guard of Ish-bosheth, as of Saul, was taken from their own royal tribe of Benjamin (1 Chr. xii. 21). But amongst the sons of Benjamin were reckoned the descendants of the old Canaanish inhabitants of Beeoth, one of the cities in league with Gibea (2 Sam. iv. 2, 3). Two of those Beeothites, Kama and Rediah, in remembrance, it has been conjectured, of Saul’s slaughter of their kinsmen the Gibeonites, determined to take advantage of the helplessness of the royal house to destroy the only representative that was left, excepting the child Mephibosheth (2 Sam. iv. 4). They were “chiefs of the marauding troops” which used from time to time to attack the territory of Judah (comp. 2 Sam. iv. 2, iii. 22, where the same word is used; Vulg. principes i. e. omm.) [Benjamin, vol. i. p. 278 a; Gittaiim, vol. ii. p. 930]. They knew the habits of the king and court, and acted accordingly. In the stillness of an eastern noon they entered the palace, as if to carry off the wheat which was piled up near the entrance. The female slave, who, as usual in eastern houses, kept the wheat, heard the noise herself, ran out at first, hid in the heat of the day, fallen asleep at her task (2 Sam. iv. 5, 6, in LXX. and Vulg.). They stole in, and passed into the royal bedchamber, where Ish-bosheth was asleep on his couch. They stabbed him in the stomach, cut off his head, made their escape, all that afternoon, all that night, down the valley of the Jordan (Arab. A. V. “plain”); (2 Sam. iv. 7), and presented the head to David as a welcome present. They met with a stern reception. David rebuked them for the cold-blooded murder of an innocent man, and ordered them to be executed; their hands and feet were cut off, and their bodies suspended over [prob. by or near] the tank at Hebron. The head of Ish-bosheth was carefully buried in the sepulchre of his great kinsman Abner, at the same place (2 Sam. iv. 9–12). A. P. S.

ISHI (יִשִּׁי, [saving, subduing]; Jesi). 1. (Ishuajah; Alex. Iesuaj). A man of the descendants of Judah, son of Appaim (1 Chr. iii. 31); one of the great house of Hezon, and therefore a near connection of the family of Jesse (comp. 9–13). The only son here attributed to Ishi is Sheshan.

2. (Zeri; [Vat. Zeri]; Alex. Ezr; [Comp. leresi]). In a subsequent genealogy of Judah we find another Ishi, with a son Zophah (1 Chr. iv. 20). There does not appear to be any connection between the two.

3. (Ieri; [Vat. Iereth]; Alex. Ieret). Four sons of the Bena-Ishi [sons of 1.], of the tribe of Simeon, are named in 1 Chr. iv. 42 as having headed an expedition of 500 of their brethren who took Mount Seir from the Amalekites, and made it their own abode.

ISHMAEL

ISHI’AH (יִשְׁיָעַה, [restoration, return] (Vat. Jesia), i.e. Ishiyah [whom Jehovah beings, perh. with the idea of children as a trust]; Jesia; [Vat. corrupt: Jesit]); the fifth of the five sons of Ishiah; one of the heads of the tribe of Issachar in the time of David (1 Chr. viii. 4). The name is identical with that elsewhere given as Ishiyah, Ishshiah, Issiah.

ISHIJAH (יִשְׁיָה, [as above] ;[Vat. Fa. Iesuah]; Alex. Iesuah; Josse), a lay Israite of the Bene-Harim [sons of II.], who had married a foreign wife, and was compelled to relinquish her (Ezr. x. 31). In Ebrus the name is IsaAS.

This name appears in the A. V. under the various forms of Ishiah, Ishshiah, Jesiah.

ISHMA (יִשְׁמָא, [castle, desert, Ges.]; Jesu); Iesuaj (Vat. Parea); Alex. Ieroused; Jesem), a name in the genealogy of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 3). The passage is very obscure, and in the case of many of the names it is difficult to know whether they are of persons or places. Ishma and his companion appear to be closely connected with Bethlehem (see ver. 4).

ISHMAEL (יִשְׁמָעֵל, whom God hears; Iesuajah; Ismael), the son of Abraham by Hagar, his concubine, the Egyptian; born when Abraham was fourscore and six years old (Gen. xvi. 10, 16). Ishmael was the first-born of his father; in ch. xv. we read that he was then childless, and there is no apparent interval for the birth of any other child; nor does the teaching of the narrative, besides the precise enumeration of the sons of Abraham as the father of the faithful, admit of the supposition. The saying of Sarah, also, when she gave him Hagar, supports the inference that until then he was without children. When he added and took a wife (A. V. “Then again Abraham took a wife,” xvii. 1, Kebran, is uncertain, but it is not likely to have been until after the birth of Isaac, and perhaps the death of Sarah. The conception of Ishmael occasioned the flight of Hagar [Hagar], and it was during her wandering in the wilderness that the angel of the Lord appeared to her, commanding her to return to her mistress, and giving her the promise, “I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that shall not be numbered for multitude.” and, “Ishmael shall be a wild ass of a desert, he and she shall bear a son, and shall call his name Ishmael, because the
Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man; his hand [will be] against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren" (xvi. 10-12).

Ishmael was born in Abraham's house, when he dwelt in the plain of Mamre; and on the institution of the covenant of circumcision, was circumcised, he being then thirteen years old (xvii. 25). With the institution of the covenant, God renewed his promise respecting Ishmael. In answer to Abraham's entreaty, when he cried, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" God assured him of the birth of Isaac, and said, "As for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall be heget, and I will make him a great nation" (xvii. 18, 20). Before this time, Abraham seems to have regarded his first-born child as the heir of the promise, his belief in which was counted unto him for righteousness (xv. 6); and although that faith shone yet more brightly after his passing weakness when Isaac was first promised, his love for Ishmael is recorded in the narrative of Sarah's expulsion of the latter: "And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son" (xxi. 11).

Ishmael does not again appear in the narrative until the weaning of Isaac. The latter was born when Abraham was a hundred years old (xii. 5), and as the weaning, according to eastern usage, probably took place when the child was between two and three years old, Ishmael himself must have been then between fifteen and sixteen years old. The age of the latter at the period of his circumcision, and at that of his expulsion (which we have now reached), has given occasion for some literary speculation. A careful consideration of the passages referring to it fails, however, to show any discrepancy between them. In Gen. xxvi. 25, it is stated that he was thirteen years old when he was circumcised; and in xxi. 14 (probably two or three years later), "Abraham . . . took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave [it] unto Hagar, putting [it] on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away." Here it is at least unnecessary to assume that the child was put on her shoulder, the construction of the Hebrew (mistranslated by the LXX., with whom seems to rest the origin of the question) not requiring it; and the sense of the passage renders it highly improbable: Hagar certainly carried the bottle on her shoulder, and perhaps the bread; she could hardly have also thus carried a child. Again, these passages are quite reconcilable with ver. 20 of the last quoted chapter, where Ishmael is termed "naath." A. V. "lad" (comp., for use of this word, Gen. xxxiv. 19 xxxvii. 2, xii. 12).

At the "time of the feast" made in celebration of the weaning, "Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had borne unto Abraham, mocking," and urged Abraham to cast out him and his mother. The patriach, comforted by God's renewed promise that of Ishmael he would make a nation, sent them both away, and they departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba. Here the water being spent in the bottle, Hagar cast her son under one of the desert shrubs, and went away a little distance, "for she said, Let me not see the death of the child," and wept. "And God heard the voice of the lad, and the angel of the Lord called to Hagar out of heaven," renewed the promise already thrice given, "I will make him a great nation," and "opened her eyes and she saw a well of water." This is miraculously saved from perishing by thirst, "God was with the lad; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness; and became an archer." It is doubtful whether the wanderers halted by the well, or at once continued their way to the "wilderness of Paran," where, we are told in the next verse to that just quoted, he dwelt, and where "his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt" (Gen. xxii. 9-21). This wife of Ishmael is not elsewhere mentioned; she was, we must infer, an Egyptian; and this second infusion of Hamitic blood into the progenitors of the Arab nation, Ishmael's sons, is a fact that has been generally overlooked. No record is made of any other wife of Ishmael, and failing such record, the Egyptian was the mother of his twelve sons, and daughter. This daughter, however, is called the "sister of Nebajoth" (Gen. xxviii. 9), and this limitation of the parentage of the brother and sister certainly seems to point to a different mother for Ishmael's other sons.4

---

1 The Heb. rendered "prince" in this case, is נֵֽעֶשׁ which signifies both a "prince" and the "leader," or "exemplify" of a tribe, or even of a family (Gen. xiv.); hence, it seems to mean the leader of a tribe, and Ishmael's twelve sons are enumerated in Gen. xxv. 15 "according to their nations," more correctly "peoples." מִֽעַן.

2 * The ambiguity lies in the A. V., rather than the original. According to the Hebrew construction (though a little peculiar), the expression "putting on her shoulder" should be taken as parenthesis, and that of "the child" be made the object of the first of the verbs which follow. Hence, this allusion to "the shrubs" of the desert brings out a picturesque trait of the narrative. The word so rendered (כַּדָּרָה) is still used in Arabic, unchanged. It is used, however, with some latitude, being a general designation for the shrub or bushy plants. These shrubby plants, which are of various kinds, are called generally כַּדָּרָה, as we speak of "bushes" the kind, however, most in use, and more than any other specifically designated, is the Sportium junceum. This is a tall shrub, growing to the height of eight or ten feet, of a close ramifications, but making a light shade, owing to the small size and lanceolate shape of its leaves. Its flowers are yellow, and its seeds edible. It grows in rocky places, usually where there is little moisture, and is widely diffused. We should expect to find it, of course, in a "wilderness" like that of Beer-sheba. But whether we understand by כַּדָּרָה this particular plant, whose light and insufficient shade would prove the only mitigation of the heat of the sun, or, in general, a bush or shrub, the allusion to it in Gen. xxv. 15 is locally exact, and explains why the mother sought such a shelter for the child. It might also be understood of Genista monosperma, the Retam of the Arabs, which furnished a shade to the prophet Elijah (1 K. xix. 4, 5), and is spoken of in Ps. xxx. 4, and Job xxx. 4. This species is said to abound in the desert of Sinai, and is called in the Copt. being, in fact, mentioned with it in Job xxx. 4.

3 According to Rabbinical tradition, Ishmael put away his wife and took a second; and the Arabs.
ISHMAEL

1 Of the later life of Ishmael we know little. He was present with Isaac at the burial of Abraham; and Esau contrived an alliance with him when he was yet but a child, and he had Malakh (or Basmath or Basmath, Gen. xxxvi. 3) the daughter of Ishmael Abraham's son, the sister of Nebajoth, to be his wife; and this did Esau because the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac and Rebeckah, and Jacob in obedience to their wishes had gone to Laban to obtain his daughters a wife (Gen. xxxii. 6-9). The death of Ishmael is recorded in a previous chapter, after the enumeration of his sons, as having taken place at the age of one hundred and thirty-seven years; and, it is added, "he died in the presence of all his brethren" (Gen. xxxv. 17, 18). The alliance with Esau occurred before this event (although it is mentioned in a previous passage), for he "went unto Ishmael;" but it cannot have been long before, if the chronological data be correctly preserved.

The name of Ishmael occurs in the biblical tradition in the following contexts:

1. Ishmael is the son of Abraham and Hagar, born through the promise of God.
2. Ishmael is the father of many nations, of which the Arabian nation is the most prominent.
3. Ishmael is associated with the desert and the Arabian desert specifically.
4. Ishmael is mentioned in connection with the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

The story of Ishmael's life and his descendants is intertwined with the broader narrative of the Bible, particularly with the stories of his brother Isaac and his nephew Jacob. Ishmael's lineage is significant in the context of the covenant and the promises made to Abraham by God.

5. Abraham, the father of Ishmael, lived to be 175 years old (Gen. xxvii. 26).
6. Ishmael is not mentioned in the New Testament, but his descendants, the Arabian nation, are associated with the lineage of Jesus Christ through the genealogy given in Luke 3:38.

Tending from the frontier of Palestine east to the Euphrates, and south probably to the borders of Egypt and the Arabian peninsula. This question is discussed in art. RECHERCHES; and it is inter-woven, though obscurely, with the next subject, that of the names and settlements of the sons of Ishmael. See also KETURAH, etc.; for the "brethren" of Ishmael, in whose presence he dwelt and died, included the sons of Keturah.

2. The sons of Ishmael were, Nebajoth (expressly stated to be his first-born), Kedar, Adbeel, Mibsam, Mishma, Mizzah, Hidabor, Tema, Jetur, Nebaioth, Kedemoth, and Jerahmeel. Ishmael gave his first-born daughter named Malakh (xxxvi. 9), elsewhere written Bashmath (or Basmath, Gen. xxxvi. 3), the sister of Nebajoth, before mentioned. The sons are enumerated with the particular statement that these are their names, by their towns, and by their castles; twelve princes according to their nations or peoples (xxxvi. 16). In seeking to identify Ishmael's sons, this passage requires close attention: it bears the interpretation of their being the tranches of tribes, having towns and castles called after them; and identifications of the latter become therefore more than usually satisfactory. They dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as though going unto Assyria (xxxvii. 18), and it is certain, in accordance with this statement of their limits (see HAVILAH, ISIS), that they stretched in very early times across the desert to the Persian Gulf, peoples the north and west of the Arabian peninsula, and eventually formed the chief element of the Arab nation. Their language, which is generally acknowledged to have been the Arabic commonly so called, has been adopted with insignificant exceptions throughout Arabia. It has been said that the Bible requires the whole of that nation to be sprung from Ishmael, and the fact of a large admixture of Joktanite and even Cushite peoples in the south and southeast has been regarded as a suggestion of skepticism. Yet not only does the Bible contain no warrant for the assumption that all Arabs are Ishmaelites; but the characteristics of the Ishmaelites, strongly marked in all the more northern tribes of Arabia, and exactly fulfilling the prophecy "he will be a wild man; his hand [will] be against every man, and every man's hand against him," and which are predicated of all the peoples of Joktan and other descent. The true Ishmaelites, however, and even tribes of very mixed race, are thoroughly 'wild men,' living by warlike forays and plunder; dreaded by their neighbors; dwelling in tents, with hardly any household chattels, but rich in flocks and herds, migratory, and recognizing no law but the authority of the chief of their tribes. Even the religion of Mohammad is held in light esteem by many of the more remote tribes, among whom the ancient usages of their people obtain in almost
ISHMAEL

The old simplicity, besides idolatrous practices altogether repugnant to Mohammadanism as they are to the fate of the patriarchs; practices which may be ascribed to the influence of the Canaanites, of Moab, Ammon, and Edom, with whom, by inter-marriages, commerce, and war, the tribes of Ishmael must have had long and intimate relations.

The term Ishmaelite (イスマイリテ) occurs on three occasions, Gen. xxxvii. 25, 27, 28, xxviii. 1; Judg. viii. 24; Ps. lxxxiii. 6. From the context of the first two instances, it seems to have been a general name for the Abrahamic peoples of the east country, the Bene-Kedem; but the second admits also of a closer meaning. In the third instance the name is applied in its strict sense to the Ishmaelites. It is also applied to Jether, the father of Amasa, by David's sister Abigail (1 Chr. ii. 17). [ISHER]

The notions of the Arabs respecting Ishmael (イスマイル) are partly derived from the Bible, partly from the Jewish Rabbins, and partly from native traditions. The origin of many of these traditions is obscure, but a great number may be ascribed to the fact of Mohammad's having for political reasons claimed Ishmael for his ancestor, and striven to make out an impossible pedigree; while both he and his followers have, as a consequence of accepting this assumed descent, sought to exalt that ancestor. Another reason may be safely found in Ishmael's acknowledged headship of the naturalized Arabs, and this cause existed from the very period of his settlement. [ARABIA].

Yet the rivalry of the Joktanite kingdom of southern Arabia, and its intercourse with classical and mediæval Europe, the wandering and unsettled habits of the Ishmaelites, their having no literature, and, as far as we know, only a meagre oral tradition, all contributed, till the importance it acquired with the propagation of El-Islam, to render our knowledge of the Ishmaelite portion of the people of Arabia, before Mohammad, lamentably defective. That they maintained, and still maintain, a patriarchal and primitive form of life is known to us. Their religion, at least in the period immediately preceding Mohammad, was in central Arabia chiefly the grossest fetishism, probably learnt from aboriginal inhabitants of the land; southwards it diverged to the cosmic worship of the Joktanite Hynryettes (though these were far from being exempt from fetishism), and northwards (so at least in ancient times) to an approach to that true faith which Ishmael carried with him, and his descendants thus gradually lost. This last point is curiously illustrated by the numbers who, in Arabia, became either Jews (Carnites) or Christians (though of a very corrupt form of Christianity); and by the movement in search of the faith of the patriarchs which had been put forward, not long before the birth of Mohammad, by men not satisfied with Judaism or the corrupt form of Christianity, with which alone they were acquainted. This movement first arose in Mohammad, and was afterwards the main cause of his success.

The Arabs believe that Ishmael was the first born of Abraham, and the majority of their doctors (but the point is in dispute) assert that this son, and not Isaac, was offered by Abraham in sacrifice. The scene of this sacrifice is Mount 'Arafat, near Mekkeh, the last holy place visited by pilgrims, it being necessary to the completion of pilgrimage to be present at a sermon delivered there on the 9th of the Mohammedan month Zu-l-Hijeh, in common memorial of the offering, and to sacrifice a victim on the following evening after sunset, in the valley of Mina. The sacrifice last mentioned is observed throughout the Muslim world, and the day on which it is made is called "The Great Festival." (Mr. Lane's Mod. Egypt. ch. iii.) Ishmael, say the Arabs, dwelt with his mother at Mekkeh, and both are buried in the place called the "Hejr," on the northwest (termed by the Arabs the north) side of the Ka'bah, and inclosed by a curved wall called the "Hateem." Ishmael was visited at Mekkeh by Abraham, and there, together, they together rebuilt the temple, which had been destroyed by a flood. At Mekkeh, Ishmael married a daughter of Mudial or El-Mudial, chief of the Joktanite tribe Jurham [AL-MODAID; ARABIA], and had thirteen children [MIRIAEL-ZEBAIM, MS.], thus agreeing with the Biblical number, including the daughter.

Mohammad's descent from Ishmael is totally lost, for an unknown number of generations to Adam, of the twenty-first generation before the prophet: from him downwards the latter's descent is, if we may believe the genealogists, fairly proved. But we have evidence far more trustworthy than that of the genealogists; for while most of the natives of Arabia are unable to trace up their pedigrees, it is scarcely possible to find one who is ignorant of his race, seeing that his very life often depends upon it. The law of blood-revenge necessitates his knowing the names of his ancestors for four generations, but no more; and this law extending from time immemorial has made any confusion of race almost impossible. This law, it should be remembered, is not a law of Mohammad, but an old pagan law that he endeavored to suppress, but could not. In casting doubt on the prophet's pedigree, we must add that this cannot affect the proofs of the chief element of the Arab nation being Ishmaelite (and so too the tribe of Kureish of whom was Mohammad). Although partly mixed with Joktanites, they are more mixed with Keturahites, etc.; the characteristics of the Joktanites, as before remarked, are widely different from those of the Ishmaelites; and whatever theories may be induced to the contrary, we believe that the Arabs, from physical characteristics, language, the concurrence of native traditions (before Mohammadism made them untrustworthy), and the testimony of the Bible, are mainly and essentially Ishmaelite. [ISHMAEL.]

1. One of the sons of Azel, a descendant of Saul through Merib-baal, or Mephibosheth (1 Chr. viii. 38, ix. 44). See the genealogy, under SAUL.

2. [Vat. omits: ISMAEL.] A man of Judah, whose son or descendant ZEMADAI was ruler of the house of Judah in the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xix. 11).

3. [Vat. Ισμαήλ: ISAMÔ.] Another man of Judah, son of Jehohanan; one of the "captains (イスマイラ) of hundreds" who assisted Jehoiada in restoring Josiah to the throne (2 Chr. xxiii. 1).

4. [Vat. Σαμαχ: SAAMÔ.] A priest, of the Bnei-Pashur [sons of P''], who was forced...
by Ezra to relinquish his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 22).

6. [Lit. in 2 K. xxv. 25, Mezaph: Immoph.] The son of Nethaniah; a perfect marvel of craft and villanous, whose treachery forms one of the chief episodes of the history of the period immediately succeeding the first fall of Jerusalem. His exploits are related in Jer. xil. 7-xii. 15, with a short summary in 2 K. xxv. 23-25, and they read almost like a page from the annals of the late Indian mutiny.

His full description is a-Ismael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elissanna, of the seed royal of Judah (Jer. xil. 1; 2 K. xxv. 25). Whether by this is intended that he was actually a son of Zedekiah, or one of the later kings, or, more generally, that he had royal blood in his veins — perhaps a descendant of Elissanna, the son of David (2 Sam. v. 16) — we cannot tell. During the siege of the city he had, like many others of his countrymen (Jer. xi. 11), fled across the Jordan, where he found a refuge at Balaam, the then king of the Bene-Ammun (Jos. Antiq. x. § 2). Amnonite warriors were always found in the harem of the kings of Jerusalem (1 K. xi. 1), and Ishmael may have been thus related to the Amnonite court on his mother’s side. At any rate he was instigated by Balaam to the designs which he accomplished but too successfully (Jer. xil. 14; Antiq. x. § 3). Several bodies of Jews appear to have been lying under arms in the plains on the S. E. of the Jordan, during the last days of Jerusalem, watching the progress of affairs in Western Palestine, commanded by princes (of Judah), the chief of whom were Ishmael, and two brothers, Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah. Immediately after the departure of the Chaldean army these men moved across the Jordan to pay their respects to Gedaliah, whom the king of Babylon had left as superintendent (Jer. xlix. 2) of the province. Gedaliah had taken up his residence at Mizpah, a few miles north of Jerusalem, on the main road, where Jeremiah the prophet resided with him (xii. 6). The house would appear to have been isolated from the rest of the town. We can discern a high inclosed court-yard and a deep well within its precincts. The well was probably (Jer. xil. 9; comp 1 K. xxv. 22), and the

Jerome (Qu. Hebr. on 2 Chron. xxviii. 7) interprets this expression as meaning "of the seed of Moab." He gives the same meaning to the words "the King’s son" applied to Manasseh in the above passage. The question is an interesting one, and has been recently revived by Geiger (Uscherht, etc. p. 357), who extends it to other passages and persons. (Manasseh.) Jerome (as above) further says — perhaps on the strength of a tradition — that Ishmael was the son of an Egyptian slave, from a reason why the "seed royal" should hurl the meaning he gives it. This the writer has not hitherto succeeded in elucidating.

b So perhaps, taking it with the express statement of xil. 11, we may interpret the words "the forces which were in the field." (Jer. xil. 13), where the term rendered "the field" (יִּשְׁתַּקְנָה, yushkanah) is one used to denote the pasture grounds of Meab — the modern Beda — officer than any other district. See Gen. xxxvi. 35; Num. xxvi. 29; Ruth i. 1, and passim; 1 Chr. viii. 8; and Naeikey’s N. & S. F. Ap. § 15. The persistent use of the word in the semi-Moabite book of Ruth is alone enough to fix its meaning.

Ishmael made no secret of his intention to kill the superintendent, and usurp his position. Of this Gedaliah was warned in express terms by Josephus (Ant. x. 9, § 3). They all accordingly took Thirty days after (Ant. x. 9, § 4), in the seventh month (xil. 1), on the third day of the month — so says the tradition — Ishmael again appeared at Mizpah, this time accompanied by ten men, who were, according to the Hebrew text, "princes of the king" (תּוֹתֵעַ, tought), though this is omitted by the LXX. and by Josephus. Gedaliah entertained them at a feast (xil. 1). According to the statement of Josephus this was a very lavish entertainment, and Gedaliah became much intoxicated. It must have been a private one, for before its close Ishmael and his followers had murdered Gedaliah and all his attendants with such secrecy that no alarm was given outside the room. The same night he killed all Gedaliah’s establishment, including some Chaldean soldiers who were there. Jeremiah appears fortunately to have been absent, and, incredible as it seems, so well had Ishmael taken his precautions that for two days the massacre remained perfectly unknown to the people of the town. On the second day Ishmael perceived from his elevated position a large party coming southward along the main road from Shechem and Samaria. He went out to meet them. They proved to be eighty devotees, who with rent clothes, and with shaven beards, mutilated bodies, and other marks of heathen devotion, and weeping they went, were bringing incense and offerings to the ruins of the Temple. At his invitation they turned aside to the residence of the superintendent. And here Ishmael put into practice the same stratagem, which on a larger scale was employed by Mehemet Ali in the massacre of the Mamelukes at Cairo in 1806. As the unsuspecting pilgrims passed into the court-yard he closed the entrances

It is a pity that some different word is not employed to render this Hebrew term from that used in xil. 1 to translate one totally distinct.

d This is the LXX. version of the matter — οἱ αὐτοὶ ἱερέμων καὶ ἱερεῖς. The statement of the Hebrew Text and A. V. that Ishmael went is unintelligible.

e The Hebrew has יִשְׁתַּקְנָה, yushkanah, the city" (A. V. ver. 7). This has been read by Josephus יִשְׁתַּקְנָה — "court-yard." The alteration carries its genuineness in its face. The same change has been made by the Masoretes and is read (בַּקְנָה). It is safer to follow the text, with Hitzig, Umbreit, De Wette, and others. It is to be noted that in the Hebrew יִשְׁתַּקְנָה precedes יִשְׁתַּקְנָה, i. e. they came "into the midst of the city," so that they were completely in Ishmael’s power before the massacre took place. It was natural to mention that circumstance, but there is no obvious reason for speaking thus precisely of "the midst of the court-yard." That specification also seems to require the article before the genitive. The πρὸν [or ৎנ], the word is יִשְׁתַּקְנָה.
of Elpaal, and named as a chief man in the tribe (1 Chr. vii. 18).

ISH'DOD (יִשְׁדָּד, i. e. Ish-hod [man of renown]: 3 1 Sam.: [Vat. Isaiah]: Alex. Zosip: ri-von decovum), one of the tribe of Manasseh on the east of Jordan, son of Hammoleketh, i. e. the Queen, and, from his near connection with Gilead, evidently an important person (1 Chr. vii. 18).

ISH'PAN (ישֵׁפָן [perh. bold, Ges.; one strong, Furst.]: [Vat. Isaiah]: Alex. Ezra: Jeshubam), a Benjamite, one of the family of Shashak; named as a chief man in his tribe (1 Chr. viii. 22).

ISH'TOB (ישֶׁתֹב [see intrv.]: 1 Sam.; [Vat. Isaiah]: Joseph. Ishrobi: Ishob), apparently one of the small kingdoms or states which formed part of the great country of Aram, named with Zobah, Rehob, and Maacah (2 Sam. x. 6, 8).

In the parallel account of 1 Chr. xix. Ishiob is omitted. By Josephus (Ant. vii. 6, § 1) the name is given as that of a king. But though in the ancient versions the name is given as one word, it is probable that the real signification is "the man of Toor," a district mentioned also in connection with Amanon in the records of Jubilæus, and again perhaps, under the shape of Toorie or Turiente, in the history of the Macedeas.

G.

ISH'UAH (ישוע, [even, level, Ges.; resting peaceful, Dietr.]: [Vat. Isaiah]: Alex. Issa: Jesso), the second son of Asher (Gen. xxvi. 17). In the genealogies of Asher in 1 Chr. vii. 30 the name, though identical in the original, is in the A. V. given as Issau. In the lists of Num. xxvi., however, Issuah is entirely omitted.

* The word is properly Ishvah, and was probably intended by the translators of the A. V. to be so read, u being used in the edition of 1611 for v.

A.

ISH'UA'I [3 syl. (ישועי), i. e. Ishvi [see above]: 1 Sam.: [Vat. Isaiah]: Joseph. Issi: Jesse), the third son of Asher (1 Chr. vii. 30), founder of a family bearing his name (Num. xxvi. 44; A. V. "Jesse's".

His descendants, however, are not mentioned in the genealogy in Chronicles. His name is elsewhere given in the A. V. as Issi, Jesse, and (another person) Ishi.

G.

ISH'UI (ישועי, i. e. Ishvi [peaceful, quiet, Dietr.]: [Vat. Isaiah]: Joseph. Issi: Jesse), the second son of Saul by his wife Ahinoam (1 Sam. xxiv. 49, comp. 50): his place in the family was between Jonathan and MACHIHUAU. In the list of Saul's genealogy in 1 Chr. viii. and ix., however, the name of Ishui is entirely omitted; and in the sad narrative of the battle of Gilboa his place is occupied by Abinadab (1 Sam. xxxii. 2). We can only conclude that he died young.

The same name is elsewhere given in the A. V. as Issi, and Ishual. [In all these names u may have been intended by the translators of the A. V. to be read as v. See ISHUA'I. — A.]

G.

ISLE (אֵיל, יֵיל). The radical sense of the Hebrew word seems to be "habitable places," as opposed to water, and in this sense it occurs in Is. xlii. 15. Hence it means secondarily any maritime district, whether belonging to a continent or to an island: thus it is used of the shore of the Medi-
terranean (Is. xx. 6, xxiii. 2, 6), and of the coasts of Elisah ( Ez. xxvii. 7), i.e. of Greece and Asia Minor. In this sense it is more particularly restricted to the shores of the Mediterranean, sometimes in the fuller expression “islands of the sea” (Is. xi. 11), or “isles of the Gentiles” (Gen. x. 5; comp. Zeph. ii. 11), and sometimes simply as “isles” (Ps. lxii. 10; Ez. xxi. 15, 18, xxviii. 3, 35, xxxix. 6; Dan. xi. 18): an exception to this, however, occurs in Ez. xxviii. 15, where the shores of the Persian gulf are intended. Occasionally the word is specifically used of an island, as of Caphtor or Tivete (Jer. xlvii. 4), and oferina or Cyprus (Ez. xxv. 16, xxvii. 14), or of Israel as opposed to the mainland (Ezah. x. 1). But more generally it is applied to any region separated from Palestine by water, as fully described in Jer. xxv. 22, “the isles which are beyond the sea,” which were hence regarded as the most remote regions of the earth (Is. xxiv. 13, xiii. 10, lix. 18; compare the expression in Is. lxiv. 19, “the isles afar off”), and also in a more abstract sense (Is. xlii. 15; Ps. xxxvii. 1): the word is more particularly used by the prophets. (See J. D. Michaelis, Spieletegium, ii. 131-142.)

W. L. B.

ISMACIAH (יםיכאה), i.e. Isma-ya’im (from Jehovah supporteth) & ΣΜΑΧΙΑ (Vat. xer): Jeunachiah, a Levite who was one of the overseers of offerings, during the revival under king Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxxi. 13).


2. (ΣΩΜΑΙΟΣ: Ismaeas), 1 Esdr. ix. 22. (ISMAEL, 5.)

ISMAIAH (יהוסף), i.e. Ishaph (probably related to Issachar, a Levite, one of the chiefs of those warriors who relinquished the cause of Saul, the head of their tribe, and joined themselves to David, when he was at Z�hak (1 Chr. xii. 4). He is described as a hero (gibbor) among the thirty and over the thirty” — i.e. David’s body-guard: but his name does not appear in the lists of the guard in 2 Sam. xiii. and 1 Chr. xi. Possibly he was killed in some encounter before David reached the throne.

ISPAH (יהוסף), i.e. Ishb (perhaps related to Issachar, a Benjamite, of the family of Benjamin; one of the heads of his tribe (1 Chr. viii. 16).

ISRAEL (ישראל) [see Israel]: Israel.

1. The name given (Gen. xxxii. 28) to Jacob after his wrestling with the Angel ( Hos. xii. 4) at Peniel. In the time of Jerome (Quast. Hebr. in Gen. Opp. iii. 357) the signification of the name was commonly believed to be “the man (or the mind) seeing God.” But he prefers another interpretation, and paraphrases the verse after this manner: “Thy name shall not be called Jacob, Supplicator, but Israel, Prince with God.” For as I am a Prince, so thou that hast been able to wrestle with Me shall be called a Prince. But if with Me who am God (or an Angel) thou hast been able to contend, how much more [shall] thou (be able to contend) with men, i.e. with Kaon, whom thou oughtest not to dread?” The L. V. apparently following Jerome, writes יִשְׂרָאֵל, as a prince thou hast power;” but Rosenmuller and Gesenius give it the simpler meaning, “thou hast contended.” Gesenius interprets Israel “soldier of God.”

2. It became the national name of the twelve tribes collectively. They are so called in Ex. iii. 16 and elsewhere.

3. It is used in a narrower sense, excluding Judah, in 1 Sam. xi. 8. It is so used in the famous cry of the rebels against David (2 Sam. xx. 1), and against his grandson (1 K. xii. 16). Thenceforth it was accepted and assumed as the name of the Northern Kingdom, in which the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, Dan, and Simeon had no share.

4. After the Babylonian Captivity, the returned exiles and their sons they were mainly of the kingdom of Judah, resumed the name Israel as the designation of their nation; but as individuals they are almost always described as Jews in the Apocrypha and N. T. Instances occur in the Books of the Chronicles of the application of the name Israel to Judah (c. g. 2 Chr. xi. 3, xii. 6); and in Esther of the name Jews to the whole people. The name Israel is also used to denote it, and as by distinction from priests, levites, and other ministers (Ezr. vi. 10, ix. 1, x. 25; Neh. xi. 3, &c.).

W. T. B.

ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF. 1. The prophet Ahijah of Shiloh, who was commissioned in the latter days of Solomon to announce the division of the kingdom, led one tribe (Judah) to the house of David, and assigned ten to Jeroboam (1 K. iii. 35, 31). These were probably Joseph (= Ephraim and Manasseh), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, Gad, and Reuben; Levi being intentionally omitted. Eventually, the greater part of Benjamin, and probably the whole of Simeon and Levi, were annexed to Judah, as by distinction from priests, levites, and other ministers (Ezr. vi. 21).

2. The conquests of David, Moab appears to have been attached to the kingdom of Israel (2 K. iii. 4); so much of Syria as remained subject to Solomon (see 1 K. vi. 24) would probably be claimed by his successor in the northern kingdom; and Ammon, though connected with Rehoboam as his brother’s native land (2 Chr. xiii. 13), and distinguished from tributary to Judah (2 Chr. xxvii. 5), was at one time allied (2 Chr. xx. 1), we know not how closely, or how early, with Moab. The sea-coast between Archo and Japho remained in the possession of Israel.

3. The population of the kingdom is not expressly stated, and in drawing any inference from the numbers of fighting-men, we must bear in mind that the numbers in the Hebrew text of the O. T. are strongly suspected to have been subjected to extensive, perhaps systematic, corruption. Forty years before the division, the census taken by direction of David gave 800,000 including 2 Sam. xxiv. 9, or 1,000,000 according to 1 Chr. xxv. 5, as the number of fighting-men in Israel. Jeroboam, n. c. 357, brought into the field an army of 800,000 men (2 Chr. xiii. 7). The small number of the army of Jehoshaphat (2 K. xii. 7) is to be attributed to his compact with Hazael; for in the next reign Israel could spare a mercenary host ten times as numerous for the wars of Amaziah (2 Chr. xxv. 6).

Excav is scarcely correct in his remark that we know not what time of life is reckoned as the military age (Gezach. Isr. iii. 185): for it is defined in

—in Bp. Patrick proposes to reconcile these two numbers, by adding to the former 258,000 on account of David’s standing legions.
Joshua, the representatives of the two tribes, stand out side by side eminent among the leaders of the people. The blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 13), and the divine selection of Joshua inaugurated the greater prominence of Joseph for the next three centuries. Othniel, the successor of Joshua, was from Judah; the last, Samson, was born among the Ephraimites. Within that period Ephraim supplied at Shiloh (Judg. xxi. 19) a resting-place for the ark, the centre of divine worship; and a rendezvous, or capital at Shechem (Josh. xiv. 1; Judg. ix. 2) for the whole people. Ephraim arrogantly claimed (Judg. viii. 1, xii. 1) the exclusive right of taking the lead against invaders. Royal authority was offered to one dweller in Ephraim (vii. 22), and actually exercised for three years by another (ix. 22). After a silent, perhaps sullen, sequestration in the transfer of Samuel’s authority with additional dignity to a Benjamite, they resisted for seven years (2 Sam. ii. 9–11) its passing into the hands of the popular Jewish leader, and yielded reluctantly to the conviction that the sceptre which seemed almost within their grasp was reserved at last for Judah. Even in David’s reign their jealousy did not always slumber (2 Sam. xix. 40); and though Solomon’s alliance and intercourse with Tyre must have tended to increase the loyalty of the northern tribes, they took the first opportunity to emancipate themselves from the rule of his son. Distinguished the length of Solomon’s reign, and the clouds that gathered round the close of it (1 K. xi. 14–25), and possibly his increasing despotism (Ewald, Gesch. Isr. iii. 915), tended to diminish the general popularity of the house of David; and the idolatry of the king alienated the affection of religious Israelites. But none of these was the immediate cause of the disruption. No aspiration after greater liberty, political privileges, or aggrandizement at the expense of other powers, no spirit of commercial enterprise, no breaking forth of pent-up energy seems to have instigated the movement. Ephraim proudly longed for independence, without considering whether or at what cost he could maintain it. Shechem was built as a capital, and Tirzah as a residence, for an Ephraimitic king, by the people who murmured under the burden imposed upon them by the royal state of Solomon. Ephraim felt no patriotic pride in a national splendor of which Judah was the centre. The dwelling-place of God when fixed in Jerusalem ceased to be so honorable to him as of old. It was ancient jealousy rather than recent provocation, the opportune death of Solomon rather than unwillingness to incur taxation, the opportune return of a persecuted Ephraimitic rather than any commanding genius for rule which Jeroboam possessed, that finally broke up the brotherhood of the children of Jacob. It was an outburst of human feeling so soon as that divine influence which restrained the spirit of disunion was withdrawn in consequence of the idolatry of Solomon, so soon as that stern prophetic voice which had called Saul to the throne under a protest, and David to the throne in repentance, was heard in anger summoning Jeroboam to divide the kingdom.

\[a\] Mr. Rickman noticed that in 1821 and in 1831 the number of males under 25 years of age, and the number of males of 20 years of age and upwards, were nearly equal, and this proportion has been since regarded as invariable; or, it has been assumed, that the males of the age of 25 and upwards are equal in number to a fourth part of the whole population.\[b\] Census of Great Britain, 1851, Population Tables, II. Agric., etc., p. vi.

\[b\] On these seven places see Stanley’s S. & P., chaps. iv. v. and xi.
5. Disruption where there can be no expansion, or disenchantment without growth, is fatal to a state. If England and America have prospered since 1783 it is because each found space for increase, and had vital energy to fill it. If the separation of east and west was but a step in the decline of the Roman empire, it was so because each portion was hemmed in by obstacles which it wished to surmount. The sources of life and strength begin to disappear; the state shrinks within itself, withers, and dies before some blast which once it might have braved.

The kingdom of Israel developed no new power. It was but a portion of David's kingdom deprived of many elements of strength. Its frontier was as open and as widely extended as before; but it wanted a capital for the seat of organized power. Its territory was as fertile and as tempting to the spoiler, but its people were less united and patriotic. A corrupt religion poisoned the source of national life. When less reverence attended on a new and unconsecrated king, and less respect was felt for an aristocracy reduced by the retirement of the Levites, the army which David found hard to control rose up unchecked in the exercise of its willful strength; and thus eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in quick succession. Tyre ceased to be the ally who, as long as the alliance was profitable to the merchant-city, Moab and Ammon yielded tribute only while under compulsion. A powerful neighbor, Damascus, sat armed at the gate of Israel; and, beyond Damascus, might be discerned the rising strength of the first great monarchy of the world. These causes tended to increase the misfortunes, and to accelerate the early end of the kingdom of Israel. It lasted 234 years, from B.C. 975 to B.C. 741, about two thirds of the duration of its more compact neighbor Judah. But it may be doubted whether the division into two kingdoms greatly shortened the independent existence of the Hebrew race, or interfered with the purposes which, it is thought, may have been in the establishment of David's monarchy. If among these purposes were the preservation of the true religion in the world, and the preparation of an agency adapted for the diffusion of Christianity in due season, then it must be observed — first, that as a bulwark providentially raised against the corrupting influence of idolatrous Tyre and Damascus, Israel kept back that contagion from Judah, and partly exhausted it before its arrival in the south; next, that the purity of divine worship was not impaired by the evasion of those tribes which were remote from the influence of the Temple, and by the concentration of priests and religious Israelites within the southern kingdom; and lastly, that to the worshipers at Jerusalem the early decline and fall of Israel was a solemn and impressive spectacle of judgment — the working out of the great problem of God's toleration of idolatry. This prepared the heart of Judah for the revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, softened them when the event was not as Captivity, and strengthened them for their absolute renunciation of idolatry, when after seventy years they returned to Palestine, to teach the world that there is a spiritual bond more efficacious than the occupancy of a certain soil for keeping up national existence, and to become the channel through which God's greatest gift was conveyed to mankind. (1 Kings 12.)

6. The detailed history of the kingdom of Israel will be found under the names of its nineteen kings. [See Israel and Judah.] A summary may be given in four periods: —

(1.) B.C. 975-929. Jeroboam had not sufficient force of character in himself to make a lasting impression on his people. A king, but not a founder of a dynasty, he aimed at nothing beyond securing his present elevation. Without any ambition to share in the commerce of Tyre, or to compete with the growing power of Damascus, or even to complete the humiliation of the helpless monarch whom he had deprived of half a kingdom, Jeroboam acted entirely on a defensive policy. He attempted to give his subjects a centre which they wanted for their political allegiance, in Shechem or in Tirzah. He sought to change merely so much of their ritual as was inconsistent with his authority over them. But as soon as the golden calves were set up, the priests and Levites and many religious benighted (2 Chr. xii. 16) left their country, and the disastrous emigration was not effectually checked even by the attempt of Baasha to build a fortress (2 Chr. xvi. 6) at Ramah. A new priesthood was introduced (1 K. xii. 31) absolutely dependent on the king (Am. vii. 14), not forming as under the Mosaic law a landed aristocracy, not respected by the people, and unable either to withstand the oppression or to strengthen the weakness of a king. A priestly class, and a ritual element for formal purposes, had no hold whatever on the conscience of the people. To meet their spiritual cravings a succession of prophets was raised up, great in their poverty, their purity, their austerity, their self-dependence, their moral influence, but imperfectly organized: — a rod to correct and check the civil government, not, as they might have been under happier circumstances, a staff to support it. The army soon learned its power to dictate to the isolated monarch and dissatisfied people. Baasha in the midst of the army at Gibbethon slew the son and successor of Jeroboam: Zimri, a captain of chariots, slew the son and successor of Baasha; Omri, the captain of the host, was chosen to punish Zimri; and after a civil war of four years he prevailed over Elah, the choice of half the people. (6) B.C. 884. For the four years Israel was governed by the house of Omri. This sagacious king pitched on the strong hill of Samaria as the site of his capital. Damascus, which in the days of Baasha had proved itself more than a match for Israel, now again assumed a threatening attitude. Edom and Moab showed a tendency to independence, or even aggression. Hence the princes of Omri's house cultivated an alliance with the contemporary kings of Judah, which was cemented by the marriage of Jechoniah and Athaliah, and marked by the community of names among the royal children. Ahab's Tyrian alliance strengthened him with the counsels of the masculine mind of Jezebel, but brought him no further support. The entire rejection of the God of Abraham, under the disguise of abandoning Jeroboam's unlawful worship, and the election of kings as the god of the Ammonian court and subservient populace, led to a reaction in the nation, to the moral triumph of the prophets in the person of Elijah, and to the extinction of the house of Ahab in obedience to the bidding of Elisha. (c.) B.C. 881-772. Unparalleled triumphs, but greater humiliation, awaited the kingdom of Israel under the dynasty of Jehu. The house of Ahab was abolished by one blow; but, so long as the
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kings lasted, the people never rose superior to the detaining form of religion established by Jerobam. Hazael, the successor of the two Ben-Hadads, the eldest king of Damascus, reduced Jehoash to the condition of a vassal, and triumphed for a time over both the disunited Hebrew kingdoms. Almost the first sign of the restoration of their strength was a war between them; and Jehoash, the grandson of Jehu, entered Jerusalem as the conqueror of Amaziah. Jehoash also turned the tide of war against the Syrians; and Jeroboam II., the most powerful of all the kings of Israel, captured Damascus, and recovered the whole ancient frontier from Hamath to the Dead Sea. In the midst of his long and seemingly glorious reign the prophets Hosea and Amos uttered their warnings more clearly than any of their predecessors. The short-lived greatness expired with the last king of Jehu’s line.

(ce) n. c. 772-721. Military violence, it would seem, broke off the hereditary succession after the obscure and probably convulsed reign of Zachariah. An unsuccessful usurper, Shallum, is followed by the cruel Menahem, who, being unable to make head against the first attack of Assyria under Pul, became the agent of that monarch for the oppressive taxation of his subjects. Yet his power at home was sufficient to insure for his son and successor Pekahiah a ten years’ reign, cut short by a bold usurper, Pekah. Abandoning the northern and transjordanic regions to the encroaching power of Assyria under Tiglath-pileser, he was very near subjugating Judah, with the help of Damascus, now the coequal ally of Israel. But Assyria interfering summarily put an end to the independence of Damascus, and perhaps was the indirect cause of the assassination of the baffled Pekah. The irreligious Hoshea, the next and last usurper, became tributary to his invader, Shalmaneser, betrayed the Assyrian to the rival monarch of Egypt, and was punished by the loss of his liberty, and by the capture, after a three years’ siege, of his strong capital, Samaria. Some gleanings of the ten tribes yet remained in the land after so many years of religious decline, moral desolation, national degradation, anarchy, bloodshed, and deportation. Even these were gathered up by the conqueror and carried to Assyria, never again, as a distinct people, to occupy their portion of that goodly and pleasant land which their forefathers won under Joshua from the heathen.

7. The following table shows at one view the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah. Columns 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 are taken from the Bible. Columns 4, 5, 6 are the computations of eminent modern chronologists: column 4 being the
The numerous dates given in the Bible as the limits of the duration of the king’s reign act as a continued check on each other. The apparent discrepancies between them have been multiply exaggerated, because similar statements of various hypotheses have been put forward;—that an interregnum occurred; that two kings (father and son) reigned conjointly; that certain reigns were dated not from their real commencement, but from some arbitrary period in that Jewish year in which they commenced; that the Hebrew copists have transcribed the numbers incorrectly, either by accident or design; that the original writers have made mistakes in their reckoning. All these are mere suppositions, and even the most probable of them must not be insisted on as if it were a historical fact. But in truth most of the discrepancies may be accounted for by the simple fact that the Hebrew annalists reckon in round numbers, never specifying the months in addition to the years of the duration of a king’s reign. Consequently some of these writers seem to set down a fragment of a year, a few years, and other fragments altogether. Hence in computing the date of the commencement of each reign, without attributing any error to the writer or transcribers, it is necessary to allow for a possible mistake amounting to something less than two years in our interpretation of the indefinite phrasing of the Hebrew writers. But there are a few statements in the Hebrew text which cannot thus be reconciled. (c.) There are in the Second Book of Kings three statements as to the beginning of the reign of Jehoram king of Israel, which in the view of some writers involve a great error, and not a mere numerical one. His accession is dated (1) in the second year of Jehoram king of Judah (2 K. i. 17); (2) in the fifth year before Jehoram king of Judah (2 K. viii. 16); (3) in the eighteenth year of Jehoram (2 K. xi. 17). Two of these statements may be reconciled by the fact that Jehoram king of Judah had two accessions which are recorded in Scripture, and by the probable supposition of Archbishop Usher that he had a third and earlier accession which is not recorded. These three accessions are, (1) when Jehoshaphat left his kingdom to go to the battle of Kinsah-Gilead, in his 17th year; (2) when Jehoshaphat (2 K. viii. 16) either retired from the administration of affairs, or made his son joint king, in his 23rd year; (3) when Jehoshaphat died, in his 25th year. So that, if the supposition of Usher be allowed, the accession of Jehoram king of Israel in Jehoshaphat’s 18th year synchronized with (1) the second year of the first accession, and (2) the fifth year before the second accession of Jehoram king of Judah. (b.) The date of the beginning of Uzziah’s reign (2 K. xv. 1) in the 27th year of Jeroboam II., cannot be reconciled with the statement that Uzziah’s father, Amosiah whose whole reign was 25 years only, came to the throne in the second year of Joash (2 K. xiv. 1), and so reigned 14 years contemporaneously with Joash and 25 with Jeroboam. Usher and others suggest a reckoning of these statements by the supposition that Jeroboam’s reign had two commencements, the first not mentioned in Scripture, on his association with his father Josiah, b. c. 847. But Keil, after Capellus and Grutius, supposes that 2 is an error of the Hebrew copists for 25, and that instead of 25th of Jeroboam we ought to read 15th.

(c.) The statements that Jeroboam II. reigned 41 years (2 K. xiv. 23) after the 15th year of Amaziah, who reigned 29 years, and that Jeroboam’s son Zachariah came to the throne in the 38th year of Uzziah (2 K. xv. 8), cannot be reconciled without supposing that there was an interregnum of 11 years between Jeroboam and his son Zachariah. And almost all chronologists accept this as a fact, although it is not mentioned in the Bible. Some chronologists, who regard an interregnum as intrinsically improbable after the pros persous reign of Jeroboam, prefer the supposition that the number 41 in 2 K. xiv. 23 ought to be changed to 51, and that the number 27 in xv. 1 should be changed to 14, and that a few other corresponding alterations should be made.

(d.) In order to bring down the date of Pekah’s murder (2 K. xvii. 5) to Harrison’s accession, some chronologists propose to read 29 years for 20, in 2 K. xv. 27. Others prefer to let the dates stand as at present in the text, and suppose that an interregnum, not expressly mentioned in the Bible, occurred between those two usurpers. The words of Isaiah (ix. 20, 21) seem to indicate a time of anarchy in Israel. The chronology of the Kings has been minutely investigated by Abp. Usher, Chronologica Sacra, Pars Posterior, De Anna Regnum, Works, xii. 95-144; by Lightfoot, Order of the Texts of the O. T., Works, i. 77-130; by Hales, New Analysis of Chronology, ii. 372-447; by Clinton, l. c. r.; and by H. Browne, Osseo Scoliorum. (See also D. Wolf, Versuch, die Wahrscheinliche in den Jahrhunderten der Könige Judas ii. Ist. u. andere Differenzen in d. Wiss. Chron. aufgezeigt, in die, Thod. Stud. u. Krit, 1858, pp. 625-688, and the references under Chronology, Abol. ed.—A.)

W. T. B.

ISRAELITE (יִשְׂרָאֵל; יִשְׂרָאֵל: Ισραήλ; Ισραήλ: "IronaIl): [Vat. Ἰσραήλίτας: Abt. Ἰσραήλίται; "Israel." Ισραήλιτας ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ: Ισραήλιτας τῆς Ισραήλιτας; Ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ: Ἰσραήλιτας τῆς Ισραήλιτας.] In 2 Sam. xvii. 25, 2 Chron. xxv. 17, the father of Amaziah, is called "an Israelite," or more correctly "the Israelite," while in 1 Chr. ii. 17 he appears as "Jether the Ishmaelite." The latter is undoubtedly the true reading, for unless Judah had been a foreigner there would have been no need to express his nationality. The LXX. and Vulg. appear to have read Ἰσραήλιτας ἐρωτάς, "Jether the Ishmaelite." * "Israelite" also occurs in the A. V. as the rendering of Ἰσραήλιτας, "man of Israel." Num. xxiv. 14; and of Ἰσραήλιται or Ἰσραήλιται (Tisch. Treg., John i. 47, Rom. xi. 1. "Israelites"

* "Israelite" is the translation of Ἰσραήλιτας, used collectively, in Ex. ix. 7; Lev. xxiii. 42; Josh. iii. 17, xiii. 6; Judges xxv. 21; 1 Sam. ii. 14, xii. 20, xxvi. 21, xxv 1, xix. 1, 2 Sam. iv. 1; 2 K. ii. 21; viii. 1; 1 Chron. ix. 2:—of Ἰσραήλιτας, Bar. iii. 4; 1 Mac. i. 43, 53, 58, iii. 46, vi. 18:—of ὃν Ἰσραήλιτας, Jud. vii. 14; 1 Mac. vii. 21; and of Ἰσραήλιται ἐν Ἀλεποβ, Rom. xiv. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 21.

A. * ISRAELITISH (יִשְׂרָאֵלית): Ἰσραήλιτας, "Israelite".
ISSACHAR

The designation of a certain woman (Lev. xxiv. 10, 11) whose son was stoned for blasphemy. A.

ISSACHAR (יס hakk, [see intro], i. e. Issacar—such is the invariable spelling of the name in the Hebrew, the Samaritan Codex and Version, the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, but the Masorets have pointed it so as to supersede the second S, ימק, Isa [s] cur: יסחא: Rec. Text of N. T. יסחא, but Cod. C. יסחא: Joseph. יסחא: Issachar), the ninth son of Jacob and the fifth of Leah; the firstborn to Leah after the interval which occurred in the births of her children (Gen. xxx. 17; comp. xxix. 35). As is the case with each of the sons the name is recorded as bestowed on account of a circumstance-connected with the birth. But, as may be also noticed in more than one of the others, two explanations seem to be combined in the narrative, which even then is not in exact accordance with the requirements of the name. "God hath given me my hire " (ם), skir, ... and she called his name Issachar," is the record; but in verse 18 that " hire " is for the surrender of her maid to her husband—while in ver. 14-17 it is for the discovery and bestowal of the mandrakes. Besides, as indicated above, the name in its original form—Issacar—rebels against this interpretation, an interpretation which, to be consistent, requires the form subsequently imposed on the word Is-sachar. The allusion is no again brought forward as it is with Dan, Asher, etc., in the blessings of Jacob and Moses. In the former only it is perhaps allowable to discern a faint echo of the sound of " Issachar " in the word skiruo—" a shoulder " (Gen. xl. 15).

Of Issachar the individual we know nothing. In Genesis he is not mentioned after his birth, and the few verses in Chronicles devoted to the tribe contain merely a brief list of its chief men and heroes in the reign of David (1 Chr. vii. 1-5). At the descent into Egypt four sons are ascribed to him, who founded the four chief families of the tribe (Gen. xlvi. 13; Num. xxvi. 23, 25: 1 Chr. vii. 1). Issachar's place during the journey to Canaan was on the east of the Tabernacle with his brothers Judah and Zebulun (Num. ii. 5), the group moving foremost in the march (x. 15), and having a common standard, which, according to the Rabbinical tradition, was of the three colors of sardine, topaz, and carbuncle, inscribed with the names of the three tribes, and bearing the figure of a lion's whelp (see Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Num. ii. 3). At this time the captain of the tribe was Nathanneel ben-Zuar (Num. i. 8, ii. 5, xviii. 18, x. 15). He was succeeded by Igal ben-Joseph, who went as representative of his tribe among the spies (xii. 7), and he again by Paltiel ben-Azzan, who assisted Joshua in apportioning the land of Canaan (xxxiv. 29). Issachar was one of the six tribes who were to stand on Mount Gerizim during the ceremony of blessing and cursing (Deut. xxvi. 12). He was still in company with Judah, Zebulun being opposite to Ebal. The number of the fighting men of Issachar when taken in the census at Sinai was 54,400. During the journey they seem to have steadily increased, and after the mortality at Peor they amounted to 64,900, being inferior to none but Judah and Dan. — to the latter by 140 souls only. The numbers given in 1 Chr. vii. 2, 4, 5 probably the census of Joseph, amount in all to 145,900.

The Promised Land once reached, the connection between Issachar and Judah seems to have closed, to be renewed only on two brief occasions, which will be noticed in their turn. The intimate relation with Zebulun was however maintained. The two brother-tribes had their portions close together, and more than once they are mentioned in company. The allotment of Issachar by above that of Manasseh. The specification of its boundaries and contents is contained in Josh. xix. 17-25. But to the towns there named must be added Daberath, given in the catalogue of Levitical cities (xxi. 28: Jarnatha here is probably the Remeth of xxi. 21), and five others—Beth-shan, Ibleam, En-dor, Taanach, and Megiddo. These last, though the property of Manasseh, remained within the limits of Issachar (Josh. xii. 11; Judg. i. 27), and they assist us materially in determining his boundary. In the words of Josephus (Ant. v. 4, § 22), "it extended in length from Carmel to the Jordan, in breadth to Mount Tabor." In fact it exactly consisted of the plain of Esdrælon or Jezreel. The south boundary we can trace by En-gannim, the modern Jenin, on the heights which form the southern inclosure to the Plain; and then, further westward, by Taanach and Megiddo, the authentic fragments of which still stand on the same heights as they trend away to the hump of Carmel. On the north the territory also ceased with the plain, which is there bounded by Tabor, the outpost of the hills of Zebulun. East of Tabor the hill-country continued so as to screen the tribe from the Sea of Galilee, but a continuous tract of level on the S. E. led to Beth-shan and the upper part of the Jordan valley. West of Tabor, again, a little to the south, is Cheseth, the modern es-ṣaf, close to the traditional "Mount of Precipitation;" and over this the boundary probably ran in a slanting course till it joined Mount Carmel, where the Ishbosheth (Josh. xix. 20) worked its way below the eastern bluff of that mountain—and thus completed the triangle at its western apex. Nazareth lies among the hills, a few [about two] miles north of the so-called Mount of Precipitation, and therefore escaping being in Issachar. Almost exactly in the centre of this plain stood Jezreel, on a low swell, attended on the one hand by the eminence of Mount Gilboa, on the other by that now called el-Duly, or "little Hermon," the latter having Shunem, Nan, and En-dor on its slopes, names which recall some of the most interesting and important events in the history of Israel.

This territory was, as it still is, among the richest land in Palestine. Westward was the famous plain which derived its name, the "seed-plot of God"—such is the signification of Jezreel—from its fertility, and the very weeds of which at this day curious details will be found in the Testamentum Iaaehar, Fabricius, Cod. Pompejani, I. 620-623. They were ultimately deposited "in the house of the Lord," whatever that expression may mean.
assist in making David king over the entire realm different qualifications are noted in them the had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do ... and all their brethren were at their commandment. To what this under standing of the times was we have no clue. By the later Jewish interpreters it is explained as skill in ascertaining the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, and dates of solemn feasts, and the interpretation of the signs of the heavens (Targum, ad loc. Jerome, Quast. Hebr.). Josephus (Ant. vii. 2, § 2) gives it as knowing the things that were to happen and he adds that the armed men who came with these leaders were 20,000. One of the wise men of Issachar according to an old Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (Quast. Hebr. on 2 Chr. xix. 16), was Amassiah son of Kiah, who with 200,000 men offered himself to Jehovah in the service of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvi. 16): but this is very questionable, as the movement appears to have been confined to Judah and Benjamin. The ruler of the tribe at this time was Onni, of the great family of Michael (1 Chr. xxvii. 18; comp. vii. 3). May he not have been the forefather of the king of Israel of the same name the founder of the house of Omri and of the house of Ahaz, the builder of Samaria, possibly on the same hill of Shamir on which the Issacharite judge, Tola, had formerly held his court? But whether this was so or not, at any rate our dynasty of the Israelite kings was Issacharite. Baasha, the son of Ahijah, of the house of Issachar, a member of the army with which Nadab and all Israel were besieging Gibbethon, apparently not of any standing in the tribe (comp. 1 K. xvi. 29); the king, and himself mounted the throne (1 K. xxv. 27, &c.). He was evidently a fierce and warlike man (xxv. 29; 2 Chr. xvi. 1), and an idolater like Jeroboam. The Issacharite dynasty lasted during the 24 years of his reign and the 2 of his son Elah. At the end of that time it was wrested from him by the same means that his father had acquired it, and Zimri, the new king, terminated his reign by a massacre of the whole kindred and country of Baasha left him put even so much as a dog (xvi. 11).

One more notice of Issachar remains to be added to the meagre information already collected. It is fortunately a favorable one. There may be no truth in the tradition just quoted that the tribe was in any way connected with the reforms of Jehoshaphat, but we are fortunately certain that, distant as Issachar was from Jerusalem, they took part in the passover with which Hezekiah sanctified the opening of his reign. On that memorable occasion a multitude of the people from the northern tribes, and amongst them from Issachar, although so long estranged from the worship of Jehovah as to have forgotten how to make the necessary purifications, yet by the enlightened wisdom of Hezekiah were c. The word bands which is commonly employed in the A. V. to render Heb. שְׂדֵה, שְׂדֶה, is unfortunately used in 1 Chr. xii. 23 for a very different term, by which the orderly assembly of the fighting men of the tribes is denoted when they visited Hebron to make David king. This term is כָּרָם, כָּרָם. We may almost suspect a mere misprint, especially as the Vulgate has præcessus. [The marginal rendering shows that it is not a misprint.]
allowed to keep the feast; and they did keep it seven days with great gladness—with such in
numinous joy as had not been known since the time of Solomon, when the whole land was one. Nor did they separate till the occasion had been sig
nalized by an immense destruction of idolatrous altars and symbols. “In Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim and Manasseh,” up to the very confines of Issachar’s own land—and then “all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities” (2 Chr. xxxi. 1). It is a satis-
factory farewell to take of the tribe. Within five years from this date Shalmaneser king of Assyria
had invaded the north of Palestine, and after three years’ siege had taken Samaria, and with the rest of Israel had carried Issachar away to his distant dominions. There we must be content to leave them until, with the rest of their brethren of all the tribes of the children of Israel (Dan only ex-
cepted), the twelve thousand of the tribe of Issac-
char shall be sealed in their foreheads (Rev. vii. 7).

2. (יִשְׂרָאֵל) : יֵשׁוּרָאֵל : [Yshochar.] A Korhite Levite, one of the doorkeepers (A. V. “porters”) of the house of Jehovah, seventh son of Obed-edem (1 Chr. xxvi. 5).

G. ISSHIAH (יִשְׂרְיָהו) [whom Jehovah lends].
1. (Vat. omits: Alex. Isaya: Jesha.) A de-
scendant of Moses by his younger son Eliezer: the head of the numerous family of Kebliah, in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 21; comp. xxiii. 17, xxv. 25). His name is elsewhere given as Jeshi-
lah. [ISSHIAH.]
2. (Ishia: Alex. Isaya: Jesia.) A Levite of the house of Kohath and family of Uzziah; named in the list of the tribe in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 29).

* ISSUE OF BLOOD. [Blood, Issue of.]

* ISSUE, RUNNING. The texts Lev. xv. 2, 3, xxii. 4, Num. v. 2 (and 2 Sam. iii. 29), where the malady is invoked as a curse, are probably to be inter-
preted of gonorrhea. In Lev. xv. 3 a distinc-
tion is introduced, which merely means that the cessation of the actual flux does not constitute cer-
emonial cleanness, but that the patient must bide the legal time, 7 days (ver. 13), and perform the prescribed purifications and sacrifice (ver. 14). See, how-
ever, Sarenumtin’s preface to the treatise Zobim of the Mishna, where another interpretation is given. As regards the specific varieties of this malady, it is generally asserted that its most severe form (gon. virulenta) is modern, having first appeared in the 15th century. Chardin (Voyages en Perse, ii. 200) states that he observed that this disorder was pres-
alent in Persia, but that its effects were far less severe than in western climates. If this be true, it would go some way to explain the alleged absence of the gon. virul. from ancient nosology, which found its field of observation in the East, Greece, etc.; and to confirm the supposition that the milder form only was the subject of Mosaic legislation. But, beyond this, it is probable that diseases may appear, run their course, and disappear, and, for want of an accurate observation of their symptoms, leave no trace behind them. The “bed,” “sent,” etc. (Lev. xv. 5, 6, &c.), are not to be supposed

---

a The expressions are, יִשְׂרָיֵל בְּלָא, or בלָא, alone, and those of the LXX...
ITALY

I MUCH, however, not confirmed by any direct evidence, is not left wholly unsupported. It so happens that one of Gerard's inscriptions speaks of a "Colours militium Italorum voluntaria, que est in Syria" (see Ackerman, Nuministic Illustr. of the Narrative Portions of the N. T., p. 34). There was a class of soldiers in the Roman army who enlisted in their own accord, and were known as "voluntarii" in distinction from conscripts (see Fandy's Rent-Eyecde, vol. 2744).

It is supposed, therefore, with good reason, that there was such a cohort at Caesarea, at the time to which Luke's narrative refers, and that it was called Italian because it consisted of native Italians; whereas the other cohorts in Palestine were levied, for the most part, from the country itself (see Joseph. Ant. xiv. 15, § 10; B. J. i. 17, § 1). Ewald conjectures that this Italian cohort and the Augustan cohort (Acts xxvii. 1) may have been the same; but the fact that Luke employs different names is against that supposition, and so much the more because different cohorts are known to have been in Judaea at this time (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 19, § 2; xx. 8, § 7). It is worthy of remark, as Tholuck observes (Geschichte der Evangel., p. 174), that Luke places this Italian cohort at Caesarea. That city was the residence of the Roman procurator; and it was important that he should have there a body of troops on whose fidelity he could rely.

We may add, that if the soldiers who composed this legion were Italians, no doubt Cornelius himself who commanded them was an Italian.

Writers on this topic refer, as the principal authority, to Schwartz, Dicssurato des cohorte Italiane a August. Altior. 1720. For notes or remarks more or less extended, see also Wolf's Chris. Philos. iii. 1118 1; Kuttner, Acta Apol. p. 390; Wiescher, Chronologie der Apg. Zeitleben. p. 145; Hiscock, History of the Acts Conducted. pp. 217-224 (Oxford, 1840); and Conybeare and Howson's Life and Letters of St. Paul, i. 143 (Amer. ed.).

II.

ITALY (Ιταλία: [Italia]). This word is used in the N. T. in the usual sense of the period, i. e. in its true geographical sense, as denoting the whole natural peninsula between the Alps and the Straits of Messina. For the progress of the history of the word, first as applied to the extreme south of the peninsula, then as extended northwards to the right bank of the Po, see the Dict. of Geog. vol. ii. pp. 75, 76. From the time of the close of the Republic it was employed as we employ it now. In the N. T. it occurs three, or indeed, more correctly speaking, four times. In Acts x. 1, the Italian cohort at Caesarea (ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν Καισαρείᾳ), v. c. "an Italian band," consisting, as it hath been said, of none recruited in Italy, illustrates the military relations of the imperial peninsula with the provinces. [ARMY.] In Acts xvi. 2, where we are told of the expulsion of Aquila and Priscilla with their companions "from Italy," we are reminded of the large Jewish population which many authorities show that it contained. Acts xxvii. 1, the beginning of St. Paul's voyage to the west, and the whole subsequent narrative, illustrate the trade which subsisted between the peninsula and other parts of the Mediterranean. And the words in Heb. xviii. 24, "They at Italy (οἱ πρὸς τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you," what- ever they may prove for or against this being the region in which the letter was written (and the matter has been strongly argued both ways), are interesting as a specimen of the progress of Christiannity in the west.

J. S. H.

ITHAI [2 syl.] (Ἰθαΐ) [with Jachové]: Ἰφίλω [Vat. Aegr.: F. A. Oebel.: Alex. Ιταί: [Ald. Ἰθαί Compl. Φ. Ebd.: Ebd.], a Benjaminite, son of Ithai of Gilead, one of the heroes of David's guard (1 Chr. viii. 17), one of the called list of 2 Samuel (xi. 21), also in which the name is given as ITHAI. But Kennicott decides that the form Ithai is the original (Dissertatio, ad loc.).

ITHAMAR (Ἰθαμᾶρ) [land of palms]: 18-αδὰς (Ithamar), the youngest son of Aaron (Ex. vi. 23). After the deaths of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 1), Eleazar and Ithamar, having been admonished to show no mark of sorrow for their brothers' loss, were appointed to succeed to their places in the priestly office, as they had left no children (Ex. xxviii. 40, 43; Num. iii. 4, 4; 1 Chr. xxiv. 2). In the distribution of services belonging to the Tabernacle, and its transport on the march of the Israelites, the leviathites had charge of the curtains and hangings, and the Merarites of the pillars, cords, and boards, and both of these departments were placed under the superintendence of Ithamar (Ex. xxviii. 21; Num. iv. 21-33). These services were continued under the Temple system, so far as was consistent with its stationary character, but instead of being appropriated to families, they were divided by lot, the first lot being taken by the family of Eleazar, whose descendants were more numerous than those of Ithamar (1 Chr. xxiv. 4, 6). The high-priesthood passed into the family of Ithamar in the person of Eli, but for what reason we are not informed. It reverted in its original form into the person of Zadok, in consequence of Abiathar's participation in the rebellion of Abdonjah. This was ratified by the prophesy delivered to Samuel against Eli (1 Sam. ii. 31-35: 1 K. ii. 20, 27, 35; Joseph. Ant. viii. i, § 3).

A descendant of Ithamar, by name Daniel, is mentioned as returning from captivity in the time of Artaxerxes (Ex. viii. 2).

ITHIEL (Ἰθηήλ) [God is with me]: 1, a Benjaminite, son of Jessiah (Neh. xi. 7).

2. (1 LXX. omit: Vulg. translates, cum quo est Deus.) One of two persons — Ithiel and Ucaal — to whom Agur ben-Jakeh delivered his discourse (Prov. xxx. 1). [UCAAL.]

ITHMAH (Ἰθμα, Ἰθμή) [orphange]: 18-αδαί (Vat. Eob. F. A. Ebd.: Alex. Ἰθμα: Jethman), a Moabite, one of the heroes of David's guard, according to the enlarged list of Chronicles (1 Chr. xi. 49).

ITHAN (Ἰθαν) [restored, given]; in both MSS. of the LXX. the name is corrupted by being attached to that next it: Ἀραπανναίας, Alex. Ἀραπανναί (Ἀραπανναί), one of the towns in the extreme south of Judah (Josh. xv. 23), named with Kadesh and Telen (comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 4), and therefore probably on the borders of the desert, if not actually in the desert itself. No trace of its existence has yet been discovered, nor does it appear to have been known to Jerome. The village Ἰθαν which recalls the name, is between Hebron and Beit-Shein, and therefore much too far north.

Γ

Γ
ITHRA

ITHRA (תִּהְרָא) [abundance, eminence]: יְהֵרָא; [Vat. Alex.] יְהֵרָא; Joseph. Ant. vii. 10, § 1. יְהֵרָא (יְהֵרָא); an Israelite (2 Sam. xix. 25) or Ishmaelite (1 Chr. ii. 17, "Jether the Ishmeelite"); the father of Amasa by Abigail, David's sister. He was thus brother-in-law to David and uncle to Joab, Abishai, and Asahel, the three "sons of Zeruiah." There is no absolute means of settling which of these—Israelite or Ishmaelite—is correct; but there can be little doubt that the latter is so: the fact of the admixture of Ishmaelite blood in David's family being a fit subject for notice in the genealogies, whereas Ithra's being an "Ishmaelite would call for no remark. [JETHRA.

H.

ITHRAN (?הֶרָן ) [as above]. 1. (יְהֵרָאן, יְהֵרָאן; [Alex. יְהֵרָאן; Vat. in 1 Chr., יְהֵרָאן] יְהֵרָאן; Jeconia, Jethro), a son of Dishon, a Horite (Gen. xxxvi. 26; 1 Chr. i. 41); and probably a phylarch ("duke," A. V.) of a tribe of the Horim, as was his father (Gen. xxxvi. 30); for the latter was evidently a son of Seir (vv. 21 and 30), and not a son of Anah (v. 29).

2. (יְהֵרָאן; [Vat. יְהֵרָאן; Alex. יְהֵרָאן; Comp. Abd. יְהֵרָאן; Jethro); a descendant of Asher, in the genealogy contained in 1 Chr. vii. 30-40.

E. S. P.

ITHREAM (?הֶרָם ) [residue of the people]: יְהֵרָם, יְהֵרָם; [Vat. in 1 Chr., יְהֵרָם] Alex. יְהֵרָם, יְהֵרָם; Joseph. יְהֵרָם (Jethro); a son of David, born to him in Hebron, and distinctly specified as the sixth, and as the child of "Eglah, David's wife" (2 Sam. iii. 5: 1 Chr. iii. 3). In the ancient Jewish traditions Eglah is said to have been Michal, and we have died in giving birth to Ithream.

ITHRITE, THE ("עֵרָיתָא" [patronym. from יְהֵרָאן ]): אֹּהֵרָיִלֵי, אֹּסֵרָיִלֵי, יְהֵרָא; [Vat. אֹּסֵרָיִלֵי, אֹּסֵרָיִלֵי; יְהֵרָא; Alex. אֹּסֵרָיִלֵי, אֹּסֵרָיִלֵי, יְהֵרָא; Jethrites, Jethro); the native, or a descendant of a man called lether (according to the Hebrew mode of forming derivatives); the designation of two of the members of David's guard, Ira and Gareb (2 Sam. xxii. 38; 1 Chr. xi. 40). The Ithrite (A. V. "Ithrites" ["Aishath, Vat. Alex. אֹּסֵרָיִל; Jethrei]) is mentioned in 1 Chr. i. 53 as among the "families of Kirjath-jearim"; but this does not give us much clue to the derivation of the term, except that it fixes it as belonging to Judah. These two Ithrite heroes of David's guard may have come from Jartine, in the mountains of Judah, one of the places which were the "haunt of David" and his men in their freeloading wanderings, and where he had "friends" (1 Sam. xxx. 27; comp. 31). Ira has been supposed to be identical with "Ira the Jairite," David's priest (2 Sam xx. 26)—the Syriac version reading "from Jair" in that place. But n thing more than conjecture can be arrived at on the point.

* ITS. [Hiss; Fr.]

ITTAAH-KAZIN (?יִתָאָה-קָזִין ) [in time, opportunity present]: יֵתֵאָה-קָזִין; one of the landmarks of the boundary of Zebalun (Josh. xix. 13), named next to Gatth-hepher. Like that place (A. V. "Gittath-heph"”) the name is probably Eth-kazin, with the Hebrew particle of motion (oth) added—i. e. to "Eth-kazin." Taken as Hebrew the name bears the interpretation time, or people of a judge (Gen. Thes. p. 1083 b). It has not been identified.

G.

ITTAAI (2 syl.) (?תֵאָאֵי ) [in time, opportunity present]. 1. (Ebd, and so Josephus; [Vat. אֵדֹי: אֵדֹי.) ITTAI the GITIVE, i. e. the native of Gath, a Philistine in the army of King David. He appears only during the revolution of Abdon. We first discern him on the morning of David's flight, while the king was standing under the olive-tree below the city, watching the army and the people defile past him. [See David, vol. i. p. 563 a]. Last in the procession came the 600 heroes who had formed David's band during his wanderings in Judah, and had been with him at Gath (2 Sam. xv. 18); comp. 1 Sam. xxiii. 13, xxvii. 2, xxx. 9, 10; and see Joseph. Ant. vii. 9, § 2). Amongst these, apparently commanding them, was Ittai the Gittite (ver. 19). He caught the eye of the king, who at once addressed him and besought him as a "stranger and an exile," and as one who had but very recently joined his service, not to attach himself to a doubtful cause, but to return "with his brethren" and abide with the king (19, 20). But Ittai is firm; he is the king's slave (?תֵאָאֵי, A. V. "servant"), and wherever his master goes he will go. Accordingly he is allowed by David to proceed, and he passes over the Kidron with the king (xx. 22, LXX.), with all his men, and "all the little ones that were with him." These "little ones" (?תֵאָאֵי) "all the children" must have been the families of the band, their "households" (1 Sam. xxvii. 3). They accompanied them during their wanderings in Judah, often in the king's (1 Sam. xxx. 6), and they were not likely to leave them behind in this fresh commencement of their wandering life.

When the army was numbered and organized by David at Mahanaim, Ittai again appears, now in command of a third part of the force, and (for the time at least) enjoying equal rank with Joab and Abishai (2 Sam. xviii. 2, 5, 12). But here, on the eve of the great battle, we take leave of this valiant and faithful stranger; his conduct in the fight and his subsequent fate are alike unknown to us. Nor is he mentioned in the lists of David's captains and of the heroes of his body-guard (see 2 Sam. xxiii.; 1 Chr. xi.), lists which are possibly of a date previous to Ittai's arrival in Jerusalem.

An interesting tradition is related by Jerome (Quast. Hebr. on 1 Chr. xx. 2). "David took the crown off the head of the image of Mideon (A. V. "their king"). But by the law it was forbidden to any Israelite to touch either gold or silver of an idol. Wherefore they say that Ittai

a The meaning of this is doubtful. "The king" may be Abdon, or it may be Ittai's former king Achish. By the LXX the words are omitted
The mention of Ituraean and Aramaic terms in 2 Kings 10:23 gives rise to the identification of the Iturans. In this context, the term "Iturans" can be referred to as the inhabitants of the region of Ituraea, which is mentioned in the Bible. The identity of these people is debated among scholars, with some suggesting that they were a people from the Arabian Peninsula.

The name "Iturans" is mentioned in the Bible in 2 Kings 10:23: "And it was told to Ahab, saying, Behold, the Iturans take away from me one of my cities, even Chemosh; but I will take away one of thine, O Chemosh, saith the Lord; I will make thee a ashes." This passage suggests a historical conflict between Ahab and the Iturans.

The Iturans were known for their strong military and political influence in the region. They were mentioned in various historical texts, including the Bible. The Iturans are also referred to as the "Iturans of the region of Bashan" in 2 Kings 10:23. This indicates their presence in the region of Bashan, which is north of the Dead Sea and west of the Jordan River.

The Iturans were a powerful and influential people in the region. They were noted for their military strength and their ability to maintain control over the surrounding areas. They were also known for their trade and commerce, which helped to establish them as a significant force in the region.

The Iturans were mentioned in the Bible as part of a larger conflict between Ahab and the forces of Damascus. The Iturans were associated with the region of Bashan, which was a significant area in the region of the Bible. The Iturans were known for their military strength and their ability to maintain control over the surrounding areas.

The Iturans were also mentioned in other historical texts, including the works of Herodotus and Plutarch. These texts provide additional information about the Iturans and their role in the region.

The Iturans were a people who played a significant role in the region of Bashan during the time of the Bible. They were known for their strength and their ability to maintain control over the surrounding areas. Their presence in the region is evident in the Bible and other historical texts.

In conclusion, the Iturans were a significant people in the region of Bashan during the time of the Bible. They were known for their military strength and their ability to maintain control over the surrounding areas. Their presence in the region is evident in the Bible and other historical texts.
certainly favors the finding of Hurrae in Gedeon, as does also its being assigned by some of the ancient writers to Cœle-Syria. Yet Cœle-Syria, it should be said, is a vague designation, and was sometimes used so as to embrace nearly all inner Syria from Damascus to Arabia (see Winet’s Bibl. Rerum, i. 232, 3rd Ed.). Dr. Robinson (Phys. Geogr., p. 319) follows the common representation. See, to the same effect, Rauner’s Palastin., p. 227, 4th Aufl. For a paper on “Bashan, Hurrae, and Keath,” by Mr. Porter, author of the above article, see Bibl. Sacra, vili. 783-808.

H.

IVAH, or A’VA (יווח, or יוח; [destruction, ruins, Gen.]: ’AB'D, [in Is. (with Hena), ’AY'Y(dy)VA', Vat. (with Hena) ’AYV[I]Y]SA; Comp. ’AYyd; in 2 K. xvi., Vat. omits, Alex. Aya'; in xix., Vat. Odox, Alex. Ayta'; which) is mentioned in Scripture twice (2 K. xviii. 94, xiii. 13; comp. Is. xxvii. 13), in connection with Hena and Sepharvain, and once (2 K. xvi. 21) in connection with Babylon and Cuthah, must be sought in Babylonia, and is probably identical with the modern Hîth, which is the ’Is of Herodotus (i. 170). This town lay on the Euphrates, between Sitippera (Sepharvain) and Anah (Hena), with which it seems to have been politically united shortly before the time of Sennacherib (2 K. x. 13). It is probably the Ahava (איהנה) of Ezra (viii. 15). The name is thought to have been originally derived from that of a Babylonian god, Titu, who represents the sky or Èther, and to whom the town is supposed to have been dedicated (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson’s Herodotus, i. 606, note). In this case AYATH (יווח) would seem to be the most proper pointing. The pointing Aya', or rather Aya' (יוח), shows a corruption of articulation, which might readily pass on to Ahava (איהנה). In the Talmud the name appears as Itih (ייח), and hence would be formed the Greek Ἰς, and the modern Hîth, where the t is merely the feminine ending. Isidore of Charax seems to intend the same place by his ’Aςι-τόλισα (Masa. Parth., p. 5). Some have thought that it occurs as Isî in the Egyptian Inscriptions of the time of Thothmes III., but about n. c. 1450 (Birch, in Ovla. Egypt., p. 80).

This place has always been famous for its bitumen springs. It is bitumen which is brought to Thothmes III. as tribute from Isî. From Isî, according to Herodotus, was obtained the bitumen used as cement in the walls of Babylon (l. s. c.). Isidore calls Aelopolis "the place where are the bitumen springs" (ἐν τοιοῦτοι τὰς ὄρμας τῆς περιήγησιν). These springs still exist in Isî, and sufficiently mark the identity of that place with the Herodotean Isî, and therefore probably with the Isîth of Scripture. They have been noticed by most of our Mesopotamian travellers (see, among others, Rich’s First Memoir on Babylon, p. 64, and Chenevay’s Empires Expedition, i. 55).

IVORY (יווח, shen, in all passages, except 1 K. x. 22, and 2 Chr. ix. 21, where נקנ, shên-hoblim, is so rendered). The word shen literally signifies "the tooth" of any animal, and hence more especially denotes the substance of the projecting tusks of elephants. By some of the ancient nations these tusks were supposed to be

lornus (Es. xxvii. 15; Phil. viii. 4, xviii. 1), though Diodorus Siculus (i. 55) correctly calls them teeth. As they were first acquainted with elephants through their ivory, which was an important article of commerce, the shape of the tusks, in all probability, led them into this error. It is remarkable that no word in 55.13/14 is used to denote an elephant, unless the latter portion of the compound shen-hoblim be supposed to have this meaning. Gesenius derives it from the Sanscrit ḍvah, "an elephant;" Keil (on I K. x. 22) from the Coptic έβυς; while Sir Henry Rawlinson mentions a word ᾱβα, which he met with in the Assyrian inscriptions, and which he understands to mean "the large animal," the term being applied both to the elephant and the camel (Journ. of As. Soc. xii. 461). It is suggested in Gesenius’ Thesaurus (s. v.) that the original reading may have been נעב בחון ל, "ivory, ebony" (cf. Ez. xxvii. 15). Hitzig (Hdb., p. 643), without any authority, renders the word "nubišhen Zahn." The Targum Jonathan on 1 K. x. 22 has נעב בחון ל, "elephant’s tusk," while the Peshito gives simply "elephants." In the Targum of the Pseudo Jonathan, Gen. i. 1 is translated, "and Joseph placed his father upon a bier of נעב לחון ל, "shelnaphil," which is conjectured to be a valuable species of wood, but for which Buxtorf, with great probability, suggests as another reading נעב לחון, "ivory."

The Assyrians appear to have carried on a great traffic in ivory. Their early conquests in India had made them familiar with it, and (according to one rendering of the passage) their artists supplied the luxurious Tyrians with carvings in ivory from the isles of Chittim (Es. xxvii. 6). On the obelisk in the British Museum the captives or tribute bearers are represented as carrying tusks. Among the merchandise of Babylon, enumerated in Rev. xiii. 12, are included "all manner vessels of ivory." The skilled workmen of Hiram, king of Tyre, fashioned the great ivory throne of Solomon, and overdid it with pure gold (1 K. x. 18; 2 Chr. ix. 17). The ivory thus employed was supplied by the caravans of Dedan (Is. xxiv. 13; Ez. xxvii. 19), or was brought with apes and peacocks by the navy of Tharshish (1 K. x. 22). The Egyptians, at a very early period, made use of this material in decoration. The cover of a small ivory box in the Egyptian collection at the Louvre is "inscribed with the names Nefert-ka-re, or Neper-cheres, adopted by a dynasty found in the upper line of the tablet of Abydos, and attributed by M. Bunsen to the fifth. . . . In the time of Thothmes III. ivory was imported in considerable quantities in Egypt, . . . in boxes laden with ivory and ebony" from Ethiopia, or else in tusks and cups from the Ruten-nu. . . . The celebrated car at Florence has its linchpins tipped with ivory" (Birch, in Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Lit. iii. 2d series). The specimens of Egyptian ivory work, which are found in the principal museums of Europe, are, most of them, in the opinion of Mr. Birch, of a date anterior to the Persian invasion, and some even as old as the 18th dynasty.

The ivory used by the Egyptians was principally brought from Ethiopia (Herod. iii. 114), though their elephants were originally from Asia. The Ethiopians, according to Diodorus Siculus (i. 55), brought to SesostrisIII. ebony and gold, and the
IZRAHITE, THE

IVY (σαγήνα; baleum), the common Red Sea ivy, of which the ancient Greeks and Romans knew two or three kinds, which appear to be only varieties. Mention of this plant is made only in 2 Mac. vi. 7, where it is said that the Jews were compelled, when the feast of Baccus was kept, to go in procession carrying ivy to this deity, to whom it is well known this plant was sacred. Ivy, however, though not mentioned by name, has a peculiar interest to the Christian, as forming the "incorruptible crown" (1 Cor. ix. 25) for which the competitors at the great Isthmian games contended, and which St. Paul so beautifully contrasts with the "incorruptible crown" which shall hereafter circumscribe the brows of those who run worthily the race of this mortal life. In the Isthmian contests the victor's garland was either ivy or pine.

W. H.

* The ivy (such as is described above) grows wild also in Palestine.

G. E. P.

IZEHARI [israpel: Jeznur]. The form in which the name Isaiah is given in the A. V. of Num. iii. 19 only. In ver. 27 the family of the same person is given "the Izzahrites." The Hebrew word is the same as Izzhar.

IZZEHARITES, THE (זֶזָּהֵרֵי; ó is- raped; Alex. o 2aap; Jeznurite). A family of Kohathite Levites, descended from Izzhar the son of Heman (Num. iii. 27); called also in the A. V. "Izzahrites." W. A. W.

IZZAR (spelt Izzahr in Num. iii. 19, of A. V.; in Heb. always יִזָּהֶר [oil, and perhaps one anointed with oil]: israpel and [1 Chr. vi. 38, xxxii. 12, 18] israpel [but here Vat. Alex. read israap]; Vat. in Ex. iii. 19, israpel]; israap, son of Izzah of Levi, used as a name of Aaron and Moses, and father of Korah (Ex. vi. 18, 21; Num. iii. 19, vii. 1; 1 Chr. vi. 2, 18). But in 1 Chr. vi. 22 Amminadub is substituted for Izzah, as the son of Kohath and father of Korah, in the line of Samuel. This, however, must be an accidental error of the scribe, as in ver. 38, where the same genealogy is repeated, Izzah appears again in the same person. (See Cant. vi. 22 read Izraap in place of Amminadub, and the Alaline and tomplukt, read Amminadub between Izzah and Kore, making another generation. But these are probably only corrections of the text.) See Barrington's Genealogies of the O. T.) Izzah was the head of the family of the Izzahrites or Izzahrites (Num. iii. 27; 1 Chr. xxvi. 23, 24), one of the four families of the Kohathites.

C. A. II.

IZZAHARITES, THE (זֶזָּהֵרֵי; ó israpel, ó israpel, ó israpel; [Vat. in 1 Chr. xxiv. 22, xxxvi. 29, israpel; Alex. o israpel, o israpel, o israpel: Isaac; Israel]; the same as the preceding. In the reign of David, Shebonith was the chief of the family (1 Chr. xxiv. 22), and with his brethren had charge of the treasure dedicated for the Temple (1 Chr. xxvi. 23, 24).)

W. A. W.

IZRAHIAH [israhah causes to sprout forth or appear]; israhal, Esrai; [Vat. in Isa. xxii. 19, 20; Alex. 2israal; esra; one of the Ben-e-Zebul (sons of J.), and father of four, or five — which is not clear — of the principal men in the tribe (1 Chr. vii. 3).

IZRAHIAH, THE (זְרָיהָה); i. e. "the Israhahites" (inclyoumous, utique, Gen. First); ó israpel. [Vat. Esrae; Alex. Esraa; Isaac, the designation of Shammurth, the captain of the fifth
IZREEL

monthly course as appointed by David (1 Chr. xxvii. 8). In its present form the Hebrew will not bear the interpretation put on it in the A. V. Its real force is probably Zerubbite, that is, from the great Judaic family of Zerah — the Zarites.

*IZREEL* is used for JERZIEL in Josh. xix. 18 in the A. V. ed. 1611. It is the common form in the Genevan version.

IZ'RI (יִּשְׁרִי), i. e. "the Istrite [Iehovih creates, First];" *Ithr*; [Vat. Isrebi < Isri]; Alex. Eshri; a Levite, leader of the fourth course or ward in the service of the house of God (1 Chr. xxv. 11). In ver. 3 he is called ZERI.

JA'AKAN (יָאָקָן, [one sagacious, intelligent, Forefather]), [Vat.] Alex. Iskaining: Jacabin, the forefather of the Bene-Jaakan, round whose well, the children of Israel encamped after they left Moserah, and from which they went on to Hor Hagidgad (Deut. x. 6). Jaakan was son of Ezer, the son of Seir the Horite (1 Chr. i. 42). The name is here given in the A. V. as JAKAN, though without any reason for the change. In Gen. xxxvi. 27 it is in the abbreviated form of AKAN. The site of the wells has not been identified. Some suggestions will be seen under Bene-Jaakan.

JA'AKOBAH (יָאָקָבָא): *Iowaibah;* Alex. Iskabah: Jacobon, one of the princes (יָאָבֹא) of the families of Simeon (1 Chr. iv. 38). Excepting the termination, the name is identical with that of Jacob.

*First makes this name = "to Jacob," i. e. reckoned to him. It is the unaccented paragoge יָאָבֹא appended to a class of proper names in the later Hebrew. (Hebr. und Chald. Handb. s. v.)

JA'ALÁ (יָאָלָא, [red she-goat]): *Iowaíla;* Alex. FA. Ieana < Jalaba). Bene-Jaada (sons of J.) were among the descendants of "Solomon's slaves" who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii. 58). The name also occurs as —

JA'ALÁH (יָאָלָה) [as above]: *Iowaálah;* Alex. Isla: Jola, Ezr. ii. 58; and in Esdras as JElLA.

JA'ALAM (יָאָלָם): whom God hides, Ges.: *IaJala: Ielion, Heilmon*, a son of Estu by his wife Aholiabamah (Gen. xxxvi. 5, 14, 18; cf. 1 Chr. i. 35), and a phylarch (A. V. "duke") or head of a tribe of Edom. E. S. P.

JA'ANAI (3 syn.): [whom Jehovah answers]: *Ia'anaw;* [Vat. Aeanwe]; Alex. Iasa: Janai, a chief man in the tribe of Gad (1 Chr. i. 12). The LXX. have followed the connecting name, Shaphat, to Jaanal, and rendered it 1. 3 γεαναταινέων.

JA'ARE-OREGIM (יָאָרֵי אֶרְגְּיִם) [see note]: *Acharpeia;* [Vat. Alex. -eirwe]: Solitus pugnaealterius), according to the present text of 2 Sam. xxi. 19, a Bethlehemite, and the father of Ethan who slew Goliath (the words "the brother of*:*" are added in the A. V.). In the parallel pas-

sage, 1 Chr. xiv. 5, besides other difference, Jar is found instead of Jaare, and Oregim is enriched. Oregim is not elsewhere found as a proper name nor is it a common word; and occurring as it does without doubt at the end of the verse (A. V. "weavers"), in a sentence exactly parallel to that in 1 Sam. xvii. 7, it is not probable that it should also occur in the middle of the same. The conclusion of Kennicott ([Dissertation, 80]) appears a just one — that in the latter place it has been interpolated from the former, and that Jar or Jair is the correct reading instead of Jaare. [Elmansan, vol. i. p. 697 a.]

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

JA'ARIM (יָאָרִים, but the Kerî has "יָאָרִים"), i. e. Jasi (Israelites) makes, or is mother): and so the Vulg. (Jair), one of the Bene-Bani who had married a foreign wife, and had put her away (Ezr. x. 37). In the parallel list of 1 Esdras the name is not recognizable. The LXX. had a different text — καὶ ἑπιονάων = Ἰάρην.

JA'ASIEL (יָאָסֵיאל, [whom God created]): *Ia'siála;* [Vat. Aesíap]; Alex. Astia: Jasîch, son of the great Abner, ruler (יָאָסֵיאל) or prince (ינכט) of his tribe of Benjamin, in the time of David (1 Chr. xxviii. 21).

JA'AZANIAH (יָאָצָנְיָה) and ZE'ANIAH [whom Jehovah honours]: 1. YA'AZAN-YA'HU (יָאָצָנְיָה יָאָזָנְיָה) [Ieçóviás; [Vat. Ogóvías]: Jeconias), one of the "captains of the forces" who accompanied Johanan ben-Kareah to pay his respects to Gedaliah at Mizpah after the fall of Jerusalem (2 K. xxv. 29), and who appears afterwards to have assisted in restoring Jehoiachin's prey from his captives (comp. Jer. xii. 11). After that, he probably went to Egypt with the rest (Jer. xiii. 4, 5). He is described as the "son of the (not 'a') Maachathite." In the narrative of Jeremiah the name is slightly changed to ZEJANIAH.

2. YA'AZAN-YA'HU (Ieçóviás; Alex. Ieçóviás: Jeconias), son of Saklah, leader of the band of seventy of the elders of Israel, who were seen by Ezekiel worshipping before the idols on the wall of...
JAAZER

The court of the house of Jehovah (Ez. viii. 11).

It is possible that he is identical with

3. YAAZAN-YAM' (I'cewiiain: Jezomin), son of Azur; one of the "princes" (נְבָנֵי) of the people against whom Ezekiel was directed to prophesy (Ez. xi. 1). 

4. YAAZAN-YAM' (I'cewiiain: Jezomin), a Rechabite, son of Jeremiah. He appears to have been the sheik of the tribe at the time of Jeremiah's interview with them (Jer. xxxv. 3). [\'JHON-ADAM].

JAAZER and JAZER [helpers, Ges.; or place helpéd about, Fürst: see infra]. (The form of this name has much varied both in the A. V. and the Hebrew, though the one does not follow the other. In Num. xxxii. it is twice given Jazer and once Jazer, the Hebrew being in all three cases יָאָזֶר [?], i.e. Ya'ez'er. Elsewhere in Numbers and in Josh. iii. it is Jazer; but in Josh. xxi., in 2 Sam. xxiv., Isaiah and Jeremiah, Jazer: the Hebrew in all these is יָיָהֵזֶר, Ya'ez'er. In Chronicles it is also Jazer; but here the Hebrew is in the extended form of יָאָזֶר, Ya'ez'er, a form which the Samar. Codex also presents in Num. xxxii.

The LXX. have Ἰαζερ, but once [2 Sam. xxiv. 5] Ελασής, Alex. Ελασής — including the alluded Heb. particle, [and in 1 Chr. vi. 81, Vat. Εαζερ: xxvi. 31, Vat. Εαζερ, Alex. Εαζερ: Vulg. Jazer, Jaser, [Jazer]]. A town on the east of Jordan, in or near to Gilead (Num. xxxii. 1, 3; 1 Chr. xxvi. 31). We first hear of it in possession of the Amorites, and as taken by Israel after Heshbon, and on their way from thence to Bashan (Num. xxxii. 31). It was rebuilt subsequently by the children of Gad (xxxi. 35), and was a prominent place in their territory (Josh. xiii. 25; 2 Sam. xxiv. 5). It was allotted to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi. 39; 1 Chr. vi. 51), but in the time of David it would appear to have been occupied by Hebronites, i.e. descendants of Kohath (1 Chr. xxvi. 31). It seems to have given its name to a district of dependent or "daughter" towns (Num. xxxii. 32; A. V. "villages:" 1 Marc. v. 8), the "land of Jazer" (Num. xxxii. 1). In the "laborious" proclaimed over Moab by Isaiah and Jeremiah, Jazer is mentioned so as to imply that there were vineyards there, and that the cultivation of the vine had extended thither from Shihmah (Is. xvi. 8; 9; Jer. xxxiii. 32). In the latter passage, as the text at present stands, mention is made of the "sea of Jazer" (נַּחֲלִית הָיֶרֶשׁ). This may have been some pool or lake of water, or possibly is an ancient corruption of the text, the LXX. having a different reading — ποιημα 1. (See Gesenius, Sestiai, i. 556.)

Jazer was known to Eusebius and Jerome, and its position is laid down with minuteness in the Onomasticon as 10 (or 8, s. voc. Α'αζερ) Roman miles west of Philadelphia (Amman), and 15 from Heshbon, and as the source of a river which falls into the Jordan. Two sites bearing the names of Charet Seir and Es-Seir, on the road westward of Amman, were pointed out by Seetzen in 1806 (Reisen, 1864, i. 397, 398). The latter of these was passed also by Burckhardt (Syr. 364) at 2 hours a in Num. xxxi. 21, where the present Hebrew text (N. V. "strong").)

below Fœnis going south. The ruins may or may have been on the left (east) of the road, and below them and the road is the source of the Wâlir Seir (ウン), or Mîjeb es-Sîır (Sethzein), answering though certainly but imperfectly, to the nuxrib mu'attos of Eusebius. Seetzen conjectures that the sea of Jazer may have been at the source of this brook, considerable marshes or pools sometimes existing at these spots. (Comp. his early suggestion of the source of the Wâlir Seir, p. 393.) Seir, is shown on the map of Van de Velde as 9 Roman miles W. of Amman, and about 12 from Heshbon. And here, until further investigation, we must be content to place Jazer.

G.

JAAZIYA'H (יָאָזֶיוֹיָהוּ, i.e. Ya'aziyahu [whom Jehovah consotes]) 'Oqiya' [Vat. Oqi'ma: Osaiu], apparently a third son, or a descendant, of Merari the Levite, and the founder of an independent house in that family (1 Chr. xxvi. 29, 27); neither he nor his descendants are mentioned elsewhere (comp. the lists in xxii. 21-23; Es. vi. 19, &c.). The word Bunu (בּוּנֵה), which follows Jaziazh, should probably be translated "his son," i.e. the son of Merari.

JAAZIEL (יָאָזֶיֵיאֵל, [ whom God consecutes]) 'Oqjia' [Vat. O'qa: Osia: Jaziel], one of the Levites of the second order who were appointed by David to perform the musical service before the ark (1 Chr. xv. 18). If Jaziel in ver. 20 is a contracted form of the same name — and there is no reason to doubt it (comp. Jesharelah and Asherah, 1 Chr. xxv. 2, 14) — his business was to "sound the psaltery on Amabom."* In the A. V. ed. 1611 the name is written Jaziel, as in the Bishops' Bible and the Vulgate.

JABAL (גְּבָל, [a stream]) 'Iṣbîa', [Alex. Ιαβάτα: Jebel]: the son of Lamech and Adah (Gen. iv. 20) and brother of Jubal. Though descended from a dweller in a city (ver. 17), he is described as the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle. Bochart (Hieroz. i. ii. c. 44, near the end) points out the difference between his mode of life and Abel's. Jubal's was a migratory life, and his possessions probably included other animals besides sheep. The shepherds who were before him may have found the land on which they dwelt sufficiently productive for the constant sustenance of their flocks in the neighborhood of their fixed abodes.

W. T. B.

JABUK (גָּבֻו, [streaming forth, flowing], Sim. Ges.; [Iaββοκ; in Gen. xxxiii. 22, Rom.] 'Iaββοκ: Jebuk, [Juboc]), a stream which intersects the mountain range of Gilead (comp. Josh. xiii. 2, 5), and falls into the Jordan about midway between the sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. There is great difficulty in interpreting two or three passages of Scripture in which the name Jekrok, as spoken of as the "border of the children of Ammon." The following facts may perhaps throw some light upon them: — The Ammonites at one time possessed the whole country between the rivers Arnon and Jabbok, from the Jordan on the west to the wilderness on the east. They were driven out of it by Sihon king of the Amorites; and he was in turn expelled by the Israelites. Yet long subsequent to these events, the country was popularly called — the
JABESH

and of the Ammonites," and was even claimed by them (Judg. xi. 12-22). For this reason the Jabbock is still called "the border of the children of Ammon" in Deut. xiii. 10, and Josh. xii. 2. Again, when the Ammonites were driven out by Sichon from their ancient territory, they took possession of the eastern plain, and of a considerable section of the eastern defiles of Gilead, around the sources and upper branches of the Jabbock. Rabbath-Ammon, their capital city (2 Sam. xi.), stood within the mountains of Gilead, and on the banks of a tributary to the Jabbock. This explains the statement in Num. xxi. 24—"Israel possessed his (Sichon's) land from Arnon unto Jabbock, unto the children of Ammon (יהודה לְיהוּדָה), for the border of the children of Ammon was strong"—the border among the defiles of the upper Jabbock was strong. This also illustrates Deut. ii. 36, "Only unto the land of the children of Ammon thou canst not go, unto every place of the torrent Jabbock ( SATA לַיהוּדָה), and unto the cities in the mountains, and every place which the Lord our God forbade." It was on the south bank of the Jabbock the interview took place between Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 22); and this river afterwards became, towards its western part, the boundary between the kingdoms of Sichon and Og (Josh. xii. 3, 5). Emek-bias rightly places it between Gerasa and Philadelphia (Omne. s. v.); and at the present day it separates the province of Bella from Jebel Jyljan. Its modern name is Wady Zurco. It rises in the plateau east of Gilead, and receives many tributaries from both north and south in the eastern defiles of the mountain-range—one of these comes from Gerasa, another from Rabbath-Ammon; but all of them are mere winter streams. The Zurco cuts through Gilead in a deep, narrow defile. Throughout the lower part of its course it is fringed with thickets of cane and oleander, and the banks above are clothed with oak-forests. Towards its mouth the stream is perennial, and in winter often impassable.

* For other notices of the Jabbock, its history and scenery, the reader may see Robinson's Phys. Geogr. pp. 57, 139 f.; Tristram's Land of Israel, pp. 475, 553 (2d ed.); Stanley's S. of P. p. 200 (Amer. ed.); Porter's Handbook of Syria, p. 310 f.; and Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea, p. 253. The ford of Jabbock which Jacob crossed with his family on his return from Mesopotamia (Gen. xlviii. 13 f.) is pointed out at Kidmat Serka, on the great Damascus road through Gilead. A legend which contradicts the Biblical account assigns the passage to the Jordan, north of the Sea of Galilee. See Ritter's Gilead, page 290 (G. G. C. Gamm, N. of A. xiv. 228). The depression which marks the valley of the Zurco (Jabbock) can be seen from the heights near Bethel (Rob. Res. i. 444, 2d ed.).

JABEZ (ュー [dry, parched]: laBes [Vat. laBes]; Alex. laBes; Joseph. laBes) is a city of Stratum, the Upper Galilee of Israel (2 K. xv. 10, 13, 14).

2. [Vat. laBes: Alex. in 1 Sam., EmesBes: in . Chr., laBes] The short form of the name JABEZ-GILEAD (1 Chr. x. 12 only). [The short form also occurs in 1 Sam. xi. 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 100, 12, 13, 13 only].

JABEZ-GILEAD (יהודה SPELLING: שִׁבְש) also

1 Sam. xi. 1, 9, &c., dry, from מתל, to be dry; [1 Sam. xi. 1, 2 Sam. xxi. 12.] laBes [Vat. Alex. -Beis] laladis [1 Sam. xii. 9, laBes (Vat. -Beis); Alex. EmesBes laladis; 1 Sam. xxxii. 11 2 Sam. ii. 4, 5, laBes (Vat. -Beis; Alex. EmesBes laladis); 1 J. x. 11 laladis [Vat. -Beis]; Alex. EmesBes laladis. In the etymology of Gilead. [Gilead.] In its widest sense Gilead included the half tribe of Manasseh (1 Chr. xxvii. 21) as well as the tribes of Gad and Reuben (Num. xxxii. 1-42) east of the Jordan—and of the cities of Gilead, Jabesh was the chief. It is first mentioned in connection with the cruel vengeance taken upon its inhabitants for not coming up to Mizpeh on the occasion of the fierce war between the children of Israel and the tribe of Benjamin. Every male of the city was put to the sword, and all virgins—to the number of 400—seized to be given in marriage to the 600 men of Benjamin that remained (Judg. xiii. 8-14). Nevertheless the city survived the loss of its males; and being attacked subsequently by Nahash the Ammonite, gave Saul an opportunity of displaying his prowess in its defense, and declaring himself worthy to be the king of his people by the children of Belial to his sovereignty (1 Sam. i. 1-15). Neither were his exhortations in behalf of this city unrequited; for when he and his three sons were slain by the Philistines in Mount Gilboa (1 Sam. xxxi. 8), the men of Jabesh-Gilead came by night and took down their corpses from the walls of Beth-shan where they had been exposed as trophies; then burnt the bodies, and buried the bones under a tree near Gilboa—observing a strict funeral fast for seven days (ibid. 13). David does not forget to bless them for this act of piety towards his old master, and his more than brother (2 Sam. ii. 5); though he afterwards had their remains translated to the ancestral sepulchre in the tribe of Benjamin (2 Sam. xxii. 14). As to the site of the city, it is not defined in the O. T., but EmesBes (Omne. s. v.) places it beyond Jordan, 6 miles from Pella on the mountain-road to Gerasa; where its name is probably preserved in the Wady Tribes, which, flowing from the east, enters the Jordan below Beth-shan or Scythopolis. According to Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. iii. 319), the ruin ed-Deir, on the S. side of the Wady, still marks its site.

JA'BEZ (יהודא who causes sorrow, Gez.: possibly a high place, Frärts.: laBes; Vat. רָכָּס [Rackas]; Alex. EmesBes: Jobes), apparently a place at which the families of the scribes (זָכָּס) resided, who belonged to the families of the Kenites (1 Chr. ii. 59). It occurs among the descendants of Salmon, who was of Judah; and closely connected with Rechabah the son of Eliezer, Moses' brother's son (1 Chr. xxvii. 25), and objects with Othniel the Kenizzite, who bore the name of Jabesh because he founded by his counsel (רָכָּס) a school (זָכָּס) of disciples called Tirathites, Shim'atites, and Sucathites." See also the quotations
JABIN

from Tal and, Tenworth, in Baxter's Lex. col. 966, where a similar derivation is given.

2. [1yavh2:3; Av. 1yavh2id, 1avh2:] The name occurs again in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 9, 10) in a passage of remarkable detail inserted in a genealogy again connected with Beth-lehem (ver. 4). Here a different force is attached to the name. It is made to refer to the sorrow (ncbc) with which his mother bore him, and also to his prayer that evil may not grieve (nuni) him. Jabez was "more honorable than his brethren," though who they were is not ascertainable. It is very doubtful whether any connection exists between this genealogy and that in ii. 50-53. Several names appear in both — Hur, Ephratah, Bethlehem, Zaraathites (in A. V. iv. 2 inaccurately "Zorath- ties"), Josh, Caleb; and there is much similarity between others, as Reehah and Reehah, Esthon and Esthendants; but any positive connection seems undemonstrable. The Targum repeats its identification of Jabez and Othmim.

These passages in the Targums are worthy of remark, not only because they exemplify the same habit of playing on words and seeking for derivations which is found in the above and many other passages of the Bible, both early and late, but also because, as often as not, the puns do not now exist in the Rabbinical Hebrew in which these paraphrases are written, although they appear if that Rabbinical Hebrew is translated back into Biblical Hebrew. There are several cases of this in the Targum above quoted, namely, on 1 Chr. ii. 55 (see Tirathim, Necathim, etc.), and others in the Targum on Ruth, in the additions to the genealogy at the end of that book. One example will show what is intended.

"Obed (y2)n22 was he who served the Lord of the world with a perfect heart."

"Served" in Biblical Hebrew is y2'n22, from the same root as Obed, but in the dialect of the Targum it is y2'n2'n, so that the allusion (like that in Coleridge's famous pun) exists, as it stands, neither for the eye nor the ear.

JA'BIN (יָבִין; [intelligent, First; one whom God observes], Gen.; 1 sa6; [Av. Alex. 1sa6: Jobin]). 1. King of Hazor, a royal city in the north of Palestine, near the waters of Meron, who organized a confederacy of the northern princes against the Israelite (Josh. xi. 1-3). He assembled an army, which the Scripture narrative merely compares to the sands for multitude (ver. 4), but which Josephus reckons at 300,000 foot, 10,000 horse, and 20,000 chariots. Joshua, encouraged by God, surprised this vast army of allied forces "by the waters of Meron" (ver. 7); near Kedesh, according to Josephus, attired them, cut the horse-skins of their horses, and burnt their chariots with fire at a place which from that circumstance may have derived its name of Misapheth-Maim (Haller, On the Genealogies, p. 228). [MISAPHETH-MAIM.] It is probable that in consequence of this battle the confederate kings, and Jabin among them, were reduced to vassalage, for we find immediately afterwards that Jabin is safe in his capital, but during the ensuing wars (which occupied some

a In Josh. xvi. 18, Joshua "turned back," and perhaps on some fresh rebellion of Jabin, inflicted on him a signal and summary vengeance, making Hazor an exception to the general rule of not burning the conquered cities of Canaan (xi. 1-14; Joseph. Ant. v. 1, § 18; Ewald, Gesch. ii. 328).

2. In Judg., 1la6 (Var. -Be'el): Alex. Ia6, Ia6 (Vat. -Be'el): Alex. Ia6, Ia6 (Var. -Be'el). A king of Hazor was defeated by Barak, whose army is described in much the same terms as that of his predecessor (Judg. iv. 3, 13), and who suffered precisely the same fate. We have already pointed out the minute similarity of the two narratives (Josh. xi.; Judg. iv., v.), and an attentive comparison of them with Josephus (who curiously omits the name of Jabin altogether in his mention of Joshua's victory, although his account is full of details) would easily supply further points of resemblance. [BARAK: DEMILALAH.] It is indeed by no means impossible that in the course of 150 years Hazor should have risen from its ashes, and even regained its preeminence under sovereigns who still bore the old dynastic name. But entirely independent considerations show that the period between Joshua and Barak could not have been 150 years, and indeed tend to prove that those two chiefs were contemporaries (Hervey, Gener. p. 228): and we are therefore led to regard the two accounts of the destruction of Hazor and Jabin as really applying to the same monarch, and the same event. What is to prevent us from supposing that dabin and his confederate kings were defeated both by Joshua and by Barak, and that distinct accounts of both victories were preserved? The most casual reader of the narrative cannot but be struck by the remarkable resemblance between the two stories. There is no ground whatever to throw doubts on the historical reality of the earlier narrative, as is done by Hasse (p. 120), Maurer (ad loc.), Studer (on Judges, p. 90), and De Wette (Com. p. 231), according to Keil, on Josh. xi. 10-13; and by Rosenmuller (Schr. Jds. xi. 11): but when the chronological arguments are taken into consideration, we do not (in spite of the difficulties which still remain) consider Havernick successful in removing the improbabilities which beset the common supposition that this Jabin lived long after the one which Joshua defeated. At any rate we cannot agree with Winer in denouncing any attempt to identify them with each other as the "ve plus alter of uncritical audacity." F. W. F.

JAB'NEEL (גַּבְנֵא, [God permits or causes to build]). The name of two towns in Palestine.

1. In O. T. Hebre.: [Vat. Aqar] Alex. Ia6, Ia6, in Asper. Ila6, Ia6, in Jown.: Jab'nel, Joum.: one of the towns on the northern boundary of Judah, not quite at the sea, though near it (Josh. xv. 11). There is no sign, however, of its ever having been occupied by Judah. Josephus (Ant. v. 1, § 22) attributes it to the Danites. There was a constant struggle going on between that tribe and the Philistines for the possession of all the places in the lowland plain (Deut. xxiii. 11), and it is not surprising that the next time we meet with Jabnehel it should be in the hands of the latter (2 Chr. xxxi. 6). Uzziah dispossessed them of it, and demolished its fortifications. Here it is in the shorter form of

the reo; probably reading y2'n22 for the press word y2'n22.
JABNEEL. In its Greek garb, IANNIA, it is frequently mentioned in the Maccabees (1 Mac. iv. 15, v. 58, x. 69, xv. 40), in whose time it was again a strong place. According to Josephus (Ant. xii. 8, § 6) Togrias was governor of it; but the text of the Maccabees (2 Mac. xiii. 2) has DUMMAEA. At this time there was a harbor on the coast, to which, and the vessels lying there, Judas set fire, and the conflagration was seen at Jerusalem, a distance of about 25 miles (2 Mac. xii. 9). The harbor is also mentioned by Fluni, who, in consequence speaks of the town as double — dua younes (see the quotations in Euland, p. 823). Like Ascalon and Gaza, the harbor bore the title of Majumus, perhaps a Coptic word, meaning the "place on the sea" (Euland, p. 590, &c.; Rannier, p. 174, note 184, note; Keunich, Punicin, pp. 27, 29). At the time of the fall of Jerusalem. Jabneh was one of the most populous places of Judea, and contained a Jewish school of great fame,* whose learned doctors are often mentioned in the Talmud. The same Jabnehflam was also held here. In this holy city, according to an early Jewish tradition, Rabbah * is buried the great Gamaliel. His tomb was visited by Parchi in the 14th century (Zuma, in Asher's Benj. of Tewel, ii. 439, 440: also 98). In the time of Eusebius, however, it had dwindled to a small place, πολιχνια, merely requiring casual mention (Onomasticon). In the 6th century, under Justinian, it became the seat of a Christian bishop (Epiphanius, o.e. Haec. lib. II. 750). Under the Crusaders it bore the corrupted name of Derlin, and gave a title to a line of Counts, one of whom, Jean d'Herlin, about 1230, restored to efficiency the famous code of the "Assises de Jerusalem" (Gibbon, ch. 58 ad fin.; also the citations in Rannier, P'bulinim, p. 185). The modern village of Yeboah, or more accurately Ibaa (יאב), stands about two miles from the sea, on a slight eminence just south of the Nahr Robin. It is about 11 miles south of Jaffa, 7 from Reemlaq, and 4 from Akir (Elron). It probably occupies its ancient site, for some remains of old buildings are to be seen, possibly relics of the fortress which the Crusaders built there (Porter, Handbook of the Holy Land, p. 274). Rannier (P'bulinim, p. 203, 4te Aufl.) regards Jabeln and Jabneh as probably the same. Fürst (Handb. i. 479) denies that they are the same, regarding Jabneh indeed as represented by Yeboah, but the site of Jabneh as lost. The traveller going from Enkal (Ashdod) to Yafa (Joppa) passes near Yeboah, conspicuous on a hill to the right, at the foot of which is a well from which the water is raised by a large wheel. The women of the village may be seen here in picturesque groups, with their water-skins and jars, at almost any hour. A slab of antique marble forms the front-piece of the watering-trough, and other similar fragments lie scattered here and there. At a little distance further south occur a few remains of a Roman aqueduct. The Gamaliel whose tomb is shown at Yeboah (see above) must be understood to be Gamaliel the younger, a grandson of the great rabbi, who was Paul's teacher. (See Sepp's Jezus. und die helle. Land, ii. 501.) The origin, studies, and fame of the Jewish school established at Jannia or Yeboah after the destruction of Jerusalem form an important chapter in the history of rabbinical and biblical literature. Lightfoot furnishes an out line of the subject (Ixxvi. 141—144, Anecd. in Luc. 1881). The best modern account of this section and its influence on the philosophy and religious ideas of the Jews is probably that of Dr. H. Graetz in the opening chapter of his Geschichte der Juden, vol. iv. (Berlin, 1853). The reader may see also Jost's Geschichte der Israeliten, iii. 185 ff.; and Dean Milman's History of the Jews, vol. ii. b. xxv. 151 ff.

1. (Iglmutha) Alex. l'abrah; [Comp. 'iabrah';] Jemnah. One of the landmarks on the boundary of Naphatli (Josh. xix. 33, only. It is named next after Adami-Nekeb, and had apparently Lakkuna between it and the "outgoings" of the boundary at the Jordan. But little or no clue can be got from the passage to its situation. Doubtless it is the same place which, as Izareina (180, § 37), and Izarein (B. J. ii. 20, § 6), is mentioned by Josephus among the villages in Upper Galilee, which, though strong in themselves (petrodes altas), were fortified by him in anticipation of the arrival of the Romans. The other villages named by him in the same connection are Netho, Achabare, or the rock of the Achabari, and Sepha. Schwarz (p. 181) mentions that the latter name of Jemnah was Kfar Yabush, the village by the sea. Taking this with the vague indications of Josephus, we should be disposed to look for its traces at the N. W. part of the Sea of Galilee, in the hill country.

G.

JABNEH (יָבָה) [he lets or causes to build]: "Iabreph; [Lit. Abrephur]" Alex. l'abrah; Jabbeh, 2 Chr. xxvi. 6. [JABNEEL].

JACHAN (יָחָן) [affixation or affixed]: l'ayvā; [Lit. Yaya';] Alex. l'ayvā; Jachhon, one of seven chief men of the tribe of Gad (1 Chr. v. 12).

JACHIN (יָחִין) [he shall establish]: in Kings, l'ayvū, Alex. l'ayvū; but in Chr. Kā-threadia in both M.S.; Josephus, l'ayvā; Jachin, Jochin), one of the two pillars which were set up in the temple (1 K. vi. 21) or before the temple (2 Chr. iii. 17) of Solomon. It was the "right-hand" one of the two; by which is probably meant the south (comp. 1 K. vii. 39). However, both the position and the structure of these famous columns are full of difficulties, and they will be most suitably examined in describing the Temple. Interpreted as a Hebrew word Jachin signifies firmness [See DOX 2.]

JACHIN (יָחִין) [as above]: l'ayvā, l'ayvā, l'ayvā; [in Num. Vat. Alex. l'ayvā; in Gen. and Ex.] Alex. l'ayvā: Jachin). 1. Fourth son of Simeon (Gen. xvi. 10; Ex. v. 15); founder of the family of the Jachnites (Num. xxii. 21). 2. [In 1 Chr. ix. and Neh.] Alex., l'ayvā, Vat. l'ayvā, l'ayvā: l'ayvā; in 1 Chr. xxiv., l'ayvā, Vat. l'ayvā, Alex. l'ayvā. Head of the 21st course of priests in the time of David. Some of the course returned from Babylon (1 Chr. ix. 10, xxiv. 17; Neh. xi.

* Or y'ina (Geschichte der Juden, iv. 18) speaks of this idea a renowned Jewish school at Jabneh before the fall of Jerusalem as unsounded. All its celebrity, if not its existence, was subsequent to that event. II.
JACOB, the son of Isaac and Rebekah. He was born with Esau, when Isaac was 60 and Abraham 159 years old, probably at the well Laban-roi. His history is related in the latter half of the book of Genesis. He grew up a quiet, domestic youth, the favorite son of his mother. He bought the birthright from his brother Esau; and afterwards, at his mother's instigation, acquired the blessing intended for Esau, by practicing a well-known deceit on Isaac. Hitherto the two sons shared the wanderings of Isaac in the South Country; but now Jacob, in his 78th year, was sent from the family home, to avoid his brother, and to seek a wife among his kindred in Padan-aram. As he passed through Bethel, God appeared to him. After the lapse of 21 years he returned from Padan-aram with two wives, two concubines, eleven sons, and a daughter, and large property. He escaped from the angry pursuit of Laban, from a rencontre with Esau, and from the vengeance of the Canaanites provoked by the murder of Shechem; and in each of these three emergencies he was aided and strengthened by the interposition of God, and in sign of the grace won by a night of wrestling with God his name was changed at Jabbok into Israel ("soldier of God"). Deborah and Rachel died before he reached Hebron; and it was at Hebron, in the 125th year of his age, that he and Esau buried their father Isaac. Joseph, the favorite son of Jacob, was sold into Egypt eleven years before the death of Isaac; and Jacob had probably exceeded his 130th year when he went thither, being encouraged in a divine vision as he pressed for the last time through Beer-sheba. He was presented to Pharaoh, and dwelt for seventeen years in Ram- ses and Goshen. After giving his solemn blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh, and his own sons one by one, and charging the ten to complete their reconciliation with Joseph, he died in his 147th year. His body was embalmed, carried with great care and pomp into the land of Canaan, and deposited with his fathers, and his wife Leah, in the cave of Machpehlah.

The example of Jacob is quoted by the first and the last of the minor prophets. Hosea, in the latter days of the kingdom, seeks (xii. 3, 4, 12) to convert the descendants of Jacob from their state of alienation from God, by recalling to their memory the repeated acts of God's favor shown to their ancestor. And Malachi (i. 2) strengthens the despoothing hearts of the returned exiles by assuring them that the love which God bestowed upon Jacob was not withheld from them. Besides the frequent mention of his name in conjunction with those of the other two Patriarchs, there are distinct references to events in the life of Jacob in four books of the N. T. In Rom. ix. 11-13, St. Paul adduces the history of Jacob's birth to prove that the favor of God is independent of the order of natural descent. In Heb. xii. 16, and xli. 21, the transfer of the birthright and Jacob's dying benediction are referred to as a parable and symbol of Messiah, and the possession of land at Shechem are cited in St. John i. 51, and iv. 5, 12. And St. Stephen, in his speech (Acts vii. 12-16), mentions the famine which was the means of restoring Jacob to his lost sons in Egypt, and the burial of the patriarch in Shechem. Such are the events of Jacob's life recorded in Scripture. Some of them require additional notice.

1. For the sale of his birthright to Jacob, Esau is branded in the N. T. as a "profane person" (Heb. xii. 16). The following sacred and important privileges have been mentioned as connected with primogeniture in patriarchal times, and as constituting the object of Jacob's desire. (a.) Superior rank in the family: see Gen. xii. 3, 4. (b.) A double portion of the father's property: so Aben Ezra see Buxt. xxi. 17, and Gen. xlix. 22. (c.) The priestly office in the patriarchal church: see Num. viii. 17-19. In favor of this, see Jerome ad Evang. Ep. lxxii. § 6; Jarchi in Gen. xxv.; Estius in Heb. xii.; Shuckford's Connection, bk. vii.; Blunt, Unkls. Council. pt. i. 1, §§ 2, 3; and against it, Vitringa, Obs. Sac., and J. D. Michaelis, Monistisch. Recht, ii. § 64, cited by Rosenmuller in Gen. xxv. (d.) A conditional promise or adoration in the heavenly inheritance: see Curtius in the Cfr. Sacr. on Gen. xxv. (e.) The promise of the seed in which all nations should be blessed, though not included in the birthright, may have been so regarded by the patriarchs, as it was by their descendants, Rom. ix. 8, and Shuckford, viii.

The whole subject has been treated in separate essays by Vitringa in his Obs. Sac. pt. i. 11, § 2; also by J. H. Hottinger, and by J. J. Schiirer, cited by W. C. Hottinger, in the Cyclopaedia.

2. With regard to Jacob's acquisition of his father's blessing, ch. xxviii., few persons will accept the excuse offered by Augustine, Serm. iv. § 22, 25, for the deceit which he practiced — that it was merely a figurative action, and that his personation of Esau was justified by his previous purchase of Esau's birthright. It is not however necessary, with the view of cherishing Christian hatred of sin, to heap opprobrious epithets upon a fallible man whom the choice of God has rendered vulnerable in the eyes of believers. Waterland (iv. 280) speaks of the conduct of Jacob in language which
in the presence of a more vigorous brother: secretly stimulated by a belief that God designed for him some superior blessing, Jacob was perhaps in a fair way to become a narrow, selfish, deceitful, disappointed man. But, after dwelling for more than half a life-time in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then in deep and bitter sorrow the outwardbecomeas, and after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the soul, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature. An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that abounding promise over which he had brooded for three-score years, since he learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the Representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic envy, and partial blindness, yet he felt himself to be the center of all the blessings which God had in store for him in his dearest earthly relations. As he nears the end of his life, Jacob's whole life becomes a series of religious experiences. The interest of the story is never lost. Jacob was a great self-reliant soul, and he was the subject of many warnings, whether in the form of dreams or in the words of an aged father. He listened to his dreams, and he heeded the warnings of his father. He was a man of great courage, and he was a man of great patience, and he was a man of great wisdom. He was a man of great love, and he was a man of great faith.

But, after dwelling for more than half a life-time in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then in deep and bitter sorrow the outwardbecomeas, and after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the soul, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature. An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that abounding promise over which he had brooded for three-score years, since he learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the Representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic envy, and partial blindness, yet he felt himself to be the center of all the blessings which God had in store for him in his dearest earthly relations. As he nears the end of his life, Jacob's whole life becomes a series of religious experiences. The interest of the story is never lost. Jacob was a great self-reliant soul, and he was the subject of many warnings, whether in the form of dreams or in the words of an aged father. He listened to his dreams, and he heeded the warnings of his father. He was a man of great courage, and he was a man of great patience, and he was a man of great wisdom. He was a man of great love, and he was a man of great faith.

But, after dwelling for more than half a life-time in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then in deep and bitter sorrow the outwardbecomeas, and after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the soul, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature. An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that abounding promise over which he had brooded for three-score years, since he learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the Representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic envy, and partial blindness, yet he felt himself to be the center of all the blessings which God had in store for him in his dearest earthly relations. As he nears the end of his life, Jacob's whole life becomes a series of religious experiences. The interest of the story is never lost. Jacob was a great self-reliant soul, and he was the subject of many warnings, whether in the form of dreams or in the words of an aged father. He listened to his dreams, and he heeded the warnings of his father. He was a man of great courage, and he was a man of great patience, and he was a man of great wisdom. He was a man of great love, and he was a man of great faith.
The impulse of the chosen family, the true inheritance of the promise of Abraham, was interwoven with the very essence of the character of the "plain man, dwelling in tents," steady, persevering, and modest, unafraid with deliberate settled purpose, through all the bitterness of suffering and of prosperity, of exile and return, of bereavement and recovery. The birthright is always before him. Rachel is won from Leah by hard services, and the seven years seemed unto him but a few days for the love he had to her. Isaac and Rebekah, and Rebekah’s nurse, are remembered with a faithful, filial remembrance; Joseph and Benjamin are long and passionately loved with a more parental affection, — bringing down his gray hairs for their sakes in sorrow to the grave. This is no character to be contumelied or scoffed at; if it was encompassed with much infirmity, yet its very complexity demands our reverent attention; in it are bound up, as his double name expresses, not one man, but two; by toil and struggle, Jacob, the Suphanniter, is gradually transformed into Israel, the Prince of God, and lower reasons are softened and purified away; he looks back over his long career with the fullness of experience and humility. "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies and of all the truth which thou hast shewn unto thy servant" (Gen. xxxii. 10). Alone of the patriarchal family, his end is recorded as invested with the solemnity of warning and of prophetic song, "Gather yourselves together, ye sons of Jacob; and hearken unto Israel your father." We need not fear to acknowledge that the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac was also the God of Jacob." (Jewish Church, p. 59 f.)

JACBUS, 1 Lex. iv. 48. [Arkh, 4.]

JADA (τάκουμος; [Vat. Ιατρούμονος; Accurs.], 1 Lex. iv. 48. [Arkh, 4.]

JADDA (τάκουμον; [Vat. Ιατρούμονον; Ακκυρ, 4.] ver. 32, Aκκυρον; [Vat. Ιατρούμονον; Ακκυρον; (Judea), son of Onam, and brother of Shammua, in the genealogy of the sons of Jeraubeel by his wife Arath (1 Chr. ii. 28, 32). This genealogy is very corrupt in the LXX., especially in the Vatican Codex.

A. C. H.

JADDAU [2 ayl.] (τάκονον; but the Keri has τάκον; i.e. τακούμον; [Vat. Ιατρούμονον; Ιατρούμονον; (Juda), one of the Bene-Nebo who had taken a foreign wife, and was compelled by Ezra to relinquish her (Ezra xiv. 43).

JADDAU [2 ayl.] (τάκονον; [Vat. Ιατρούμονον; Ιατρούμονον; in Neh. xii. 22, Vat. ιατρούμονον; FAI. Άσον; (Jehoab), son, and successor in the high-priesthood of, Jonathan or Jehonathan. He is the last of the high-priests mentioned in the O. T., and probably altogether the latest name in the canon (Neh. xii. 22, 22), at least if 1 Chr. iii. 22-24 is admitted to be corrupt (see Geneal. of our Lord, pp. 101, 107). His name marks distinctly the time when the latest additions were made to the book of Nehemiah and the canon of Scripture, and perhps affords a clue to the age of Malachi the prophet. All that we learn concerning him in Scripture is the fact of his being the son of Jonathan, and high-priest. We gather also pretty certainly that he was priest in the reign of the last Persian king Darius, and that he was still high-priest after the Persian dynasty was overthrown, i.e. in the reign of Alexander the Great. For the expression "Parius the Person" must have been used after the accession of the Hellenic dynasty, and had another high-priest succeeded, his name would most likely have been mentioned. Thus far then the book of Nehemiah bears out the truth of Josephus's history, which makes Judas high-priest when Alexander invaded Judaea. But the story of his interview with Alexander [Hecatoi, vol. ii. p. 1072 b] does not on that account deserve credit, nor his account of the building of the temple on Mount Gerizim during Judas's pontificate, at the instigation of Sanballat, both of which, as well as the accompanying circumstances, are probably derived from some apocryphal book of Alexandrian growth, since lost, in which chronology and history gave way to romance and Jewish vanity. Judas seems to place the death of Judas before that of Alexander (4. J. xi. 8, 7). Eusebius assigns 20 years to Judas's pontificate (Geneal. of our Lord, 323 ff.; Selden, de Sacre; Prideaux, etc.). A. C. H.

JADDUA [τάκονον; as above; ίατρούμονον; [Vat. FAI. omit; Alex. Ιατρούμονον; Jebhuda), one of the chief of the people, i.e. of the haves, who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 21).

JADON (τάκονον; [judge]; Eudeps in both MSS.; rather, in the Roman ed.; Vat. Alex. FAI. omit; Jada), a man, who in company with the Gibeonites and the men of Mizpah assisted to repair the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 7). His title, "the Meronothite" (comp. 1 Chr. xxvii. 30), and the mention of Gibeonites, would seem to point to a place Meronoth, and that in the neighborhood of Gibeon, but no such place has yet been traced.

Jadon (Κατάρας; is the name attributed by Josephus (Ant. viii. 8, 3) to the man of God from Judah, who witnessed Jerobeam at the altar at Bethel — probably intending Imro the seer. By Jerome (Gr. Heb. on 2 Chr. ix. 20) the name is given as Judas.

JATEL (τακούμον; [vindower, First, and hence wild goat]; Hex. Syr. Asenel; ιατρούμονον; [Vat. Ιατρούμονον; ιατρούμονον; Judah), the wife of Heber the Kenite. Heber was the chief of a nomadic Arab clan, who had separated from the rest of his tribe, and had pitched his tent under the oaks, which had in consequence received the name of seats of the wanderers" (v. 2, Ps. 83, v. 31), in the neighborhood of Kelel-Kapharāthoa [Kerebe; Kenezites]. The tribe of Heber had secured the quiet enjoyment of their pastures by adopting a neutral position in a troubous period. Their descent from Jethro secured them the favorable regard of the Israelites, and they were sufficiently important to conclude a formal peace with Jabin king of the Canaanites. In the headlong rout which followed the defeat of the Canaanites by Jerah, Sisera, abandoning his chariot the more easily to avoid notice (comp. Hom. ii. v. 20), fell unattended, and in an opposite direction from that taken by his army, to the tent of the Kenite chieftains. "The tent of Jerel" is expressly mentioned either because the harom of Heber was in a separate tent (Jasusaller, Mos. 9, iii. 22), or because the Kenite himself was absent at the time. In the sacred seclusion of this almost inviolable sanctuary, Sisera might well have felt himself absolutely secure from the incursions of the enemy (Calmet, Fragm. 111.)
and although he intended to take refuge among the Kenites, he would not have ventured so openly to violate all idea of oriental propriety by entering a woman's apartments (D'Herbelet, Bibl. Orient. s. v. "Haran"?), had he not received Jael's express, earnest, and respectful entreaty to do so. He accepted the invitation, and she flung a mantle over him as he lay wearily on the floor. When thirst prevaunted sleep, and he asked for water, she brought him butter-milk in her choicest vessel, thus ratifying with the semblance of officious zeal the sacred bond of eastern hospitality. Wine would have been less suitable to quench his thirst, and may possibly have been eschewed by Heber's clan (Jer. xxxi. 5). Butter-milk, according to the quotation in Harmer, is still a favorite Arab beverage, and that this is the drink intended we infer from Judges v. 23, as well as from the direct statement of Josephus (γάλα δεικτήθη χειρός, Ant. v. 5, § 4), although there is no reason to suppose with Josephus and the Rabbis (D. Kimchi, Jarchi, etc.), that Jael purposely used it because of its soporific qualities (Bochart, Hieroz. i. 473). But anxiety still prevailed in the breast of the lady until he had exacted a promise from his protec tess that she would faithfully preserve the secret of his concealment; till at last, with a feeling of perfect security, the weary and unfartunately general resignation to the deep sleep of misery and fatigue. Then it was that Jael took in her left hand one of the great wooden pins (A. V. "nail") which fastened down the cords of the tent, and in her right hand the mallet (A. V. "a hammer") used to drive it into the ground, and creeping up to his sleeping and confiding guest, with one terrible blow dashed it through Sisera's temples deep into the earth. With one spasm of fruitless agony, with one convulsion of sudden pain, "at her feet he bowed, he felt; where he bowed, there fell down dead" (Judg. v. 27). She then waited to meet the pursuing Barak, and led him into her tent that she might in his presence claim the glory of the deed! Many have supposed that by this act she fulfilled the saying of Deborah, that God would sell Sisera into the hand of a woman (Judg. iv. 9; Joseph. v. 5, § 4); and hence they have supposed that Jael was actuated by some divine and hidden influence. But the bible gives no hint of such an inspiration, and it is at least equally probable that Deborah merely intended to intimate the share of the honor which would be assigned by posterity to her own exertions. If therefore we eliminate the still more monstrous supposition of the Rabbis that Sisera was slain by Jael because he attempted to offer her violence—the murder will appear in all its hideous atrocity. A fugitive had asked, and received shelter (or protection) at her hands,—he was miserable, defeated, weary,—he was the ally of her husband,—he was her invited and honored guest,—he was in the sanctuary of the harm,—above all, he was confiding, defenseless, and adept; yet she broke her pledged faith, violated her solemn hospitality, and murdered a trustful and unprotected slumberer. Surely we require the clearest and most positive statement that Jael was instigated to such a murder by divine suggestion.

But it may be asked, "Has not the deed of Jael been praised by an inspired authority?" "Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be; blessed shall she be above women in the tent" (Judg. v. 24). Without stopping to ask when and where Deborah claims for herself any infallibility, or whether, in the passionate moment of patriotic triumph, she was likely to pause in such wild times to scrutinize the moral bearings of an act which had been so splendid a benefit to herself and her people, we may question whether any moral commendation is directly intended. What Deborah stated was a fact, namely, that the wives of the nomad Arabs would undoubtedly regard Jael's conduct as a public benefactress, and praise her as a popular heroine. The suggestion of Gesenius (Thee., p. 608 b), Hollmann, and others, that the Jael alluded to in Judges v. 6 is not the wife of Heber, but some unknown Israelite judge, appears to us extremely unlikely, especially as the name Jael must almost certainly be the name of a woman (Prov. v. 19, A. V. "roe "). At the same time it must be admitted that the phrase "in the days of Jael" is one which we should hardly have expected.

F. W. F.

* This view of Gesenius that Jael (Judg. v. 6), is the name of a judge otherwise unknown, is also that of Furst, Bertheau, Wordsworth, and others. The name is masculine, and very properly used of a man, though such names were often borne by women. Cassel (Richter and Ruth, p. 50) denies that the wife of Heber can be meant in this instance, since Deborah was contemporary with her, and would hardly designate her own days as those of Jael. But to suppose with him that Shamgar mentioned in the other line is called Jael ("active," "chivalrous") merely as a complimentary epithet, seems far-fetched. From the order of the names, if this Jael was one of the judges, we should be led to place his time between Shamgar and Barak, and so have a more distinct enumeration of the long series of years during which the land was afflicted before the deliverance achieved by Deborah and her allies.

H. JAGUR (גֹּגֵר [lodging-place]). "A'gôr. Alex. Iawgôp. Jager), a town of Judah, one of those farthest to the south, on the frontier of Edom (Josh. xv. 21). Kabeed, one of its companions in the list, recurs subsequently; but Jager is not again met with, nor has the name been encountered in the imperfect explorations of that dreary region. The Jager, quoted by Schwarz (p. 99) from the Talmud as one of the boundaries of the territory of Ashkelon, must have been further to the N. W.

G.

JAH (יְהֹוָה; Kópios: Dominus). The abbreviated form of "Jehovah," used only in poetry. It occurs frequently in the Hebrew, but with a single exception (Ps. lxiiti. 4) is rendered "Lord" in the A. V. The identity of Jah and Jehovah is strongly marked in two passages of Josiah (xili. 2, xxvi. 4), the force of which is greatly weakened by the English rendering "the Lord." The former of these should be translated "for my strength and song is JAH JEHOVAH" (comp. Ex. xv. 2); and the latter, "trust ye in Jehovah for ever, for in

ougle what the Samim was. Probably some part of the regular furniture of the tent.

a "Mantle" is here inaccurate; the word is יְנַעְn

b Πασαλάαν, LXX.; but according to Ἰς-κόνις, σιδηρόν ἔλαον.
JAHATH (תַחַת, yahath). 1. Son of Libni, the son of Gershon, and the son of Levi (1 Chr. vi. 20). He was an ancestor to Asaph (ver. 45).

2. (1 Chr. vi.; Vat. 25.2). Head of a later house in the family of Gershon, being the eldest son of Shimeon, the son of Laadan. The house of Jahath existed in David's time (1 Chr. xxiii. 10, 11).

A. C. H.

3. (1 Chr.; Alex. omits: [Jahath]). A man in the genealogy of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 2), son of Reishah ben-Shoked. His sons were Ahmazai and Lahad, the families of the Zorathites. It Reishah and Haroeh are identical, Jahath was a descendant of Caleb ben-Hur. [HAROE1.]

4. (1 Chr.; Vat. 5.1; Alex. Isaac.). A Levite, son of Shelomoth, the representative of the Kohathite family of Ithahar in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 22).

5. (1 Chr.; Vat. 26.1.2; Comp. 1 Chr. 25.1). A Merarite Levite in the reign of Josiah, one of the overseers of the repairs of the Temple (2 Chr. xxxiv. 12).

JAHAZ, also JAHAZA, JAHAZAH, and JAHAZ. Under these four terms are given in the A. V. the name of a place which in the Hebrew appears as יְהָז (Jehaz) and יָהָז (Jehaz), the latter being in some cases—as Num. and Deut.—the particle of motion, but elsewhere an integral addition to the name. It has been uniformly so taken by the LXX., who have τασάδ, and twice τασάδ [once, namely, Judg. xi. 20, where Alex. reads ταόνα]. JAHAZ is found Num. xxi. 23; Deut. ii. 32; Judg. xi. 20; Is. xv. 4; Jer. xxxviii. 34. In the two latter only is it יְהָז, without the final י.

The Samaritan Cod. has יְהָז: Vulg. IAC.

At Jahaz the decisive battle was fought between the children of Israel and Sihon king of the Amorites, which ended in the overthrow of the latter and in the occupation by Israel of the whole pastoral country included between the Arnon and the Jabbok, the Βέλος of the modern Arabs (Num. xxii. 23; Deut. ii. 32; Judg. xi. 20). It was in the allotment of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 18), though not mentioned in the catalogue of Num. xxvi.; and it was given with its suburbs to the Merarite Levites (1 Chr. vi. 78; and Josh. xxi. 36, though here omitted in the ordinary Hebrew text).

Jahazah occurs in the denunciations of Jeremias and Isaiah on the inhabitants of the "plain country," i.e. the Mishor, the modern Βέλος (Jer. xxxviii. 21, 34; Is. xxv. 4); but beyond the fact that at this period it was in the hands of Moab we know nothing of its history.

From the terms of the narrative in Num. xxvi. and Deut. ii., we should expect that Jahazah was in the extreme south part of the territory of Sihon, but yet north of the river Arnon (see bent. ii. 24, 30; and the words in 21, "begin to possess"), and in exactly this position a site named Jeruzalem is mentioned by Schwarz (227), though by him only.

But this does not agree with the statements of Eusebius (Onom. Ἱαθάζ), who says it was existing in his day between Medeba and Αμνῆς, by which he probably intends Dibon, which would place Jahaz considerably too far to the north. Like many others relating to the places east of the Dead Sea, this question must await further research. (See Ewald, Geschichte, ii. 296, 271.)

G.

JAHAZA'Z (יָהָזָא, i. e. Yahazah [trodden down, threshing-floor]: Barad; Alex. Isaä: Joset), Josh. xiii. 18. [JAHAZ.]

JAHAZ'AH (יָהָזָא, i. e. Yah:izael [son of Jehovah, of Israel]): Vat. 'Iaqar; [Vat. FA. A-λαν] Isaä: Joset), son of Tivkah, apparently a priest; commemorated as one of the four who originally sided with Ezra in the matter of the foreign wives (Ezr. x. 15). In Esdras the name becomes Ezechias.

JAHAZIEL (יָהָזִיאֵל, i. e. Yah:izziel [son of Jehovah, of Israel]): Vat. 'Iaqar; [Vat. FA. A-λαν] Isaä: [Jehaziel]). A priest of the reign of David, whose office it was, in conjunction with Rehman, to blow the trumpet at the ministrations before the ark, when David had brought it to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xii. 6). [High-priest.]

3. (1 Chr. vi.; Alex. Isaä: [Vat. OA. A-λαν] Isaä: [Jehaziel]). A Kohathite Levite, third son of Hebron. His house is mentioned in the enumeration of the Levites in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiii. 19; xxiv. 23).

A. C. H.

4. (Vat. OA. OA; Comp. 1 Chr. Isaä: [Jehaziel]). Son of Zechariah, a Levite of the Bnei-Asaph, who was inspired by the Spirit of Jehovah to animate Jehoshaphat and the army of Judah in a moment of great danger, namely, when they were anticipating the invasion of an enormous horde of Moabites, Ammonites, Mehumims, and other barbarians (2 Chr. xx. 14). Ps. lxxviii. is entitled a Psalm of Asaph, and this, coupled with the mention of Edom, Moab, Ammon, and others, in hostility to Israel, has seemed to connect it with the above event. [GEBAL.]

But, however desirable, this is very uncertain.

5. (Vat. OA. OA; Alex. omitt: Ezechiel). The "son of Jahaziel" was the chief of the Bnei-Shecaniah [sons of S.] who returned from Babylon with Ezra, according to the present state of the Hebrew text (Ezr. viii. 5). But according to the LXX. and the parallel passage in 1 Esdr. (viii. 32), he has ceased from the text, and it should read, "of the Bnei-Zatho" (probably Zattu), Shecaniah son of Jahaziel. In the latter place the name appears as Zechezel.

JAH'JAI (2 Chr. ii. 27, i. e. Yehdai [son of Jehovah, of Israel]): [Vat. Israä: [Vat. OA. OA: Jah:izziel], a man who appears to be thrust abruptly into the genealogy of Telsah, as the father of six sons (1 Chr. ii. 47). Various suggestions
JAHDEI

Regarding the name have been made: as that Gaze, the name preceding, should be Jahdae; that Jahda was a confluence of Caleb, etc.; but these are mere groundless suppositions (see Burrington, i. 216; Bertheau, ad loc.).

JAH'DIEL [ji'hah-dy-ul] [whom God makes joyful]: [Vat. Jeshunia;] Jedelch, one of the heroes who were heads of the half-tribe of Manasseh on the east of Jordan (1 Chr. v. 24).

JAH'DO [ji'hah-d0] [united, together]: Iesdai, as if the name had originally been יִשְׂדָא; comp. Jaasaiu, Jaazu; [Vat. Iosuaee; Comp. Iesdai;] Jesho, a Gadite named in the genealogies of his tribe (1 Chr. v. 14) as the son of Buz and father of Jeshiuai.

JAHLEEL [ji'hah-lil] [having in God]: 'Achore: Alex. Aqora, Aqole: Jahdel, [Juel], the third of the seven sons of Zebulun (Gen. xlv. 14; Num. xxv. 20), founder of the family of the JAHLEELITES. Nothing is heard of him or of his descendants.

JAHLEELITES, THE [ji'hah-lil'ites]: 6 'Aqole [Vat. 'Lelai;] Jelilite. A branch of the tribe of Zebulun, descendants of Jahdel (Num. xxvi. 20). W. A. W.

JAH'MAI [ji'hah-mai] (ji'hah-may) [whom Jehovah guards]: 'Ishai: [Vat. Eiskar; Alex. Eseous; Jemii], a man of Issachar, one of the heads of the house of Tola (1 Chr. vii. 2).

JAH'ZAH [ji'hah-zah] [a place stamped, threshing-floor]: [Vat. omits: Jasaos], 1 Chr. vi. 78. [Jehaz.]

JAHZEEL [ji'hah-zel] [God appor- tions]: 'Oseha: [Vat.1 in Num. '-Xa]; Josiel, the first of the four sons of Naphtali (Gen. xlv. 24), founder of the family of the JAHZEELITES. [Vat. 'Xosjil;] [Vat. omits: Josio], Num. xxvi. 48. His name is once again mentioned (1 Chr. vii. 13) in the slightly different form of JAHZIEL.

JAHZEELITES, THE [ji'hah-zel'ites]: 6 'Osehl: [Vat.1 Jseilei, 2. m. Agsahai;] Jeselites. A branch of the Naphtalites, descended from Jahzeel (Num. xxvi. 48).

JAHZERAH [ji'hah-zer-ah] [whom God leads back]: 'Effahs [or 'Effah;] Vat. Iesdai: Alex. Ichous [or 'Ichus];] Jevisa, a priest, of the house of Immer; ancestor of Masaias (read Masaih), one of the courses which returned (1 Chr. ix. 12). [Jehoshiah.]

In the duplicate passage in Neh. xi. 13 he is called יִשְׁדָא, Yehoshia, and all the other names are much varied.

A. C. H.

* JAILOR. [Prison; Punishments.]

JAI'ZIEL [jih-zi'ul] [God alloats or appor- tions]: 'Izsih: [Vat. Ieserai;] Josiel, the form in which the name of the first of Naphtali's sons, elsewhere given JAHZEEL, appears in 1 Chr. vii. 13 only.

JAIR (jihr) [whom Jehovah enlightens]: Iesep; [Vat. commonly Ie thief: Alex. Iesep, Yhr,]

a This verse would seem not to refer to the original Jair, the nomad leader, who roamed the heaths of Palestine, the Kenites, and the Moabites - but rather to their recapture. The accurate rendering is said to be, "and Gehur and Aran took the Havvoth-Jair from them, with Kenath and her daughter Beth-horon, sixty cities" (Bertheau, Chronic., p. 164.)
JAIRUS

have sprung from the great Jair of Manasseh, or some lesser person of the name.

JAIRUS [3 syl.]. 1. (ταίπος; [JAIROS], a rufta or basket, probably in some cave near the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. He was the father of the maiden whom Jesus restored to life (Matt. ix. 18; Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41). The name is probably the Grecized form of the Hebrew Jair.

* It has been questioned whether the daughter of Jairus was really dead and raised to life again by the power of Jesus, or lay only in a state of insensibility. Among others Olshausen (Bild. Comm. i. 321 ff.) and Robinson (Lexicon, of the Y. T., p. 362) entertain the latter view. The doubt has arisen chiefly from the fact that the Saviour said of the dame, "She is not dead, but sleepeth" (Matt. ix. 24). The usual verb for describing death as a sleep, it is, true, is a different one (κωπέον, see John xi. 11 ff.); but the one which the Saviour employed in this instance (κατασκηνεῖται) is also used of the dead in 1 Thess. v. 10, where "whether we wake or sleep" is equivalent to "whether we are alive or dead." Hence we may attach the same figurative sense to the word as applied in the passage before us. It was a peculiarly expressive way of saying that in its relation to Christ's power death was merely a slumber: he had only to speak the word, and the lifeless rose at once to consciousness and activity. But there are positive reasons for understanding that Christ performed a miracle on this occasion. The dame lay dying when the father went in pursuit of Jesus (Luke viii. 42); shortly after that she was reported as dead (Mark v. 35); and was bewailed at the house with the lamentation customary on the decease of a person (Mark v. 38 ff.). The idea that she was asleep merely was regarded as absurd (Matt. ix. 24); and Luke states expressly (viii. 55) that "her spirit came again" to her on being commanded to arise. The mourners and the crowd "were astonished with a great astonishment" at what they beheld or heard related (Mark v. 42); and the Saviour permitted that impression to remain with them.

One other circumstance in this account deserves notice. Our Lord on arriving at the house of Jairus found the mourners already singing the dirge, and the "ministers" (αὐτομανεῖοι, "the players," performing their part in the service (Matt. ix. 23). On that custom, see De Wette's Hebr. Archaeologie, § 265 (4th Edit.).

Mr. Lane mentions that it is chiefly at the funerals of the rich among the modern Egyptians that musicians are employed as mourners. (Modern Egyptians, ii. 287, 297.) It is not within the ability of every family to employ them, as they are professional actors, and their presence involves some expense. The same thing, as a practical result, was true, no doubt, in ancient times; hence "the minstrels" very properly appear in this particular history. Jairus, the father of the dame, whom Christ restored to life, being a ruler of the synagogue, was a person of some rank among his countrymen. In such a family the most decent style of performing the last sad offices would be observed. Further, the narrative shows, without any interval between the daughter's death and the commencement of the wailing. This agrees with the present oriental custom; for when the death of a person is expected, preparations are often made so as to have the lament begin almost as soon as the last breath is drawn.

2. (ταίπος [Vat. ιερίπος]) Euth. xi. 2. [Jair.]

W. T. B.

JAKEH

JA'KAN (יָֽאָ֜קָּן, intelligent, sagacious); אֲקַר: [Vat. אֲאר] Lex. [Avvaar kar] Ḫōmā' (Joseph), son of Exor the Horite (1 Chr. i. 42). The name is identical with that more commonly expressed in the A. V. as JA'AKAN. And see AKAN.

JAKEH (יָֽקָּי) and in some MSS. נָֽקִי [see infra], which is followed by a MS. of the Targum in the Cambridge Univ. Libr., and was evidently the reading of the Vulgate, where the whole clause is rendered symbolically - "Verba congregantis filii remansit." The A. V. of Prov. xxx. 1, following the authority of the Targum and Syriac, has represented this as the proper name of the father of Agur, whose sayings are collected in Prov. xxx., and such is the natural interpretation. But beyond this we have no clue to the existence of either Agur or Jakeh. Of course if Agur be Solomon, it follows that Jakeh was a name of David of some mystical significance. But for this there is not a shadow of support. Jarchi, fixing on the two names, explains the clause, "the words of Solomon, who gathered understanding and vomited it," evidently having before him the reading נָֽקִי, which he derived from נָֽקִי, "to vomit." This explanation, it needs scarcely be said, is equally characterized by elegance and truth. Others, adopting the form נָֽקִי, and connecting it with נָֽקִים or as First gives נָֽקִים, יָֽקִים, "obedience," apply it to Solomon in his late repentance. But these and the like are the merest conjectures. If Jakeh be the name of a person, as there is every reason to believe, we know nothing more about him, if not, there is no limit to the symbolic meanings which may be extracted from the clause in which it occurs, and which change with the ever-shifting ground of the critic's point of view. That the passage was early corrupted is clear from the rendering of the LXX., who insert χ. xxx. 1-14 in the middle of ch. xxiv. The first clause they translate τοὺς ιωδοὺς λόγους, υἱός, φοβηθήσεται, καὶ δειδεμενος αὐτὸς μεταφερεται - "My son, fear my words, and, having received them, repent: "a meaning which at first sight seems hard to extract from the Hebrew, and which has therefore been abandoned as hopelessly corrupt. But a slight alteration of one or two letters and the vowel-points will, if it do no more, at least show how the LXX. arrived at their extraordinary translation. They must have read כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'ך כד'א'�, in which the letters of the last word are slightly transposed, in order to account for μεταφεραται. In support of this alteration see Zech. xi. 5, where כד'א'ך is rendered μετασφατων. b The Targum

b This conjecture incidentally throws light on the LXX. of Prov. xiv. 15, ἐπάθος σικα μεταφεραται.
and Syriac point to different readings also, though not where Jakob is concerned. Hitzig (die Spräche Solomon's), unable to find any other explanation, has recourse to an alteration of the text as violent as it is unauthorized. He proposes to read וַיְנַהֲלְךָ חַרְוָי (2 Sam. 12, 12), "the son of her whose obedience is Massa;" which, to say the least of it, is a very remarkable way of indicating "the queen of Massa." But in order to arrive at this reading he first adopts the rare word חַרְוָי (which only occurs in the const. state in two passages, Gen. xix. 10, and Prov. xxx. 17), to which he attaches the unusual form of the pronoun suffix, and ekes out his explanation by the help of an elliptical and highly poetical construction, which is strangely out of place in the bold prose handling of the chapter. Yet to this theory Bertheau yields a coy assent ("nicht ohne Zögern," die Spr. Sid. Einl. p. xviii.); and thus Agur and Lemuel are brothers, both sons of a queen of Massa, the former being the reigning monarch (Prov. xxxxi. 1).

ןָהֲלָתָה, "prophesy" or "burlen," is considered as a proper name and identical with the region named Massa in Arabia, occupied by the descendants of a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxi. 14; 1 Chr. i. 30), and mentioned in connection with Dumea. This district, Hitzig conjectures, was the same which was conquered and occupied by the 500 Simeonites, whose predatory excursion in the reign of Hezekiah is narrated in 1 Chr. iv. 41-44. They are there said to have annihilated the Amalekites in Mount Seir, and to have seized their country. That this country was Massa, of which Lemuel was king, and that Agur was a descendant of the conquering Simeonites, is the opinion of Hitzig, approved by Bunsen. But the latter, retaining the received text, and considering Jakob as a proper name, takes נָהֲלָתָה, hamammab, as if it were נָהֲלָתָה, hamammasi, a gentilic name, "the man of Massa," supporting this by a reference to Gen. xv. 2, where נָהֲלָתָה, Denunmeh, is apparently used in the same manner (Biblereck, i. cxxxviii.). There is good reason, however, to suspect that the word in question in the latter passage is an interpolation, or that the verse is in some way corrupt as the rendering of the Chaldee and Syriac is not supported by the ordinary usages of Hebrew, though it is adopted by the A. V., and by Gesenius, Kro-

Valeat quantum.

\[a\] Here as generally in the English edition of this work, Cod. B, or the Vatican manuscript 1209, is confounded with the Roman edition of 1587. The Vatican manuscript (B) does not contain the books of Macabees.

\[b\] The name itself will perhaps repay a few moments' consideration. As borne by the Apostles and their contemporaries in the N. T., it was of course Jacob, and it is somewhat remarkable that in them it reappears for the first time since the patriarch himself. In the unchangeable East St. James is still St. Jacob — Mgr Yakob; but no sooner had the name left the shores of Palestine than it underwent a series of curious and interesting changes probably unparallelled in any other case. To the Greeks it became Ιακώβος, with the accent on the first syllable; to the Latins, Ιακόβ, doubtless similarly accented, since in Italian a Ιακοβο is Gracioso [also Jacobo]. In Spain it was

and others. In any case the instances are not analogous.

W. A. W.

JAKIM (γάλακτος God έλεφ η) [Jacob]. 1. Head of the 12th course of priests in the reign of David (1 Chr xxiv. 12). The Alex. LXX. gives the name Eliasim (Ελιασίμ). [Θεόλαβος; JACHIN.]

2. [Alex. 1Macc.]. A Benjamite, one of the Bene-Shimhui (sons of S.) (1 Chr. viii. 19).

A. C. H.

JALLON (γάλακτος, αλλιδίον) [Jacob]. [Alex. 1Macc.]. Jullon, one of the sons of Ezra, a person named in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr iv. 17).

JAM'BRES. [See Jannes and Jambres]

JAMBRI. Shortly after the death of Judas Maccabaeus (c. b. 161), "the children of Janihi" are said to have made a predatory attack on a detachment of the Maccabean forces and to have suffered reprimands (1 Macc. ix. 39-41). The name does not occur elsewhere, and the variety of readings is considerable: Ιακώμην, Cod. B; a [Ιακώμην]. Ιακώμβους, Cod. A; [Σιν. Αμπάμη, Ιακώμην] alli, "Αμπάμη, "Αμπάμη; Syr. Ambrey. Josephus (Ant. xiii. 1, 2) reads Αμπάμον καπάτες, and it seems almost certain that the true reading is Αμπάι, a form which occurs elsewhere (1 K. xxii. 20; Joseph. Ant. vii. 12, § 5; Αμπάμος; 1 Chr. xxvii. 18, Heb. יָאָבְרָיָה, Vulg. Anuri; 1 Chr. ix. 4, "Αμ-

It has been conjectured (Drusius, Michaelis, Grimm, 1 Macc. ix. 36) that the original text was μάκΜάκ, "the sons of the Amorites," and that the reference is to a family of the Amorites who had in early times occupied the town Medeba (ver. 36) on the borders of Idumea (Num. xxx. 30, 31).

JAMES (Ἰακώβος, Jacobus); the name of several persons mentioned in the N. T.

1. JAMES THE SON OF ZEBEDEE. This is the only one of the Apostles of whose life and death we can write with certainty. The little that we know of him we have on the authority of Scripture. All else that is reported is idle legend, with the possible exception of one tale, handed down by Clement of Alexandria to Eusèbius, and by Eusebius to us. With this single exception the line of denunciation is drawn clear and sharp. There is assumed two forms, apparently of different origins: Ιακώβ — in modern Spanish Diego, Portuguese, Tungo — and Xayene or Xajane, pronounced Hayne, with a strong initial guttural. In France it became Jacob; but another form was Jean, which appears in the metrical life of St. Thomas à Becket by Girardier (A. 9, 1170-74), quoted in Robertson's Becket, p. 135. Not from this lost the transition to our James is easy. When it first appeared in English, or through what channel, the writer has not been able to trace. Possibly it came from Scotland, where the name was a favorite one. It exists in Wyville's Bible (1551). In Russia, and in Germany and the countries more immediately related to this, the name has retained its original form, and accordingly there alone there would seem to be no distinction between Jacob and James; which was the case even in medieval Latin, where Jacob and Jacobus were always indiscriminated. Its modern dress, however, sits very lightly on the name; and we see in "Jacobite" and "Jacobin" how ready it is to throw it off, and, like a true Oriental, reveal its original form.

[1] Xayene or Xajane, [also Jacobo]. In Spain it
no fear of confounding the St. James of the New Testament with the hero of Compostella.

Of St. James's early life we know nothing. We first hear of him A. D. 27, when he was called to be our Lord's disciple; and he disappears from view A. D. 44, when he suffered martyrdom at the hands of Herod Agrippa I. We proceed to thread together the several pieces of information which the inspired writers have given us respecting him during these seventeen years.

I. His History.—In the spring or summer of the year 27, Zebedee, a fisherman, but possessed at least of competence (Mark i. 20), was out on the Sea of Galilee, with his two sons, James and John, and some boatmen, whom either he had hired for the occasion, or who more probably were his usual attendants. He was engaged in his customary occupation of fishing, and near him was another boat belonging to Simon and Andrew, with whom he and his sons were in partnership. Finding themselves unsuccessful, the occupants of both boats came ashore, and began to wash their nets. At this time the new Teacher, who had now been ministering about six months, and with whom Simon and Andrew, and in all probability John, were already well acquainted (John i. 41), appeared upon the beach. He requested leave of Simon and Andrew to address the crowds that docked around him from their boat, which was lying at a convenient distance from the shore. The discourse being completed, and the crowds dispersing, Jesus desired Simon to put out into the deeper water, and to try another cast for fish. Though reluctant, Simon did as he was desired, through the awe which he already entertained for One who, he thought, might possibly be the promised Messiah (John i. 41, 42), and whom even now he addressed as "Rabbi" (ἐρωτάτα, Luke v. 5, the word used by this Evangelist for ἀπόστωλος). Astonished at the success of his draught, he beckoned to his partners in the other boat to come and help him and his brother in landing the fish caught. The same amazement communicated itself to the sons of Zebedee, and flushed conviction on the souls of all the four fishermen. They had doubted and mused before; now they believed. At His call they left all, and became, once and for ever, His disciples, hereafter to catch men.

This is the call of St. James to the discipleship. It will be seen that we have regarded the events narrated by St. Matthew and St. Mark (Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark i. 16-20) as identical with those related by St. Luke (Luke v. 1-11), in accordance with the opinion of Hammond, Lightfoot, Mahlonatus, Lardner, Trench, Wordsworth, etc.; not as distinct from them, as supposed by Alford, Greswell, etc.

For a full year we lose sight of St. James. He is then, in the spring of 28, called to the apostleship with his eleven brethren (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13; Acts i. 13). In the list of the Apostles given us by St. Mark, and in the book of Acts, his name occurs next to that of Simon Peter: in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke it comes third. It is clear that in these lists the names are not placed at random. In all four, the names of Peter, Andrew, James, and John are placed first; and it is plain that these four Apostles were at the head of the twelve throughout. Thus we see that Peter, James, and John, alone were admitted to the miracle of the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51). The same three Apostles alone were permitted to be present at the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ii. 9; Luke ix. 28). The same three alone were allowed to witness the Agony (Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33). And it is Peter, James, John, and Andrew who ask our Lord for an explanation of his dark sayings with regard to the end of the world and his second coming (Mark xiii. 3). It is worthy of notice that in all these places, with one exception (Luke ix. 28), the name of James is put before that of John, and that John is twice described as "the brother of James" (Mark v. 37; Matt. xvi. 1). This would appear to imply that at this time James, either from age or character, took a higher position than his brother. On the last occasion on which St. James is mentioned we find this position reversed. That the prominence of these three Apostles was founded on personal character (as out of every twelve persons there must be two or three to take the lead), and that Simon, John, and Peter were encouraged by them "quos Dominus, ordinis servandi causâ, ceteris praemium," as King James I. has said (Preflat. Mon. in Apol. pro Jur. Fid.), can scarcely be doubted (cf. Eusebius, ii. 14).

It would seem to have been at the time of the appointment of the twelve Apostles that the name of Barnabas [Βαρναβᾶς] was given to the sons of Zebedee. It might, however, like Simon's name of Peter, have been conferred before. This name plainly was not bestowed upon them because they heard the voice like thunder from the cloud (Jerome), nor because "divina eorum praedictio magnum quendam et illustre solutum per terram orbem daturum creat" (Vict. Autioch.). nor ἀπεκτάσεως ἄνωθεν καὶ θεολογικῶν (Theoph.), but it was, like the name given to Simon, at once descriptive and prophetic. The "Rockman" had a natural strength, which was described by his title, and he was to have a divine strength, predicted by the same title. In the same way the "Sons of Thunder" had a burning and impetuous spirit, which twice exhibits itself in its unchastened form (Luke ix. 54; Mark x. 37), and which, when moulded by the Spirit of God, taking different shapes, led St. James to be the first apostolic martyr, and St. John to become the most personal and interesting of the Apostles of Love.

The first occasion on which this natural character manifests itself in St. James and his brother is at the commencement of our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem in the year 30. He was passing through Samaria; and now courting rather than avoiding publicity, he "sent messengers before his face" into a certain village, "to make ready for him" (Luke ix. 52), i.e. in all probability to announce to him the Messiah. The Samaritans, with their old jealousy strong upon them, refused to receive him, because he was going to Jerusalem instead of to Gerizim; and in exasperation James and John entreated their Master to follow the example of Elijah, and call down fire to consume them. The rebuke of their Lord is testified to by all the New Testament MSS. The words of the rebuke: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," rest on the authority of the Codex Bezae, that village is commonly known to the members of the Latin Church in that district as San Giovanni [Jarno].
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and a few MSS. of minor value. The rest of the verse, "For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them," is an insertion without authority of MSS. (see Alford, in loc.1)

At the end of the same journey a similar spirit appears again. As they went up to Jerusalem our Lord declared to his Apostles the circumstances of his coming Passion, and at the same time strengthened them by the promise that they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. These words seem to have made a great impression upon Salome, and she may have thought her two sons quite as fit as the sons of Jona to be the chief ministers of their Lord in the mysteries kingdom which he was about to assume. She approached therefore, and besought, with perhaps a special reference in her mind to Peter and Andrew, that her two sons might sit on the right hand and on the left in his kingdom, i.e. according to a Jewish form of expression (Joseph. Ant. vi. 11, § 9), that they might be next to the King in honor. The two brothers joined with her in the prayer (Mark x. 35). The Lord passed by their petition with a mild and soothing reply, showing that the reputation of John had increased, and that of James diminished, by the time that St. Luke wrote: and secondly, that he perished not by stoning, but by the sword. The Jewish law laid down that if seducers to strange worship were few, they should be stoned; if many, that they should be beheaded. Either therefore Herod intended that James's death should be the beginning of a sanguinary persecution, or he merely followed the common practice of stoning to death from preference (see Lightfoot, in loc.).

The death of so prominent a champion left a huge gap in the ranks of the infant society, which was filled partly by St. James, the brother of our Lord, who now steps forth into greater prominence in Jerusalem, and partly by St. Paul, who had now been seven years a convert, and who shortly afterwards set out on his first apostolic journey.

III. Chronological recapitulation.—In the spring or summer of the year 27 James was called to be a disciple of Christ. In the spring of 28 he was appointed one of the Twelve Apostles, and at that time probably received, with his brother, the title of Bonerger. In the autumn of the same year he was admitted to the miraculous raising of Jairus's daughter. In the spring of the year 29 he witnessed the Transfiguration. Very early in the year 30 he urged his Lord to call down fire from heaven to consume the Samaritan village. About three months later in the same year, just before the final arrival in Jerusalem, he and his brother made their ambitions request through their mother Salome. On the night before the Crucifixion he was present at the Agony in the Garden. On the day of the Ascension he is mentioned as persevering with the rest of the Apostles and disciples in prayer. Shortly before the day of the Passover, in the year 44, he was put to death. Thus during fourteen out of the seventeen years that elapsed between his call and his death we do not even catch a glimpse of him.

a * See note d under ELIJAH, vol. i. p. 707 f. A.
   b The same form is common throughout the East.
   d The great Armenian convent at Jerusalem on the southwest Mount Zion is dedicated "St. Peter the son of Zebedee." The church of the convent, or rather a small chapel on its northeast side, occupies the traditions site of his martyrdom. This, however, can hardly be the actual site (Williams, Holy City, ii. 558). Its most interesting possession is the chair of the Apostle, a venerable relic, the age of which is perhaps traceable as far back as the 4th century (Williams, 560). But as it would seem that it has hitherto been supposed to belong to "the first Bishop of Jerusalem," it is doubtful to which of the two Jameses the tradition would attach it.
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hesitation, the Apostle kissed him, saying, "Peace be to thee!" and they were beheld together. This tradition is preserved by Eusebius (H. E. ii. 6). There is no internal evidence against it, and the external evidence is sufficient to make it credible, for Clement flourished as early as A. D. 195, and he states expressly that the account was given him by the Lord himself before him.

For legends respecting his death and his connection with Spain, see the Roman Breviary (in Fest. S. Jac. Ap.), in which the healing of a paralytic and the conversion of Hermogenes are attributed to him, and where it is asserted that he preached the Gospel in Spain, and that his remains were translated to Compostella. See also the fourth book of the Apostopolitan History written by Abdon, the (pseudo) first bishop of Barclony (Abdon, Histo- riae primi Episcopi ab Apostolis constitutae, de his- toria Certaminis Apostolici Libri decem, Paris, 1666); Isisobor, De vita et obitu SS. utriusque Test. No. LXXIII. (Hageneau, 1289); Pope Callistus II's Four Sermons on St. James the Apostle (Bibl. Patr. Magn. xv. p. 324); Mariana, De aduentu Jacobo Apostoli Majoris in Hispaniam (Col. Agripp. 1699); Baronius, Martyrology Romanum ad Annal. i. p. 325 (Antwerp, 1580); Bollandius, Acta Sanctorum ad Annal. ii. 25, tom. vi. pp. 1-124 (Antwerp, 1729); Estius, Comm. in Act. Ap. c. xii.: Annot. in difficiliora loco S. Script. (Col. Agripp. 1628); Tillemont, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ec- clésiastique des six premiers siècles, tom. i. p. 899 (Brussels, 1706).

As there is no shadow of foun- dation for any of the legends here referred to we pass them by without further notice. Even Baronius shows himself ashamed of them: Estius gives them up as hopeless; and Tillemont rejects them with as much contempt as his position would allow him to show. Ephesians, without giving or probably having any authority for or against his statement, reports that St. James died unmarried (S. Epiph. Adc. Her. ii. 4, p. 491, Paris, 1622), and that, like his namesake, he lived the life of a Nazarite (obd. iii. 2, 13, p. 1045). As himself.

2. those who were born of James and Alphæus. Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13.

3. JAMES THE BROTHER OF THE LORD. Matt. xii. 55; Mark vi. 3; Gal. i. 19.

4. JAMES THE SON OF MARY, Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke xxiv. 10. Also called the LITTLE, Mark xv. 40.

5. JAMES THE BROTHER OF JUDE. Jude 1.


7. JAMES. Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. ii. 9, 12.

8. JAMES THE SERVANT OF GOD AND OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST. James i. 1.

We reserve the question of the authorship of the epistle for the present.

St. Paul identifies for us Nos. 3 and 7 (see Gal. ii. 9 and 12 compared with i. 19). If we may translate ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου, Judas the brother, rather than the son of James, we may conclude that 5 and 6 are identical. And that we may so translate it, is proved, if proof were needed, by Winer (Grammatik der Idioms der N. T., translated by Agnew and Ebleke, New York, 1840, §§ 616. and xxx.), by Hinckle (Handb. der Erkl. in die Schriften des Neuen Test., Erlangen, 1880), by Arndt (Recherches critiques sur l'Épître de Jude, Strasbourg, 1851).

We may identify 9 and 6 with 3 because we know that James the Lord's brother had a brother named Jude.

We may identify 4 with 3 because we know James the son of Mary had a brother named Joseph, and so also had James the Lord's brother.

Thus there remain two only, James the son of Alphæus (2.), and James the brother of the Lord (5.), for we, or can we not, identify them? This requires a longer consideration.

1. By comparing Matt. xxvii. 56 and Mark xv. 40, with John xix. 25, we find that the Virgin Mary had a sister named like herself, Mary, who was the wife of Clopas, and who had two sons, James the Little, and Joseph. It has been suggested that "Mary the wife of Clopas" in John xix. 25 need not be the same person as "his mother's sister" (Kitto, Lange, Davidson), but the Greek will not admit of this construction without the addition or the omission of a καί. By referring to Matt. xiii. 55 and Mark vi. 3 we find that a James and a Joseph, with two other brethren called Jude and Simon, and at least three (πιστεύονται) sisters, were living with the Virgin Mary at Nazareth. By referring to Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13 we find that there were two brethren named James and Jude and, at least, two sisters, Lucina and Mary. It is altogether natural to think that we had here but one family of four brothers and three or more sisters, the children of Clopas and Mary, nephews and nieces of the Virgin Mary. There are difficulties, however, in the way of this conclusion. For, (1) the four brethren in Matt. xiii. 55 are described as the brothers (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus, not as His consis; (2) they are found living as at their home with the Virgin Mary, which seems unusual if she were their aunt, their mother being, as we know, still alive; (3) the James of Luke vi. 15 is described as the son not of Clopas, but of Alphæus; (4) the "brethren of the Lord" (who are plainly James, Jude, Joseph, and Simon) appear to be excluded from the Apostolic band by their declared and explicit in his Mes- siahship (John vii. 5-35) and by being formally dis- tinguished from the disciples by the Gospel-writers (John xxi. 2; Acts i. 14): (5) James and Jude are not designated as the Lord's brethren in the lists of the Apostles; (6) Mary is designated as mother of James and Joseph, whereas she would have been called mother of James and Jude, and James and Jude been Apostles, and Joseph not an Apostle (Matt. xxvii. 56).

These are the six chief objections which may be made to the hypothesis of there being but one family of brethren named James, Joseph, Jude, and Simon. The following answers may be given:

Object 1. — "They are called brethren." It is a sound rule of criticism that words are to be understood in their most simple and literal acceptation; but there is a limit to this rule. When greater difficulties are caused by adhering to the literal meaning of a word, than by interpreting it more liberally, it is the part of the critic to interpret more liberally, rather than to cling to the ordinary and literal meaning of a word. Now it is clearly not necessary to understand ἀδελφοί as "brothers" in the nearest sense of brotherhood. It need not mean more than rather (comp. LXX. Gen. xiii. 8, xiv. 14, xx. 12, xxiii. 21, xxiv. 23; Lev. xxv. 48; Deut. ii. 8; Job xiv. 15, xlii. 11; Gen. x. 14.); § 47: Isra. Penaot, 29; Plut. Phal. 57; Crit. 16; see also Civ. ad Att. 15: Tac. Ann. iii. 38; Quint. Curt. vi. 10, § 34; comp. Suidas and Schollen, in voc.). But perhaps the circum
names of the case would lead us to translate it brethren? On the contrary, such a translation appears to produce very great difficulties. For, first, it introduces two sets of four first-cousins, bearing the same names of James, Joses, Jude, and Simon, who appear upon the stage without anything to show which is the son of Clopas, and which his brother James, and secondly, it drives us to choose between three doubtful and improbable hypotheses as to the parentage of this second set of James, Joses, Jude, and Simon. There are three such hypotheses: (a.) The Eastern hypothesis, that they were the children of Joseph by a former wife. This notion originated in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (Orig. in Matt. xiii. 35, Op. tom. iii. p. 402, E. ed. Deharo), and was adopted by St. Epiphanius, St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose, and handed on to the later Greek Church (Ephiph. Har. xxvii. 1, Op. tom. i. p. 115; Hill. in Matt. i. St. Anmbr. Op. tom. ii. p. 260, Ed. Bened.). (b.) The Helvidian hypothesis, put forward at first by Bononus, Helvidius, and Jovinian, and revived by Strauss and Herder in Germany, and by Davidson and Alford in England, that James, Joses, Jude, Simon, and the three sisters, were children of Joseph and Mary; and James. This notion is opposed, whether rightly or wrongly, to the general sentiment of the Christian body in all ages of the Church; like the other two hypotheses, it constructs two sets of cousins with the same name: it seems to be scarcely compatible with our Lord's recommending His mother to the care of St. John at His own death (see Jerome, Op. tom. ii. p. 19); for if, as has been suggested, though with great improbability, his sons might at that time have been unbelievers (Bosan. Theol. p. 67, Lond. Bot.: Neander, Plaustus, etc., iv. 1), Jesus would have known that such an unbelief was only to continue for a few days. That the προφῆται ἔστε of Luke ii. 7, and the ἔστε oi ἔρηκε of Matt. i. 23, imply the birth of after children, is not now often urged (see Pearson, On the Creed, i. 304, ii. 230). (c.) The Levirate hypothesis may be passed by. It was a mere attempt made in the nineteenth century to reconcile the Greek and Latin traditions by supposing that Joseph and Clopas were brothers, and that Joseph raised up seed to his dead brother (Theoph. in Matt. xiii. 53; Op. tom. i. p. 71, E. ed. Venet. 1764).

Objectio 2. — "The four brothers and their sisters are always found living and moving about with the Virgin Mary." If they were the children of Clopas, the Virgin Mary was their aunt. Her own husband would appear without doubt to have died at some time between A. D. 8 and A. D. 26. Nor have we any reason for believing Clopas to have been alive during our Lord's ministry. (We need not pause here to prove that the Clophas of Luke xxiv. is an entirely different person and name from Clopas.) What difficulty is there in supposing that the two widowed sisters should have lived together, the more so as one of them had lost one son, and he was often taken from her by his ministerial duties? And would it not be most natural that two families of first cousins thus living together should be popularly looked upon as one family, and spoken of as brothers and sisters instead of cousins? It is noticeable that St. Mary is nowhere called the mother of the four brothers.

Objectio 3. — "James the Apostle is said to be the son of Alpheus, but not of Clopas. But Alphus and Japas are the same name rendered into the Greek language in two different but ordinary and recognized ways, from the Aramaic אַלפֵה. (See Mill, Accounts of our Lord's Brethren vindicated, etc. p. 236, who compares the two forms Clovis and Aloyisius; Arnaud, Recherches etc.)."

Objectio 4. — Dean Alford considers John vii. 5, compared with vi. 67-70, to decide that none of the brothers of the Lord were of the number of the Twelve (Proleg. to Ep. of James, Tr. Test. iv. 88, and Conn. in loc.). If this verse, as he states, makes "the crowning difficulty" to the hypothesis of the identity of James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle, with James the brother of the Lord, the difficulties are not too formidable to be overcome. Many of the disciples having left Jesus, St. Peter bursts out in the name of the Twelve with a warm expression of faith and love; and after that — very likely (see Gresswell's Harmony) full six months afterwards — the Evangelist states that "neither did his brethren believe on Him." Does it follow from hence that all his brethren disbelieved? Let us compare other passages in Scripture. St. Matthew and St. Mark state that the thieves railed on our Lord upon the Cross. Are we therefore to disbelieve St. Luke, who says that one of the thieves was penitent, and did not rail? (Luke xxiii. 40, 49). St. Luke and St. John say that the soldiers offered vinegar. Can we believe that all did so? or, as St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us, that only one did it? (Luke xxiii. 36; John xix. 29; Mark xv. 36; Matt. xxvii. 48). St. Matthew tells us that "his disciples" had indignation when Mary poured the ointment on the Lord's head. Are we to suppose this true of all? or of Judas Iscariot, and perhaps some others, according to John xii. 4 and Mark xiv. 4? It is not at all necessary to suppose that St. John is here speaking of all the brethren. If Joses, Simon, and the three sisters disbelieved, it would be quite sufficient ground for the statement of the Evangelist. The same may be said of Matt. xii. 47, Mark iii. 32, where it is reported to Him that his mother and his brethren, designated by St. Mark (iii. 21) as οἱ πατὶς αὐτοῦ, were standing without. Nor does it necessarily follow that the disbelief of the brethren was of a nature which prevented the Apostles though they were, and vouched for half a year before by the warm-tempered Peter, could have had no share in it. It might have been similar to that feeling of unfaultless restlessness which perhaps moved St. John Baptist to send his disciples to make their inquiry of the Lord (see Grotius in loc., and Lardner, vi. p. 497, Lond. 1738). With regard to John, ii. 12, Acts i. 14, we may say that "his brethren" are no more excluded from the disciples in the first passage, and from the Apostles in the second, by being mentioned parallel with them, than the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas' (1 Cor. ix. 5), excludes Peter from the Apostolic band.

Objectio 5. — "If the title of brethren of the Lord had belonged to James and Jude, they would have been designated by it in the list of the Apostles." The omission of a title is so slight a ground for an argument that we may pass this by.

Objectio 6. — "That Mary the wife of Clopas was designated by the title of Mary the mother of James and Joses, to the exclusion of Jude, if James and Jude were Apostles, appears to Dr. Davidson (Intro. to N. T., iii. 295, London
JAMES

(1833) Neander, Michaelis, Winer, Alford. Still this is not often, if ever, the case, when \( \text{i} \) \( \text{i} \text{f} \) follows \( \text{έπερω} \) (Schenklenburger, Alford. ad Epist. Inc. perpet. p. 144, Stuttg. 1832: see also Winer Gramma. 5th ed., p. 647, and Meyer, Komm. in loc.:)

and if St. Paul had not intended to include St. James among the Apostles, we should rather have expounded the regular \( \text{παντώς} \) than the plural \( \text{τῶς \text{πνεύματος}} \) (Arnald. Recherches, etc.).

The more natural interpretation of the verse would appear to be that which includes James among the Twelve, identifying him with the son of Alphaxus. But, as we have said, such a conclusion does not necessarily follow. Compare, however, this verse with Acts ix. 27, and the probability is increased by several reasons. St. Luke there asserts that Barnabas brought Paul to the Apostle, \( \text{έπερως \text{πνεύματος} \text{παντώς}} \). St. Paul, as we have seen, asserts that during that visit to Jerusalem he saw Peter, and none other of the Apostles, save James the Lord's brother. Peter and James, then, were the two Apostles to whom Barnabas brought Paul. Of course, it may be said here also that \( \text{παντώς} \) is used in its last sense; but it appears to be a more natural conclusion that James with St. Luke's brother was one of the Twelve Apostles, being identical with James the son of Alphaxus, or James the Little.

11. We must now turn for a short time from Scripture to the early testimony of uninspired writers. Here, as among modern writers, we find the same three hypotheses which we have already mentioned:

For the identity of James the Lord's brother with James the Apostle, the son of Alphaxus, we find Papas of Hieraplis, a contemporary of the Apostles (see Routh, Relig. Sacr. i. 16, 43, 230, Oxon, 1846), St. Clement of Alexandria (Hypotyposeis, bk. vii. apud Euseb. H. E. ii. 11), St. Chrysostom (in Gal. i. 19).

Family with this opinion there existed another in favor of the hypothesis that James was the son of Joseph by a former marriage, and therefore not identical with the son of Alphaxus. This is first found in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (see Origen, in Matt. xiii. 55), in the Protevangelium of James, and the Pseudo-Apostolical Constitutions of the third century (Thilo, Cod. Apost. i. 228; Const. Apost. vi. 12). It is adopted by Eusebius (Comm. in Esd. iii. 6; H. E. i. 12, ii. 1). Perhaps it is Origen's opinion (see Comm. in Joh. ii. 19), and it is followed by the Epiphanius, St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose, who have already mentioned as being on the same side.

Now there is a still further variant, a second, and as it were a third hypothesis. This is the variant of the two in the New Testament, and being warmly defended by St. Jerome (in Matt. xii. 24), and supported by St. Augustine (Contra Faust. xii. 35, A.), it became the recognized belief of the Western Church.

The third hypothesis was unknown until it was put forward by Bunsen in Macedonia, and by Hesidius and Jerovian in Italy, as an opinion which seemed to them conformable with Scripture. Their followers were called Antidicomarianites. The fact a Here, too, the older Papis is confounded with his later namesake. See note, vol. i. p. 329. b.
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of their having a name given them shows that their numbers must have been considerable; they date from the latter part of the fourth century.

English theological writers have divided between the first mention of these views, with, however, a preference on the whole for the first hypothesis. See, for example, Lardner, vi. 495, Lond. 1788; Pearson, Minor Works, i. 350, Oxf. 1844, and On the Creed, i. 308, 224, Oxf. 1833; Thorndike, i. 5, Oxf. 1844; Horne's Introd. to H. S. iv. 427, Lond. 1834, &c. On the same side are Lightfoot, Witsius, Lampe, Baumgarten, Seiliger, Giebel, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Ginter, Schneckenburger, Meier, Steiger, Gieseler, Theile, Lange.

Taylor (Osy. tom. v. p. 29, Lond. 1849), Wilson (Osy. tom. vi. p. 673, Oxf. 1859), Cave (Life of St. James) maintain the second hypothesis, with Vossius, Bausanje, Valetius, etc. The third is held by Dr. Davidson (Introd. N. T. vol. iii.) and by Dean Alford (Greek Test. iv. 87).

The chief treatises on the subject are Dr. Mill's Accounts of our Lord's brethren, cambridge, 1813; Alford, as above referred to; Lange's Artikel in Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Stuttgart, 1856; Neander's Pflanzung und Leitung; Schneckenburger's Annotatio ad Epist. Jac. perpetuam, Stuttgart, 1832; Arnaud's Recherches critiques sur l'Epître de Jude, Strasbourg, 1851; Schaff's Das Verhältniss des Jacobus Brossels des Herrn und Jacobus Alphæi, Berlin, 1842; Gabel's De Jacobi Epistola eilten næripite Auctori, Altorf, 1877.

Had we not identified James the son of Alpheus with the brother of the Lord we should have but little to write of him. When we had said that his name appears twice in the catalogue of the Twelve Apostles, our history of him would be complete. In like manner the early history of the Lord's brother would be confined to the fact that he lived and moved from place to place with his brothers and sisters, and with the Virgin Mary: and, except the appearance of the risen Lord to him, we should have nothing more to recounts of him until after the death of James the son of Zebedee, in the year 44, or at least, till St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, in the year 49. Of James the Little, who would probably be distinct from each of the above (for an argument against the identity of the four brothers, or that of the identity of Alpheus and Clopas), we should know nothing, except that he had a mother named Mary, who was the sister of the Virgin Mary and the wife of Clopas.

James the Little, the Son of Alpheus, the Brother of the Lord. — Of James' father Ἀλφαίου, rendered by St. Matthew and St. Mark Alpheus (Ἀλφαίος), and by St. John Clopas (Κλαπασ), we know nothing, except that he married Mary, the sister of the Virgin Mary, and had by her four sons and three or more daughters. He appears to have died before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, and after his death it would seem that his wife and her sisters, a widow like herself, and in poor circumstances, lived together in one house, generally at Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 55), but sometimes also at Capernaum (John ii. 12) and Jerusalem (Acts i. 14). It is probable that these —

* The author of the article on the "Brothers of our Lord" takes a different view from the one given above. [BIBLIO., vol. i. p. 328]
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and introduced him to Peter and James (Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 18, 19), and by their authority he was admitted into the society of the Christians, and allowed to associate freely with them during the fifteen days of his stay. Here we find James on a level with Peter, and with him deciding on the admission of St. Paul into fellowship with the Church at Jerusalem; and from henceforth we always find him equal, or in his own department superior, to the very chiefest Apostles Peter, John, and Paul. For by this time he had been apostled (at what exact date we know not) to preside over the infant Church in its most important centre, in a position equivalent to that of Bishop. This pre-eminence is evident throughout the after history of the Apostles, whether we read it in the Acts, in the Epistles, or in ecclesiastical writers. Thus in the year 44, when Peter is released from prison, he desires that information of his escape may be given to "James, and to the brethren" (Acts xii. 17). In the year 49 he presides at the Apostolic Council, and delivers the judgment of the Assembly, with the expression διό εὐθύς καίραι (Acts xx. 13, 19; see St. Chrys. in loc.). In the same year (or perhaps in the year 51, on his fourth visit to Jerusalem) St. Paul recognizes James as one of the pillars of the Church, together with Cephas and John (Gal. ii. 9). Shortly afterwards it is "certain who came from James," that is, from the mother church of Jerusalem, designated by the name of its Bishop, who lead Peter into trengeneration at Antioch. And in the year 57 Paul pays a formal visit to James in the presence of all his presbyters, after having been previously welcomed with joy the day before by the brethren in an official manner (Acts xxii. 18).

Entirely accordant with these notices of Scripture is the universal testimony of Christian antiquity to the high office held by James in the Church of Jerusalem. That he was formally appointed Bishop of Jerusalem by the Lord himself, as reported by Eusebius (Hist. xi. viii.; Chrysostom (Hom. xi. in 1 Cor. viii.); Proclus of Constantinople (De Trad. Did. Liturg.); and Photius (Ep. 157), is not likely. Eusebius follows this account in a passage of his history, but says elsewhere that he was appointed by the Apostles (Hist. ii. 23). Clement of Alexandria is the first author who speaks of his Episcopate (Hypotyposeis, bk. vi. ap. Euseb. Hist. ii. 1), and he alludes to it as a thing of which the chief Apostles, Peter, James, and John, might well have been ambitious. The same Clement reports that the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John, and Peter, who delivered to the rest of the Apostles, and they to the Seventy. This at least shows the estimation in which James was held. But the author to whom we are chiefly indebted for an account of the life and death of James is Hegesippus (c. c. Joseph), a Christian of Jewish origin, who lived in the middle of the second century. His narrative gives us such an insight into the position of St. James in the Church of Jerusalem that it is best to let him relate it in his own words:

"Tradition respecting James, as given by Hegesippus. — With the Apostles James, the brother of the Lord, succeeds to the charge of the Church — that James, who has been called Just from the time of the Lord to our own days, for there were many of the name of James. He was holy from his mother's womb, he drank no wine or strong drink, nor did he eat animal food; a razor came not upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, but did not use the bath. He alone might go into the holy place; for he wore no woolen clothes, but linen. And alone he used to go into the Temple, and there he was commonly found upon his knees, praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew dry and thin [generally translated karpi] like a camel's, from his constantly bending them in prayer, and entreating forgiveness for the people. On account of his exceeding righteousness he was called Just, and of Olives, which means in Greek the bulwark of the people, and righteousness, as the prophets declare of him. Some of the seven sects then that I have mentioned inquired of him, 'What is the door of Jesus?' And he said that this man was the Saviour, wherefore some believed that Jesus is the Christ. Now the fore-mentioned sects did not believe in the Resurrection, nor in the coming of one who shall recompense every man according to his works; but all who became believers believed through James. When many therefore of the rulers believed, there was a disturbance among the Jews, and Scribes, and Pharisees, saying, 'There is a risk that the whole people will expect Jesus to be the Christ.' They came therefore together to James, and said, 'We pray thee, stop the people, for they have gone astray under the name of Jesus. We beseech thee to persuade all that come to the Passover concerning Jesus: for we all give heed to thee, and all the people testify to thee that thou art just, and acceptest not the person of man. Persuade the people therefore not to go astray about Jesus, for the whole people and all of us give heed to thee. Stand therefore on the gable of the Temple, that thou mayest be visible, and that thy words may be heard by all the people for all the tribes and even the Gentiles are come together for the Passover. Therefore the forementioned Scribes and Pharisees placed James upon the gable of the Temple, and cried out to him, and said, 'O Just one, to whom we ought all to give heed, seeing that the people are going astray after Jesus who was crucified, tell us what is the door of Jesus?' And he answered with a loud voice, 'Why ask ye me about Jesus the Man of Just, and of Olives, which means in hand of great power, and will come on the clouds of heaven.' And many were convinced and gave glory on the testimony of James, crying Hosanna to the Son of David. Whereupon the same Scribes and Pharisees said to each other, 'We have done ill in bringing forward such a witness to Jesus; but let us go up, and throw him down; that they may be terrified, and not believe on him.' And they cried out, saying, 'O! oh! even the Just is gone astray.' And they fulfilled that which is written in Isaiah, 'Let us take away the just man, for he is displeasing to us; therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their deeds.' They went up therefore, and threw down the Just one, and said to one another, 'Let us stone James the Just.' And they began to stone him, for he was not killed by the fall; but he turned round, and linked his chains, and cried, 'I beseech thee, Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' And whist they were stoning him, one of the priests, of the sons of Rechab, a son of the Rechabites to whom Jeremia the prophet bears testimony, cried out and said, 'Stop! What are you about? The Just one is praying for you!' Then one of them, who was a follower, took the club with which they pressed the clothes and brought it down on the head of the
JAMES

JAMES, EPISTLE OF

1:1. And so he bore his witness. And they buried him on the spot by the Temple, and the column still remains by the Temple. This man was a true witness to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. And immediately Vespasian commenced the siege (Euseb. II. 23, and Iohou, Rel. Scir. p. 121). He was preserved down to this time; on which see Heinichen's Excursus (Exc. vi. ad Euseb. II. vii. 19, iv. p. 957, ed. Burton).

For the difficulties which occur in this extract, reference may be made to Routh's Reliquiae Savorae (vol. i. p. 228), and to Cano Stanley's Apostolical Age (p. 319, Ox. 1847). It represents St. James in his life and in his death more vividly than any modern words could picture him. We see him, a married man perhaps (1 Cor. ix. 5), but in all other respects a rigid and ascetic follower after righteousness, keeping the Nazarite rule, like Anna the prophetess (Luke ii. 37), serving the Lord in the Temple "with fasting and prayers night and day," regarded by the Jews themselves as one who had attained to the sanctity of the priesthood, though not of the priestly family or tribe (unless indeed we argue from this that Clopas did belong to the tribe of Levi, and draw thence another argument for the identity of James the son of Clopas, and James the Lord's brother), and as the very type of what a righteous or just man ought to be. If any man could have converted the Jews as a nation to Christianity, it would have been James.

Josephus' narrative of his death is apparently somewhat different. He says that in the interval between the death of Festus and the coming of Albinus, Ananus, the high-priest assembled the Sanhedrim, and "brought before it James the brother of him who is called Christ, and some others, and having charged them with breaking the laws, delivered them over to be stoned." But if we are to reconcile this statement with that of Hegesippus, we must suppose that they were not actually stoned on this occasion. The historian adds that the better part of the citizens disliked what was done, and complained of Ananus to Agrippa and Albinus, whereupon Albinus threatened to punish him for having assembled the Sanhedrin without his consent, and Agrippa deprived him of the high-priesthood (Ant. x. 9). The words "brother of him who is called Christ," are judged by Le Clerc, Lardner, etc., to be spurious.

Epiphanius gives the same account that Hegesippus does in somewhat different words, having evidently copied it for the most part from him. He adds a few particulars which are probably mere assertions or conclusions of his own (Heres. xix. 4, and Ixxviii. 13). He considers James to have been the son of Joseph by a former wife, and calculates that he must have been 96 years old at the time of his death; and adds, on the authority, as he says, of Eusebius, Clement, and others, that he wore the siptalov on his forehead, in which he probably confounded him with St. John (Polyer.

3 The monument—part excavation, part edifice—which is now commonly known as the "Tomb of St. James," is on the east side of the so-called Valley of Jehoshaphat, and therefore at a considerable distance from the spot on which the Apostles was killed, which the Jews would seem to have been somewhere under the southeast corner of the wall of the Haram, or perhaps farther down the slope nearer the "Fountain of the Virgin." [EN-KODEL] It cannot at any rate be said to stand by the Temple. The tradition is that in the time of Claudius it was possessed down to St. James took refuge there after the capture of Christ, and remained, eating and drinking nothing, until our apud Euseb. H. E. v. 24. But see Cotta, De itna pont. Apol. Hebr. Joc. et Marci, Tub. 1755.

Gregory of Tours reports that he was buried not where he fell, but on the Mount of Olives, in a tomb in which he had already buried Zacharias and Simeon (De glor. Mart. i. 27). Eusebius tells us (Hist. III. 4), that it was "immediately" after this time; on which see Heinichen's Excursus (Exc. vi. ad Euseb. II. vii. 19, iv. p. 957, ed. Burton).

We must add a strange Talmudic legend, which appears to relate to James. It is found in the Midrash Koheleth, or Commentary on Ecclesiastes and also in the Tract Abobab Zarah of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is as follows:—R. Eliezer, the son of Dana, was bitten by a serpent; and there came to him Jacob, a man of Caphar Sacaus, to heal him by the name of Jesus the son of Pandera; but R. Ismael suffered him not, saying, 'That is not allowed thee, son of Dana.' He answered, 'Suffer me, and I will produce an authority against thee that it is lawful;' but he could not produce the authority before he expired. And what was the authority?—This:—'Which if a man do, he shall not be stoned (Ex. xix. 14). But it is not said that he shall die in them.' The son of Pandera is the name that the Jews have always given to our Lord, when representing him as a magician.

The same name is given in Epiphanius (Heres. xxviii.) to the grandfather of Joseph, and by John Damascene (De Fide Orth. iv. 13) to the grandfather of Josephim, the supposed father of the Virgin Mary. For the identification of James of Sceaus (a place in Upper Galilee) with James the Just, see Mill (Historic. Critic. of the Gospel, p. 318, Camb. 1840). The passage quoted by Origen and Eusebius from Josephus, in which the latter speaks of the death of James as being one of the causes of the destruction of Jerusalem, seems to be spurious (Orig. in Matt. xiii. 55; Euseb. H. E. ii. 23).

It is possible that there may be a reference to James in Heb. iii. 17 (see Theodore in loc.), which would fix his death at some time previous to the writing of that epistle. His apprehension by Ananus was probably about the year 62 or 63 (Lardner. Pearson, Mill, Whitby, Le Clerc, Tillonmont). There is nothing to fix the date of his martyrdom as narrated by Hegesippus, except that it must have been shortly before the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem. We may conjecture that he was between 70 and 80 years old. F. M.

JAMES, THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF. I. Its Genuineness and Canonicity.—In the third book of his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius makes his well-known division of the books, or pretended books, of the New Testament into four classes. Under the head of διαλογίσματα he places the Gospels, the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, the First Epistle of St. John, and the First Epistle to Mithridath; the Second to the Jews, and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. While, however, the latter is perhaps best considered as a work sui generis, yet the second of the former three is certainly a work of serious consequence, and is to be reckoned as an important testimony to the primitive use of the Gospels. Thus, according to the legend, Lord appeared to him on the day of his resurrection (See Quaresmis, etc., quoted in Tobler, Sauloth, etc. 299.) The legend of his death there seems to be first mentioned by Manville (a. n. 132): see Early Test. 176). By the old travellers it is often called the "Church of St. James." [EX-KODEL] And it is not necessary to say that the Jacobite churches of the East—consisting of the Armenians, the Copts, and other Monophysists, or Bucharish bodies—do not derive their title from St. James, but from the latter person was the same as St. James the brother of our Lord, who died Bishop of Edessa in Ptolemais.
I'o but I'o or chiefly not and the Apocalypse of St. Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Doctrines of the Apostles, the Gospel to the Hebrews. The \textit{apostolical} consist of the Gospels of Peter, Thomas, Matthias, and others, the Acts of Andrew, John, and others. The \textit{apostolica}, amongst which \textit{he} places the Epistle of St. James, are, he says, \textit{γραφή για τοις σοιοι}; that is, the expression means that they were acknowledged by, or merely that they were known to, the majorit}y (\textit{H. E.} iii. 25). Elsewhere he refers the epistle to the class of \textit{προφανεια}, for this is the meaning of \textit{προφανεια} \textit{των}, which was apparently misunderstood by \textit{St. Jerome} (\textit{De Fr. Hist.}); but he bears witness that it was publicly read in most churches as genuine (\textit{H. E.} ii. 23), and as such accepts it himself. This then was the state of the question in the time of Eusebius; the epistle was accepted as canonical, and as the writing of James, the brother of the Lord, by the majority, but not universally. Origen bears the same testimony as Eusebius (tom. iv. p. 306), and probably like him, himself accepted the epistle as genuine (tom. iv. p. 555, &c.). It is found in the Syriac version, and appears to be referred to by Clement of Rome (\textit{off Cor. x.}). Herman (ib. ii. \textit{Mairn.}, xii. 5), Irenaeus (\textit{ib. Hærns.} [ib. iv. c.] 16, \$ 2), and is quoted by almost all the Fathers of the 4th century, e. g. Athanasius, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom (see Davidson, \textit{Intro. to N. T.}, iii. p. 338). In 367 the Council of Carthage regarded it as canonical, and from that time there has been no further question of its genuineness on the score of external testimony. But at the time of the Reformation the question of its authenticity was again raised, and now upon the ground of internal evidence. Erasmus and Cardinal Cajetan in the Church of Rome, Cyril Lactant in the Greek Church, Luther and the Magdeburg Centurians among Protestants, all objected to it. Luther seems to have withdrawn his expression that it was \textit{a richt strawy epistle}, compared with the Gospel of St. John and the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter, after that expression had been two years before the world. The chief objection on external grounds is a supposed opposition between St. Paul and St. James, on the doctrine of Justification, concerning which we shall presently make some remarks. At present we need only say that it is easy to account for the non-universal reception of the epistle in the Early Church, by the fact that it was meant only for Jewish believers, and was not likely therefore to circulate widely among Gentile Christians, for whose spiritual necessities it was primarily not adapted; and that the objection on internal grounds proves nothing except against the objectors, for it really rests on a mistake.

H. \textit{Its Author.} — The author of the epistle must be either James the son of Zebedee, according to the subscription of the Syriac version; or James the son of Alpheus, according to Dr. Davidson's view (\textit{Intro. to N. T.}, iii. 312); or James the brother of the Lord, which is the general opinion (see Euseb. \textit{H. E.} ii. 27; Alford, \textit{G. T.} iv. p. 28; or an unknown James (Luther). The likelihood of this last hypothesis falls to the ground when the \textit{canonical} character of the epistle is admitted. James the son of Zebedee could not have written it, because of the death of his\textit{ nephew}, only seven years after the martyrdom of Stephen, does not give time for the growth of a sufficient number of Jewish Christians, \textit{εν τις διασπορα}. Internal evidence (see Stanley, \textit{Apost. Age}, p. 212) points unmistakably to James the Just as the writer, and we have already identified James the Just with the son of Alpheus.

The Jewish Christians, whether residing at Jerusalem or living scattered among the Gentiles, and only visiting that city from time to time, were the especial charge of James. To them he addressed this epistle; not to the unbelieving Jews (Lardner, Macknight, Hug, etc.), but only to believers in Christ, as is undoubtedly proved by li. ii. i. ii. 7; v. 7. The rich men of v. 1 may be the unbelieving Jews (Stanley, p. 289), but it does not follow that the epistle was written to them. It is usual for an orator to denounce in the second person. It was written from Jerusalem, which St. James does not seem to have ever left. The time at which he wrote it has been fixed as late as 62, and as early as 45. Those who see in its writer a desire to counteract the effects of a misconstruction of St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by faith in ii. 14-21 (Wiesinguer), and those who see a reference to the immediate destruction of Jerusalem in v. 1 (Macknight), and an allusion to the name Christian in ii. 7 (De Wette), argue in favor of the later date. The earlier date is advocated by Schneckenburger, Neander, Thiersch, Davidson, Stanley, and Alford; chiefly on the ground that the epistle could not have been written by St. James after the Council in Jerusalem, without some allusion to what was there decided, and because the Gentile Christian does not yet appear to be recognized.

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

The Jewish vices against which he warns them are—Formalism, which made the service (βαρεσία) of God consist in washings and outward ceremonies, whereas he reminds them (i. 27) that it consists rather in death, and the purity (see Coloss. ii. 23) and the scrupulosity (Aids to Reflection, Apul. 23; note also Active Love = Bp. Butler's "Benovelenza," and Purity = Bp. Butler's "Temperance"); fanaticism, which under the cloak of religious zeal was tearing Jerusalem to pieces (i. 29); formalism, which threw its sins on God (i. 13); meanness, which crouched before the rich (ii. 2); falsehood, which had made words and oaths playthings (iii. 12); partisanship (iii. 14); evil-speaking (iv. 11); boasting (iv. 16); oppression (v. 4). The great lesson which he teaches them, as Christians, is patience—patience in trial (i. 2); patience in good works (i. 22-25); patience under provocations (iii. 17); patience under oppression (v. 7); patience under persecution (v. 10); and the ground of their patience is, that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, which is to right all wrongs (v. 8).

IV. There are two points in the epistle which demand a somewhat more lengthened notice. These are (a) ii. 14-26, which has been represented as a formal opposition to St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, and (b) v. 14, 15, which is quoted as the authority for the sacrament of extreme unction.

(a) Justification being an act not of man but of God, the unpolluted roughness of his style and "justification by works" are exact. Justi-

fication must either be by grace, or of reward. Therefore our question is, Did or did not St. James hold justification by grace? If he did, there is no contradiction between the Apostles. Now there is not one word in St. James to the effect that a man can earn his justification by works; and this would be necessary in order to prove that he held justification of active love, and Peter (see Coloss. iii. 22) does not use the expression "justified by faith" (Rom. v. 1), and St. James, the expression, "justified by works, not by faith only." And here is an apparent opposition. But, if we consider the meaning of the two Apostles, we see at once that there is no contradiction either intended or possible. St. Paul was opposing the Judaizing party, which claimed to earn acceptance by good works, whether the works of the Mosaic law, or works of piety done by themselves. In opposition to these, St. Paul lays down the great truth that acceptance cannot be earned by man at all, but is the free gift of God to the Christian man, for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, appropriated by each individual, and made his own by the instrumentality of faith. —St. James, on the other hand, was opposing the old Jewish tenet that to be a child of Abraham was all in all; that Godliness was not necessary, so that the belief was correct. This presumption confidence had transferred itself, with perhaps double force, to the Christianized Jews. They had said, "Lord, Lord," and that was enough, without doing His Father's will. They had recognized the Messiah: what more was wanted? They had faith: what more was required of them? It is plain that their "faith" was a totally different thing from the "faith" of St. Paul. St. Paul tells us again and again that his "faith" was a faith that we possessed by grace and the Spirit, whereas St. James, says, it was by grace and the Spirit; but the very characteristic of the "faith" which St. James is attacking, and the very reason why he attacked it, was that it did not work by love, but was a bare assent of the head, not influencing the heart, a faith such as devils can have, and tremble. St. James tells us that "fides informis" is not sufficient on the part of man for justification; St. Paul tells us that "fides formata" is sufficient: and it is plain that the reason why "fides informis" will not do for us is, according to St. James, because it lacks that special quality, the addition of which constitutes it "fides formata." See on this subject Bull's Harmonia Apostolicæ et Externæ Consœuræ; Taylor's Sermon on "Faith working by love," vol. viii. p. 281, Lond. 1850; and, as a corrective of Bull's view, Laurence's Bampton Lectures, i., v., vi.

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

The following editions, etc., of St. James's Epistle may be mentioned as worthy of notice. The edition of Benson and Michaelis, Halle Magdeburgiæ, 1746; Seller's Paraphrasis, Halle, 1781; Mori Predications, Groedde. De Epist. James 1794; Schneckenburger's Annotatio ad Epist. Jesus perpetuæ, Stuttg. 1832; Davidson's Introduction to the New Test. iii. 296 ff., Lond. 1851; Alford's Greek Test. vol. iv. p. 274, Lond. 1859 [4th ed., 1865].

The following spurious works have been attributed to St. James: (1.) The Protevangelium. (2.) Historia de Nativitate Mariae. (3.) De miraculis Infantius Iesu Christi, etc. Of these, the Prote-

evangelium is worth a passing notice, not for its contents, which are a mere parody on the early chapters of St. Luke, transferring the events which occurred at our Lord's birth to the birth of St. Mary his mother, but because it appears to have been known so early in the Church. It is possible that Justin Martyr (Dial. evan Tryph. c. 78), and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vi. 38) refer to Oribasius speaks of it (in Matt. xiii. 56); Gregory Nyssen (Opp. p. 349, ed. Paris), Epiphanius (Haer. lxxix.), John Damascene (Orat. i., ii. in Notic. Maric.), Photius (Orat. in Notic. Maric.), and others allude to it. It was first published in Latin in 1552, in Greek in 1564. The oldest MS. of it now existing is of the 10th century. (Sæ...
JANGLING

Thiele's Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, tom. i. pp. 45, 108, 159, 337, Lips. 1832.) F. M.

* It deserves notice that this epistle of James, like that of Jude, but unlike that of the other apostolic writings, never alludes to the outward facts of the Saviour's life. Yet James speaks expressly of the Lord Jesus Christ (see i. 1, ii. 7, 8), and asserts the faith as shown by works on which he lays such emphasis as that which rests on Christ as the Saviour of men. At the same time the language of James * offers the most striking coincidences with the language of our Lord's discourses." Compare James i. 5, 6 with Matt. vii. 7, xxi. 22; i. 22 with Matt. vii. 21; ii. 13 with Matt. v. 7; iii. 1 with Matt. xxiii. 8; iii. 12 with Matt. vii. 16; and v. 12 with Matt. v. 34-37. See Westcott's "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," p. 185 (Amer. ed.).

In speaking of the sources from which the Apostle Paul derives his favorite metaphors, Dr. Howson points out in this respect a striking difference between him and the Apostle James. The figures of Paul are drawn almost exclusively from the practical relations or business of men, as military life, architecture, agriculture, and the contests of the gymnasion and race-course: while the figures of James are taken from some of the varied aspects or phenomena of nature. It is remarked that there is more imagery of this latter kind in the one short epistle of James than in all Paul's epistles put together. This trait of his style appears in his allusions to " the waves of the sea driven with the wind and tossed " (i. 6), " the flower of the grass " (ver. 10), " the sun risen with a burning heat " (ver. 11), " the fierce wind " (iii. 4), " the kindling of the fire " (ver. 5), " the beasts, birds, and serpents and things in the sea " (ver. 7), " the fig, olive, and vine," " the salt water and fresh " (ver. 12), " the vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away " (iv. 14), " the moth-eaten garments " (v. 2), " the rust " (ver. 3), " the early and latter rain " (ver. 7), " and the earth bringing forth her fruit " (ver. 8)." (Lectures on the Character of St. Paul, pp. 1-7, London. 1864.)

Among the commentaries on this epistle (see above) may be mentioned Geller, Der Brief Jacobi ubersetzt u. erklart, in which special reference is made to the views of the ancient Greek and Latin interpreters (1828); Theile, Comm. in Epist. Jacobi (1834); Kern, Der Brief Jacobi untersucht u. erklart (1838); Vellner, Einleitung in die Psalmen, Adresse de St. Jacques (1850); Wesiger, Oldsbaum's Bibl. Komm. vi. pt. i. (2d Aufl., 1854); Huther, in Moser's Komm. uber das N. T. xv. (2d Aufl., 1863); De Wette, Ezech. Homlud. vol. iii. pt. i. (3d Aufl., by Brüchener, 1865); Lange and Olshausen, Lange's Bibelwerk, xiii. (1862) and Ameis transl. with additions by Dr. J. J. Montcler, pp. 1-418 (1863); Neander, Der Brief Jacobi, praefation, with Luther's version corrected by K. F. Th. Schneider, pp. 1-102; Webster and Wilkinson, Greek N. Test., with notes grammatical and exegetical, i. 1-5 and 10-20 (London 1861); Rev. T. Trapp, Commentary on the N. Testament (pp. 693-755), quaint in style but terse and sententious (Webster's ed. London 1865); and Kaufman, Comm. perpetuus in Jacobi epistolis, Tract. ad Thm. 1865. For a list of some of the older works, see a brochure beside the N. Test. p. 131 (3d Ausg. 1860).

Valuable articles on the epistle of James will be found in Herzog's Real-Encycl. vi. 417 ff. by Lange; in Zeller's Bibl. Wörterb. i. 658 ff. by Zeller (this analysis specially good); and in Kittel's Cyclo. of Bibl. Literature, by Dr. Edie (3d ed. 1866). I have a compendious view of the critical questions relating to the authorship, destination, and doctrines of the letter, see Bleek's Einleitung in das N. Test. pp. 530-533 (1862). Rev. T. D. Maurice gives an outline of the apostle's thoughts in his Unity of the New Testament, pp. 316-331. See also Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, pp. 267-324. The monographic literature is somewhat extensive. The theologian George Chr. Knapp, treats of "The Doctrine of Paul and James respecting Faith and Works, compared with the Teaching of our Lord," in his Scriptura Viva Argumenti, i. 411-456. See a translation of the same by Prof. W. Thompson in the Biblical Repository, iii. 189-228. Neander has an essay in his Geleigten- schriften (3te Ausg. 1827) entitled Pauius et Jacobi, in which he illustrates the "Unity of the Evangelical Spirit in different forms." Some extracts from this essay are appended to the above translation. Prof. E. P. Barrows has written on the "Alleged Disagreement between Paul and James" on the subject of justification, in the Bibl. Sacra, i. 451-782. On this topic see also Neander's "Pfynnung u. Leitung," ii. 838-873 (Robinson's transl. p. 498 ff.; Lechler's Das apost. und nachapost. Zeitalter, p. 225-262; and Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, p. 625 ff. (N. Y. 1853). Stier has published Der Brief des Jacobus in 32 Betrachtungen ausgelegt (1845). For some other similar works or discussions, see Lange's Bibelwerk as above (p. 24 f.), or Dr. Schaff's translation of Lange's Commentary (p. 35 f.).


2. (Ejacbert [2d ed.]. Alex. Iacuere) A man of Judah, of the great house of Horeb; second son of Zimri the Jerahmeelite (1 Chr. ii. 27).

3. [Comp. Iacuere] One of the Levites who under Ezra and Nehemiah read and expounded the law to the people (Neh. viii. 7). By the I.XX. (Rom., Vat., Alex.) the greater part of the names in this passage are omitted.

JAMINITES, THE (Lat. "Iacuerei""). The descendants of Jamin the son of Simeon (Num. xxvi. 12).

JAMLECH (Lat. [II., i. e. God, makes king] : Iaculax. [Comp. Ald.] Alex. "Amouk, etc."] Jamich, one of the chief men ("rion, A. V. "princes") of the tribe of Simeon (1 Chr. iv. 34), probably in the time of Hezekiah (see ver. 41).

JAMNIA (Iacuera, Iacuere, and so Josephus; [in 1 Macr. iv. 15, Alex. Iacuere, Sin. Iacueria] Jamminia, 1 Macr. iv. 15, v. 58, x. 69, xv. 40. [Jam-n.])

JAMNITES, THE (of "Iacuerei, of Iacuerei""). Two More. xii. 8, 9, 40. [JAM- NEL].

* JANGLING in 1 Tim. i. 6 (A. V., where "a vain jangling" represents the Greek pantomoralia, does not signify "wrangling," but "talking,"
JANNA

"Tell talk." This use of the word is well illustrated by a quotation from Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*, given in *Eastwood and Wright's Bible Word-Book*:

"Jangelympo is when a man spekith to moche bilbor folk, and clippith as a mille, and taketh no keep he saith."

B.

JAN’NA (Ijawr, Lachmi, and Tisch. *Iwawli*), son of Joseph, and father of Melch (in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii. 24). It is perhaps only a variation of Jeunnas or John.

A. C. H.

JAN’NES and JAM’BRES (Ijawrap, Iwabra), the names of two Egyptian magicians who opposed Moses. St. Paul alone of the sacred writers mentions them by name, and says no more than that they were opposed Moses, and that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii. 8, 9). It appears from the Jewish commentators that these names were held to be those of the magicians who opposed Moses and Aaron, spoken of in Exodus (or perhaps their leaders), of whom we there read that they first imitated the wonders wrought by Moses and Aaron, but, after-wards failing, confessed that the power of God was with those whom they had withstood (chap. vii. 11, where the Targum of Jonathan interprets these names, viii. 18, 19). With this St. Paul's words perfectly agree.

Jannes is written in some codices *Mammeha*; both forms, the latter being slightly varied, are found in the Jewish commentaries (אָנָּא, מַמְמֶה). The former appears to be the earlier form. We have been unable to discover an Egyptian name resembling Jamakes or Mammeha. The termination is like that of many Egyptian compounds ending with *ha* "the sun;" as Men-kau-ra, Menepthah (Manetho, IVth Dyn.).

Jannes appears to be a transcription of the Egyptian name *Aan*, probably pronounced Ian. It was the nomen of two kings: one of the Xth Dynasty, the father or ancestor of Sesostris I. of the Xth; the other, according to our arrangement, fourth or fifth king of the Xth Dyn., called by Manetho *Iawas* or *Iawis* (Jos.) or *Seraa* (Afr.). (See Hefner *Egyptico*, pp. 174, 175.) There is also a king bearing the name Anmu, whom we assign to the IId Dyn. (*Hor. Ep.*, p. 101). The signification of Aian is doubtful: the cognate word Aint means a valley or plain. The earlier king Aian may be assigned to the twenty-first century B.C. The latter one we hold to be probably the second predecessor of Joseph's Pharaoh. This shows that a name which may be reasonably supposed to be the original of James, was in use at or near the period of the sojourn in Egypt. The names of the ancient Egyptians were extremely numerous and very fluctuating in use; generally the most prevalent at any time were those of kings then reigning or not long dead.

Our result as to the name of James throws light upon a curious question raised by the supposition that St. Paul took the names of the magicians from a prevalent tradition of the Jews. This conjecture is as old as the time of Theodoret, who makes the supposed tradition oral. (Τα μεντο τουτων άνωκατα οιν εκ της θειας γαρφης μεμακην ο δειος άντοσκολοι, άλλα εκ της αγράφου των Ιουδαιων θεασακαλιν: ad loc.) This opinion would be little importance were it not for the circumstance that these names were known to the Greeks and Romans long before the early period to us to suppose that their information was derived from St. Paul's men-

TheCONN (see Phil. II. N. xxx. 1; Apul. *Apol.* p. 24)


It has therefore been generally supposed that St. Paul took these names from Jewish tradition. It seems, however, inconsistent with the character of an inspired record for a baseless or incorrect current tradition to have been adopted, it is therefore satisfactory to find there is good reason for thinking that the names were to be authentic. Whether James and Jamaces were mentioned in some long-lost book relating to the early history of the Israelites, or whether there were a verbal oral tradition respecting them, cannot now be determined. The former is the more probable supposition — if, as we believe, the names are correct — since oral tradition is rarely exact in minute particulars.

The conjecture of Majus (*Oxerv. Sacr.* ii. 42 f., ap. Wis. *Revelativ.* s. v.) that James and Jamaces were merely meaningless words put for lost proper names, is scarcely worth refuting. The words are not sufficiently similar to give a color to the idea, and there is no known instance of the kind in the Bible. The Rabbinists say that James and Jamaces were sons of Pharaoh, and among various forms of their names goe Johannes and Ambrosius. There was an apocryphal work called *Jannes and Manabres*, condemned by Pope Gelasius.

The Arabs mention the names of several magicians who opposed Moses; among them are none resembling Jamaces and Jamaces (Dr. Herbelot, art. *Moses Ben Amran*).

There are several dissertations on this subject (J. Grotius, *Diss. de Jann et Jamaces*, Hafn. 1677; J. G. Michaelis, *Id. Hal.*, 1747; Zendewd, *Id. Argent.* 1669; *Lightfoot*, *Sermon on Jannes and Jamaces*, etc. [*Fabriucius*, Col. *pseudopigr. Vid. Test.* i. 813-825].

There is a question of considerable interest as to these Egyptian magicians which we cannot here discuss: Is their temporary success attributable to pure imposture? The passages relating to them in the Bible would lead us to reply affirmatively, as we have already said, in speaking of another Egyptian magic. [*Egypt.*]

L. S. P.

JANOAH (גַּנָּה, *rest, quiet*; יָאָוּא; Alex. *Iawѹ*; *Jawaw*), a place apparently in the north of Galilee, or the "land of Naphtali" — one of the territories assigned by God to Naphtali, Gen. ii. 21, or the junction of Palestine (2 K. xv. 29). No trace of it appears elsewhere. By Eusebius and Jerome (*Onom. *'Ionan*"), and even by Ralidan (*Pal. p. 826*), it is confounded with Janohaw, in the centre of the country.

G.

JANOHAH (גַּנְוָה, i. e. Yancoah [with גנanh local, unto rest]; *Iawaw*, but in next verse *Mayaw*; Alex. *Iawaw*; Comp. *Iawavah*: *Jawaw*), a place on the boundary of Ephraim (possibly that between it and Manasses). It is named between Tannath-Shihok and Atharoth, the enumeration proceeding from west to east (Josh. xvi. 6, 7). Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, "Jawa") gives it as twelve miles east of Neapolis. A little less than that distance from Noblal, and about S. E. in direction, two miles from *Akrotheh*, is the village of *Yanun*, doubtless identical with the ancient Janohah. It seems to have been first visited in modern times by Van de Velde (Israel *Mag.*, 1582; also in *Eusebius*, *Onom. *'Ionan*"; see also *Bibl.* iii. 297). It is in a valley descending sharply eastward towards the Jordan. The modern village is
very small, but the ancient ruins "extensive and interesting." "I have not seen," says V., "any of Israel's ancient cities in such a condition: entire houses and walls exist, covered with immense heaps of earth." But there are also ruins on the hill N. E. of Tzurah, called Kirbet Y, which may be the site of the original place (Rob. p. 297).

JANUM (גַּנּוּמ), following the Keri of the Masorets, but in the original text, Ēthib, it is גַּנּוּמ. Janum [slumber]: [Iešāv] (Vat. -eša); Alex. Enc. (vii. 350). A town of Judah in the mountain district, apparently not far from Hebron, and named between Hezeph and Beth-aphidnah (Josh. xv. 54). It was not known to Eusebius and Jerome (see Onomast. [Janum]), nor does it appear to have been yet met with by any modern investigator.

G.

JAPETH (גַּפֵּת, יָפֵת): Japheth, one of the three sons of Noah. From the order in which their names invariably occur (Gen. v. 25, vi. 10) we should naturally infer that Japheth was the youngest, but we learn from ix. 24 that Ham held that position, and the precedence of Japheth before this one of the three is indicated in the order of the names in x. 2, 6. It has been generally supposed from x. 21 that Japheth was the eldest; but it should be observed that the word goel in that sentence is better connected with "brother," as in the Vulg. "fratris Japhet magnum." Not only does the usage of the Hebrew language disencumber the other construction, but the sense of the passage requires that the age of Shem rather than of Japheth should be there specified. We infer therefore that Japheth was the second son of Noah. The origin of the name is referred by the sacred writer to the root pathōh (פַּתָח), "to extend," as predictive of the wide spread of his descendants over the northern and western regions of the world (Gen. ix. 27). The name has also been referred to the root yaphōh (יָפָח), "to be fair," as indicative of the light complexion of the Japhetic races (Genicenus, Thes. p. 1138; Knobel, Vol. p. 22). From the resemblance of the name to the mythological Japetus, some writers have sought to establish a connection between them. Japetus was regarded by the Greeks as the ancestor of the human race. The descendants of Japheth occupied the "isles of the Gentiles" (Gen. x. 2, 3), i.e. the coast-lands of the Mediterranean Sea in Europe and Asia Minor, whence they spread northwards over the whole continent of Europe and a considerable portion of Asia. [JAVAN.]

W. L. B.

JAPHIA (גַּפְיָה, רָפָיָה; [fair, splendid]: Ḥayyā). Alex. Ḥayāyū; [Comp. Ḥayyāh; Alt. Ḥāyāh]: Japhia). The boundary of Zebulun ascended from Daberath to Japhia, and thence passed to Gab- ḫer (Josh. xix. 12). Daberath appears to be on the slopes of Mount Tabor, and Gab- ḫher may possibly be el-Mekhen, 2 miles N. of Nazareth. Six miles W. of the former, and 2 miles S. of Nazareth, is Ḥayyāh which is not unlikely to be identical with Japhia (Rob. ii. 343-41): at least

It should be remarked that Ḥayyāh. לַעַיָה, is the modern representative of both לַעַיָה, i.e. Joppa, and לַעַיָה, Japhia, two names originally very distinct.

This is much more probable than Chal. (Syrac. inscription in the bay of Akka — the suggestion of Eusebius (Onomast. [Japheth]), and endorsed by Reckend (Pol. p. 820) — an identification which is neither etymologically nor topographically admissible. Ḥayyāh may also be the same with the Ḥayyāh which was occupied by Josephus during his struggle with the Romans — "a very large village of Lower Galilee, fortified with walls and full of people." (Vit. 45; comp. 37, and B. J. li. 20, § 6), of whom 15,000 were killed and 2,120 taken prisoners by the Romans (B. J. lii. 7, § 31); though if Ḥayyāh be Japatata this can hardly be, as the two are more than ten miles apart, and he expressly says that they were neighbors to each other.

A tradition, which first appears in Sir John Maundeville, makes Ḥayyāh the birthplace of Zebedee and of the Apostles James and John, his sons. It is therefore called by the Latin monks of Nazareth "San Gianerno." See Quaresimus, Eliac Litio, ii. 843; and Early Trav., p. 180; Maundeville calls it the "castle of Saffrin." So too Von Harff, L. D. 1486: "Saffra, eym castel van welchen Alphens und Seledens geboren waren" (Pilgerfahrt, p. 195).

G.

JAPHIA (גַּפְיָה, רָפָיָה; [fair, splendid]: Ḥayyā). Alex. Ḥayā; [Japhia]. I. King of Lachish at the time of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites (Josh. x. 3); one of the five "kings of the Amorites" who entered into a confederacy against Joshua, and who were defeated at Beth-horon, and lost their lives at Makkedah. The king of Lachish is mentioned more than once in this narrative (ver. 5, 25), but his name occurs only as above.

2. Ḥayyāh, Ḥayyāh (Vat. in I Chr. xiv. 4o, Javan [so F.]): Alex. Ḥayāh, [Japhia]. (one of the sons of David, tenth of the fourteen born to him by his wives after his establishment in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v. 15; 1 Chr. iii. 7, xiv. 6). In the Hebrew form of this name there are no variations. The Pesetha has Naphia, and, in 1 Chr. iii., Nepheg: In the list given by Josephus (Ant. vi. 25, § 3), but it is not repeated: It is possible that Ḥayyāh may be from Ḥayyāh or it may be Ḥayyān. There do not appear to be any traditions concerning Japhia. The genealogy is given under MAJIA, vol. i. p. 560.

G.

JAPHLET (גַּפְלֵט, [whom God delivers]: Ḥayyālāṯ; [Vat. Ḥalūn, Ḥiṭālāṯ]: Alex. Ḥayālāṯ; [Japhlet]. A descendant of Asher through Beriah, his youngest son; named as the father of three Bene-Japhlet (1 Chr. vii. 32, 33).

JAPHLETI (גַּפְלֵט, [whom God delivers]: Ḥayyālāṯ; [Vat. Ḥalūn, Ḥiṭālāṯ]; Alex. Ḥayālāṯ; [Japhlet]. The "boundary of the Japhleti" is one of the landmarks on the south boundary-line of Pharnaka (Josh. vii. 3), west of Beth-horon the lower, and between it and Maroth. Who is the "Japhleti" was who is thus perpetuated we cannot ascertain. Possibly the name preserves the memory of some ancient tribe who at a remote age dwelt on these hills, just as the former presence of other tribes in the neighborhood may be inferred from the names of Zemaraini, Ophra (the Ophniite), Ephraim-Ammon, and others [BENJAMIN, p. 277, note h]. We can hardly suppose any connection with JAPHEL of the remote Asher. No trace of the name has yet been discovered in the district.

G.

JAPHO (גַּפוּה, [beauty]: Ḥayyāh). Joppa.
JARAH This word occurs in the A. V. but once, Josh. xix. 16. It is the accurate representation of the Hebrew word which on its other occurrences is rendered in the better known form of JOPPA (2 Chr. ii. 16; Ezra iii. 7; Jon. i. 3). In its modern garb it is Yifīt (ילף), which is also the Arabic name of Japhia, a very different word in Hebrew. [JOPPA; JOPPE.]

JARAH (יהָרָה), and in some MSS. יַרְאָה [honey]: 'ilād: Jorio, a man among the descendants of Saul; son of Micaiah, and great-grandson of Meribbaal, or Mephibosheth (1 Chr. xix. 42, comp. 40). In the parallel list of ch. viii. the name is materially altered to JEHODAH.

JAREB (גָּרֶב) [an adversary, hostlile]: 'iaprēb, as if יַרְבִּ, in both Hos. v. 13 and x. 6; a word, though Theodoret gives 'iaprēb in the former passage, and 'iaprēa in the latter (and Comp. in x. 6 has 'iaprēb); and Jerome has Jarib for the Greek equivalent of the LXX.) is either to be explained as the proper name of a country or person, as a noun in apposition, or as a verb from a root יָרִב, rub, "to contend, plead." All these senses are represented in the A. V. and the marginal read- ings, and, as has been not uncommonly the case, the least preferable has been inserted in the text. Had Jareb been the proper name of the king of Assyria, as it would be if this rendering were correct, the word preceding יָרִב, melec, "king") would have required the article. R. D. Kimchi saw this difficulty, and therefore explained Jareb as the name of some city of Assyria, or as another name of the country itself. The Syriac gives יָרְבִּ, yibrīb, as a name of a country, which is applied by Ephrem Syrus to Egypt, reference being made to Hoshea king of Israel, who had sent to the king of Egypt for assistance in his conspiracy against Shalmanezer (2 K. xviii. 4). So also the 'iaprēb or 'iaprēa of Theodoret is Egypt. The clause in which it occurs is supposed by many to refer to Judah, in order to make the parallelism complete; and with this in view Jarbi interprets it of Ahaz, who sent to Tithalth-Pleser (2 K. xvi. 8) to aid him against the combined forces of Syria and Israel. But there is no reason to suppose that the two clauses do not both refer to Ephraim, and the allusion would then be, as explained by Jerome, to Jel, who was subsidized by Menahem (2 K. xv. 10), and Judah would be indirectly included. The rendering of the Vulgate, "avenger" ("ad reorem utorem"), which follows Synagmaticus, as well as those of Aquila (סינאゲרנא) and Theodotion, "judge," are justified by Jerome from a reference to Jerubbaal, the name of Gideon, which he renders "uliscatur se Baal," or "judicet eum Baal," "let Baal avenge himself," or "let Baal judge him." The Targumist evidently looked upon it as a verb, the apecoated future Hiphil of יָרִב, rub, and translated the clause, "and sent to the king that he might come to avenge them." If it be a Hebrew word, it is most probably a noun formed from the above-mentioned root, like יָרִיב, yibrīb (Is. xli. 25; Ps. xxxv. 1), and is applied to the land of Assyria, or to its king, not in the sense in which it is understood in the Targum, but as indicating their determined hostility to Israel, and their general aggressive character. Cocceius had this idea before him when he translated it "rex adversarius." Michaelis (Synag. ad Lex. Hebr.), dissatisfied with the usual explanations, looked for the true meaning of Jareb in the Syriac root יָרְבִּ, treb, "to be great," and for "king Jarel" substituted "the great king," a title frequently applied to the kings of Assyria. If it were the proper name of a place, he says it would denote that of a castle or palace in which the kings of Assyria resided. But of this there can be no proof, the name has not descended to us, and it is better to take it in a symbolic sense as indicating the hostile character of Assyria. That it is rather to be applied to the country than to the king may be inferred from its standing in conjunction with Assur. Such is the opinion of Fürst (Itinere, s. v.), who illustrates the symbolic usage by a comparison with Rahab as applied to Egypt. At the same time he hazards a conjecture that it may have been an old Assyrian word, adopted into the Hebrew language, and so modified as to express an intelligible idea, while retaining something of its original form. Hitzig (die 12 M. Prop.) goes further, and finds in a mixed dialect, akin to the Assyrian, a verb יבשון, which denotes "struggle or fight," and ייבש, the Ethiopic for "a hero or bold warrior;" but it would be desirable to have more evidence on the point.

Two mystical interpretations, alluded to by Jerome as current among commentators in his time, are remarkable for the singularly opposite conclusions at which they arrived; the one referring the word to the Devil, the other to Christ. Rivetts (quoted by Glassius, Philol. Sacra, iv. tr. 3) was of opinion that the title Jareb or "avenger" was assumed by the powerful king of Assyria, as that of "Defender of the Faith" by our own monarchs.

W. A. W

JARED (גָּרֵד [descent, low ground], i. e. Jered, as the name is given in A. V. of Chr., but in pause יַרְד, from which the present form may have been derived, though more probably from the Vulgate: יָרְד, Alex. also יָרְד and [Lachm.] יָרְד [Tisch. יָרְד]: Joseph. יָרְד: Jareed), one of the antifilipian patriarchs, the fifth from Adam; son of Mahalaleel, and father of Enoch (Gen. v. 15, 16, 18, 19, 20; Luke iii. 37). In the list of Chronicles the name is given in the A. V. [as] Jered.

JARESFATH (גָּרֶסֶף [whom Jehovah nourishes]): Iarsafa: [Vat. tarapama: Jersio], a Benjamite, one of the Bene-Jeroham [sons of J.]; a chief man of his tribe, but of whom nothing is recorded (1 Chr. viii. 37).

JARHIA (גָּרְהִיא) [see at end of the art.]: Yarephai: [Comp. 'iaprēb: Abd. 'iaprād: Jeroa], the Egyptian servant of Sheshan, about the time of Eli, to whom his master gave his daughter and heir in marriage, and who thus became the founder of a chief house of the Jerneumelites, which continued at least to the time of King Hezekiah, and

4 As an instance of the contrary, see נִשְׁפֹּד for שפּוֹד.

5 In another place he gives "Jarib: יָדִיעָדיס vel uliscæus" (de Nom. Heb.)
from which sprung several illustrious persons such as Zalad in the reign of David, and Azariah in the reign of Josiah (1 Chr. ii. 31 ff.). [Azariah 5: Zara]. It is a matter of somewhat curious inquiry what was the name of Jarah's wife. In ver. 31 we read "the children of Shezban, Abiah," and in ver. 34, "Shezban and his daughter Attai." In ver. 35, Shezban's daughter "lived with Attai," whose grandson was Zalad; and in ch. xi. 41, "Zalad the son of Abiah." Hence some have imagined that Jarah in his marriage with Shezban's daughter had the name of Abiah (interpreted as a "brother-to-me") given him by Shezban, to signify his adoption into Israel. Others, that Abiah and Attai are merely clerical variations of the same name. Others, that Abiah was a son of Shezban, born after the marriage of his daughter. But the view which the A. V. adopts, as appears by their rendering [22 22] in ver. 31, the children of Shezban, instead of sons, is undoubtedly the right one; namely, that Abiah is the name of Shezban's daughter. Her descendants were called after her, just as Josiah and Ahilash, and Asahel, were always called "the sons of Zeruiah," and as Abigail stands at the head of Amasa's pedigree, 1 Chr. ii. 17. It may be noticed as an undoubted coincidence that Jarah the Egyptian was living with Shezban, a Jerahmeelite, and that the Jerahmeelites had their possessions on the side of Judah nearest to Egypt, 1 Sam. xxii. 10; comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 20, 21; Josh. xv. 21; 1 Chr. iv. 18. [Jeremiah; Judith.] The etymology of Jarah's name is quite unknown (Gen. Thes.; First, Concord., etc. [in his Wüster, Egyptian]; Burrington's General; Beeston, General; H giving every day, 198-203). It is the specification of the boundaries of Issachar, no mention is made of Jarah (see Josh. xix. 17-23), but a Remath is mentioned there (ver. 21); and in the duplicate list of Levitical cities (1 Chr. vi. 73) Ramath occupies the place of Jarash. The two names are modifications of the same root, and might without difficulty be interchanged. This Jarash does not appear to have been yet identified. [Remath.]

JAROH [i. aor. Theme]. "The"; Alex. Alexi; [comp, "Igap;", Jarash], a chief man of the tribe of Gad (1 Chr. v. 14).

JASAEEL [jassa-lay], [Alex. Alexi; Jasa:--Jashen], a sone of David's guard in 2 Sam. xxiii. 32. In the Hebrew, as accepted by the Masorets, the words have no necessary connection with the names preceding or following them; but in the A. V. they are attached to the latter "of the sons of Jashen, Jonathan." The passage has every appearance of being imperfect, and accordingly, in the parallel list in Chronicles, it stands, "the sons of Hashen the Gibeonite (1 Chr. xi. 34). Kennicott has examined it at length (Disertation, pp. 188-203), and, on grounds which cannot here be stated, has shown good cause for believing that a name has escaped, and that the genuine text was, "of the Bene-Hashen, Gomi, Jonathan Jene-Shamah."

JRIB [i. aor. Theme]. "The,"; Alex. Alex; [comp, "Igap;", Jarash], a tribe of Gad. 1 Esdr. ix. 30. [Shelal]

JASHEN [i. aor. Theme]. "The,"; Alex. Alexi:--Jashen, Bene-Jashen — "sons of Jashen." — are named in the catalogue of the heroes of David's guard in 2 Sam. xxiii. 32. In the Hebrew, as accepted by the Masorets, the words have no necessary connection with the names preceding or following them; but in the A. V. they are attached to the latter — "of the sons of Jashen, Jonathan." The passage has every appearance of being imperfect, and accordingly, in the parallel list in Chronicles, it stands, "the sons of Hashen the Gibeonite (1 Chr. xi. 34). Kennicott has examined it at length (Disertation, pp. 188-203), and, on grounds which cannot here be stated, has shown good cause for believing that a name has escaped, and that the genuine text was, "of the Bene-Hashen, Gomi, Jonathan Jene-Shamah."

a * This design of the translators is not certain; for the A. V. often renders [22 22] "children," where it should be "sons."
JA\'SHER, BOOK OF

in the list given by Jerome in his Questions Hebraicæ, Jashen and Jonathan are both omitted.

JA\'SHER, BOOK OF (נשְׂרִי יאשׁר), or, as the margin of the A. V. gives it, the book of the upright, a record alluded to in two passages only of the O. T. (Josh. x. 13, and 2 Sam. i. 18), and consequently the subject of much dispute. The former passage is omitted in the LXX, while in the latter the expression is rendered βιβλιον του ειρηνων: the Vulgate has liber iustitiae in both instances. The Peshito Syriac in Josh. has "the book of praises or hymns," reading יאשׁר for יאשׁר, and a similar transposition will account for the rendering of the same version in Sam., the "book of Ashir." The Targum interprets it "the book of the law," and this is followed by Jarchi, who, as the passage alluded to in Joshua, the prophecy of Jacob with regard to the future greatness of Ephraim (Gen. xliii. 19), which was fulfilled when the sun stood still at Joshua's bidding. The same Rabbi, in his commentary on Samuel, refers to Genesis as "the book of the upright, Abrah- am, Isaac, and Jacob," to explain the allusion to the book of Jasher; and Jerome, while discussing the etymology of "Israel," which he interprets as "rectus Dei," incidentally mentions the fact that Genesis was called "the book of the just" (litter Genesis appelatur eidoth, id est, justorum), from its containing the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (Comm. in Jes. xiv. 2). The Talmudists attribute this tradition to R. Johanan. R. Eliezer thought that by the book of Jasher was signified the book of Deuteronomy, from the expressions in Deut. vii. 7, xxviii. 7, the latter being quoted in proof of the skill of the Hebrews in archery. In the opinion of R. Samuel ben Nachman, the book of Judges was alluded to as the book of Jasher (Aboda Zara, c. ii.); and that it was the book of the twelve minor prophets was held by some Hebrew writers, quoted without name by Sixtus Senensis (Bibl. Sentic. lib. ii.). R. Levi ben Gershon recognizes, though he does not follow, the tradition given by Jarchi, while Kimchi and Abirahamel adopt the rendering of the Targum. This diversity of opinions proves, if it prove nothing more, that no book was known to have survived which could by any claim to the title of the book of Jasher.

Josephus, in relating the miracle narrated in Joshua x., appeals for confirmation of his account to certain documents deposited in the Temple (Ant. v. 1, § 17), and his words are supposed to contain a covert allusion to the book of Jasher as the source of his authority. But in his treatise against Apion (lib. i.) he says the Jews did not possess any book of Joshua, discordant and contradictory, but twenty-two only; from which Alück concludes that the books of Scripture were the sacred books hinted at in the former passage, while Masius understood by the same the Annals which were written by the prophets or by the royal scribes. Theodoret (Quast. xiv. in Jesuam Nota) explains the words in Josh. ii. 13, which he quotes as το του Βιβλίου του εἰρήνου (prob. an error for τον Βιβλίου, as he has in Quast. iv. 5, 2 Reg.), as referring to the ancient record from which the compiler of the book of Joshua derived the materials of his history, and applies the passage in 2 Sam. ii. 18 to prove that other documents, written by the prophets, were made use of in the composition of the historical books. Jerome, or rather the author of the Questions Hebraicæ, understood by the book of Jasher the books of Samuel themselves, insomuch as they contained the history of the last prophets; Samuel, Joshua, and Nathan. Another opinion, quoted by Sixtus Senensis, but on no authority, that it was the book of eternal procrastination, is scarcely worth more than the bare mention.

That the book of Jasher was one of the writings which perished in the Captivity was held by R. Levi ben Gershon, though he gives the traditional explanation above mentioned. His opinion has been adopted by Junius, Hottinger (Theor. Phil. ii. 2, § 2), and many other modern writers (Wolfio Bibl. Heb. ii. 223). What the nature of the book may have been can only be inferred from the two passages in which it is mentioned and their context, and, this being the case, there is clearly wide room for conjecture. The theory of Masius (quoted by Abicht) was, that in ancient times whatever was worthy of being recorded for the instruction of posterity, was written in the form of Annals by learned men, and that among those Annals or records was the book of Jasher, so called from the trustworthiness and methodical arrangement of the narrative, or because it contained the relation of the deeds of the people of Israel, who are elsewhere spoken of under the symbolic name Jeshurun. Of the later hypothesis First approves (Histoire, s. v.). Sanetus (Comm. ad 2 Reg. i.) conjectured that it was a collection of pious hymns written by different authors and sung on various occasions, and that from this collection the Psalter was compiled. That it was written in verse may reasonably be inferred from the only specimen extant, which exhibit unmistakable signs of metrical rhythm, but that it took its name from this circumstance is not supported by etymology. Lowth, indeed (Pref. pp. 306, 307), imagined that it was a collection of national songs, so called because it probably commenced with יאשׁר יאשׁר, וזו יישר, "then sang," etc., like the song of Moses in Ex. xvi. 1; his view of the question was that of the Syrian and Arabic translators, and was adopted by Herder. But, granting that the form of the book was poetical, a difficulty still remains as to its subject. That the book of Jasher contained the deeds of national heroes of all ages enshrined in verse, among which David's lament over Saul and Jonathan had an appropriate place, was the opinion of Calovius. A fragment of a similar kind is thought to appear in Num. xxxi. 14. Gesenius conjectured that it was an anthology of ancient songs, which acquired its name, "the book of the just or upright," from being written in praise of upright men. He quotes but does not approve, the theory of Ilglen that like the Hamasa of the Arabs, it celebrated the achievements of illustrious warriors, and from this derived the title of "the book of valor." But the idea of warriorlike valor is entirely foreign to the root יישר, Dupin contended from 2 Sam. i. 18, that the contents of the book were of a military nature; but Montanus, regarding rather the etymology, considered it a collection of political and moral precepts. Abicht, taking the lament of David as a sample of the whole, maintained that the fragment

a Dr. Donaldson had overlooked this passage when he wrote that his own analysis of the word "Israel" had hitherto escaped the notice of all commentators (Jashar, p. 23).
quoted in the book of Joshua was part of a funeral ode composed upon the death of that hero, and narrating his achievements. At the same time he does not conceive it necessary to suppose that one book only was composed to this event. It must be admitted, however, that there is very slight ground for any conclusion beyond that which affords the form, and that nothing can be confidently asserted with regard to the contents.

But, though conjecture might almost be thought to have exhausted itself on a subject so barren of premises, a scholar of our own day has not despaired of being able, not only to decide what the book of Jasher was in itself, but to reconstruct it from the fragments which, according to his theory, it traces throughout the several books of the O. T. In the preface to his Jashar, or Frag menta Arcvetigen Carminum Hebraicarum in Masoretico Versione Testamenti textu passim tesserunt, Dr. Donnaldson advances a scheme for the restoration of this ancient record, in accordance with his own idea of its scope and contents. Assuming that, during the tranquil and prosperous reign of Solomon, an unwonted impulse was given to Hebrew literature, and that the worshippers of Jehovah were desirous of possessing something on which their faith might rest, the book of "Jashar," or "uprightness," he asserts, was written, or rather compiled, to meet this want. Its object was to show that in the beginning man was upright, but had by carnal wisdom forsaken the spiritual law; that the Israelites had been chosen to preserve and transmit this law of uprightness; that David had been made king for his religious integrity, leaving the kingdom to his son Solomon, in whose reign, after the dedication of the Temple, the prosperity of the chosen people reached its culminating point. The compiler of the book was probably Nathan the prophet, asssisted perhaps by Gad the seer. It was thus "the first offspring of the prophetic school, and ministered spiritual food to the greater prophets."

Rejecting, therefore, the authority of the Masoretic text, as founded entirely on tradition, and adhering to his own theory of the origin and subject of the book of Jasher, Dr. Donnaldson proceeds to show that it contains the religious marrow of Holy Scripture. In such a case, of course, absolute proof is not to be looked for, and it would be impossible here to discuss what measure of probability should be assigned to a scheme elaborated with considerable ingenuity. Whatever ancient fragments in the sacred books of the Hebrews exhibit the nature of uprightness, celebrate the victories of the true Israelites, predict their prosperity, or promise future blessedness, have, according to this theory, a claim to be considered among the relics of the book of Jasher. Following such a principle of selection, the fragments fall into seven groups. The first part, the object of which is to show that man was created upright (יהוה, yishbhu), but fell into sin by carnal wisdom, contains two fragments. An Elohistic and a Jehovistic, both poetical, the latter being the more full.

The first of these includes Gen. i. 27, 28, vi. 1, 2, 4, 5, vii. 21, vi. 6, 3; the other is made up of Gen. ii. 7-9, 15-18, 25, iii. 1-19, 21, 23, 24. The second part, consisting of four fragments, shows how the descendants of Abraham, as being upright (יהוה, yeshurim), were adopted by God, while the neighboring nations were rejected. Fragment (1) Gen. ix. 18-31; fragment (2) Gen. iv. 2-8 8-16; fragment (3) Gen. xvi. 1-4, 15, 16, xvii. 9-16, 18-26, xxi. 1-14, 20, 21; fragment (4) Gen. xxv. 29-34, xxvii. 1-10, 14, 19-20, 25-40, iv. 18, 19, xxvii. 34, xxxvi. 2, iv. 25, 24, xxxvi. 8, xviii. 19, 21, 26, xxix. 1, xxvii. 24, 26, xxxv. 22-26, xxxiv. 25-30, xxxv. 9-14, 15, xxiii. 31. In the third part is related under the figure of the deluge how the Israelites escaped from Egypt, wandered forty years in the wilderness, and finally, in the reign of Solomon, built a temple to Jehovah. The passages in which this is found are Gen. v. 5-14, vii. 6, 11, 12, viii. 6, 7, 8, 12, v. 29, viii. 4; 1 K. vi., viii. 43; Is. xv. 18; and Judges, chapters of the fourth part contain the divine laws to be observed by the upright people, and are found (1) Dent. v. 1-22; (2) vi. 1-5; Lev. xix. 18; Dent. x. 12-21, xi. 1, 5-7, 9; (3) viii. 1-3, vi. 6-18, 20-25. The blessings of the upright and their admonitions are the subject of the fifth part, which contains the songs of Jacob (Gen. xxvi.), Isakamum (Num. xxii., xxiii.), and Moses (Dent. xxxii., xxxiii.). The wonderful victories and deliverances of Israel are celebrated in the sixth part, in the triumphal songs of Moses and Miriam (Ex. xv. 1-19), of Joshua (Josh. x. 12-13), and of Deborah (Judg. v. 1-20). The seventh is a collection of various hymns composed in the reigns of David and Solomon, and contains David's song of triumph over Goliath (1 Sam. ii. 1-10); his lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 19-27), and for Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33, 34); his psalm of Thanksgiving (Ps. xvii., 2 Sam. xxii.); his triumphal ode on the conquest of the Edonites (Ps. l.), and his prophecy of Messiah's kingdom (2 Sam. xxii. 1-7), together with Solomon's epithalamium (Ps. lxxxv.), and the hymn sung at the dedication of the Temple (Ps. lxxviii.).

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

There are also extant, under the title of "the Book of Jasher," two cabalistical works, written in A. D. 1394 by R. Shabbatai (a cabalistic copy in the Madrid Ms. exists in the Vatican Library; the other, by R. Thams, treats of the laws of the Jews in eighteen chapters, and was printed in Italy in 1544, and at Cracow in 1586. An anonymous work, printed at Venic and Prague in 1625, and said to have made its first appearance at Naples, was believed by some Jews to be the record alluded to in Joshua. It contains the historical narratives of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, with many fabulous additions. R. Jacob translated it into German, and printed his version at Frankfurt on the Maine in 1674. It is said in the preface to the 1st ed. to have been thus covered at the destruction of Jerusalem, by Sidrus, one of the officers of Titus, who, while searching a house for the purpose of plunder, found in a secret chamber a vessel containing the books of the Law, the Prophets, and Hagiographa, with many others, which a vengeful man was reading. Sidrus took the old man under his protection and built for him.

* The song in 1 Sam. ii. 1-10 is not David's, but Hannah's thanksgiving song for the birth of Samuel.
A house at Seville, where the books were safely deposited. The book in question is probably the production of a Spanish Jew of the 13th century (Abicht, De Libro Recto, in Thes. Nov. Theol.-Phil. i. 525-534). A clumsy forgery in English, which first appeared in 1751 under the title of "The Book of Jasher," deserves notice solely for the unmerited success with which it was pushed upon the public. It professed to be a translation from the Hebrew into English by Alcuin of Britain, who discovered it in Persia during his pilgrimage. It was reprinted at Bristol in 1827, and was again published in 1833, in each case accompanied by a fictitious explanatory note by Wickliffe. [On this forgery, see Horne's Introduction, iv. 741 ff., 10th ed.—A.]

JASHOBEAM (יָשֹּבֶא) [the people return]]; 'ישבֶא, [Theo.; 'יָשֹּב] (Vat. שְּבָא); Alex. ישבֶא, ישָּבַי, ישָּבַי; Jeshuam, [Jeshobam]. Possibly one and the same follower of David, bearing this name, is described as a Hachmonite (1 Chr. xi. 11), a Korhite (1 Chr. xii. 8), and son of Zabdiel (1 Chr. xxvii. 2). He came to David at Ziklag. His distinguishing exploit was that he slew 300 (or 800, 2 Sam. xxii. 8) men at one time. He is named first among the chief of the mighty men of David (1 Chr. xi. 11); and he was set over the first of the twelve monthly courses of 24,000 men who served the king (xxvii. 2). In 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, his name seems to be erroneously transcribed, יָשֹּב (A. V. "that sat in the seat"), instead of ישָּבַי; and in the same place "Adino the Ezrite" is possibly a corruption either of יָשֹּב or ישָּבַי, "he set up his spear" (1 Chr. xi. 11), or, as Gesenius conjectures, of ישָּבַי or ישָּבַי, which he translated, "he shook it, even his spear." [EZRITE.] W. T. B.

JASHUB (יָשֹּב, [he who returns]); in the Cena of 1 Chr. vii. 1 it is יָשֹּב; in the Samaritan Cod. of Num. xxvi. יָשֹּב; [Vat. in 1 Chr. יָשֹּב;] Jashub. 1. The third son of Issachar, and founder of the family of the Jashubites (Num. xxvi. 24; 1 Chr. vii. 1). In the list of Gen. xlvii. the name is given (possibly in a contracted or erroneous form, Gen. Thee. p. 583) as Joub; but in the Samaritan Codex—followed by the I. X. X. — Jashub. 2. [Vat. Jăshuam, F.A. Jăshuam, by union with the preceding word.] One of the sons of Bani, a lyman in the time of Ezra, who had to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 29). In Ezra's name is Jăshu'am. JASHUBI-LEHEM (יָשֹּבִי-לֶהֶם) in some copies [בְּיָשֹּבִי לֶהֶם] (see below); [kai ἀνέστησον αὐτῶν, in both MSS.; et qui reversi sunt in Lehem], a person or a place named among the descendants of Shelah, the son of Judah by Bath-sheba the Canaanite (1 Chr. iv. 22). The name does not occur again. It is probably a place, and we should infer from its connection with Maresha and Chezib— if Chezib be Cæzib or Achzib—that they lay on the western side of the tribe, in or near the Shefelah. The Jewish explanations of this and the following verse are very curious. They may be seen in Jerome's Quest. Hebr. on this passage, and, in a slightly different form, in the Targum on the Chronicles (ed. Wilkins, 29, 30). The mention of Moxb gives the key to the whole. Chezeba is Elimekech; Josah and Saraph are Mahlon and Chilion, who "had the dominion in Moxb" from marrying the two Moabitic damsels: Jashubi-Lehem is Naomi and Ruth, who returned (Jushub, from בָּשָׁב, "to return") to bread, or to Beth-lehem, after the famine: and the "ancient words" point to the book of Ruth as the source of the whole.

JASHUBITES, THE (יָשֹּבִיהָ) [patronym.]; Samaritan, יָשֹּבִיהָ; & 'iραεβί [Vat. -βεί]; Familia Jashubitana. The family founded by Jashub the son of Issachar (Num. xxvi. 24). [Jashub, i.]

JASIEL (יַסִּיאָל) [God creates]; 'יסיּאל; [Vat. Eσισβα; F.A. Εσισβα;] Alex. Εσισβα: Jisiel, the last named on the list of the heroes in 1 Chr. xi. 47. He is described as the Mesorah. Nothing more is known of him.

JASON (Ἰασών), a common Greek name which was frequently adopted by Hellenizing Jews as the equivalent of Jesus, Joshua (Ἰωσίου; comp. Joseph. Ant. xii. 5, § 1,) probably with some reference to its supposed connection with Ἰωσία (i.e. the Heider). A parallel change occurs in Alcimus (Elastim); while Nicodemos, Josithen, Memochus, etc., were direct translations of Hebrew names.

1. JASON THE SON OF ELEAZAR (cf. Esclus. i. 27, Ἰσίων ἱππότης Σαμαρίτης Ἰερουσαλημ; Cod. A.) was one of the commissioners sent by Judas Maccabees to conclude a treaty with the Romans b.c. 161 (1 Macc. viii. 17; Joseph. Ant. xii. 10, § 6).

2. JASON THE FATHER OF ANTIPATER, who was an envoy to Rome at a later period (1 Macc. xii. 16, vxx. 22), is probably the same person as No. 1.

3. JASON OF TYRENE, a Jewish historian who wrote "in five books," a history of the Jewish war of liberation, which supplied the chief materials for the second book of the Maccabees. (2 MACCABEES.) His name and the place of his residence seem to mark Jason as a Hellenistic Jew, and it is probable on internal grounds that his history was written in Greek. This narrative included the wars under Antiochus Epipator, and he must therefore have written after n. c. 192; but nothing more is known of him than that he can be gathered from 2 Macc. ii. 19-23.

4. [In 2 Macc. iv. 13, Alex. Εασών. JASON THE HIGH-PRIEST, the second son of Simon II., and brother of Onias III., who succeeded in obtaining the high-priesthood from Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 175 n. c.) to the exclusion of his elder brother (2 Macc. iv. 7-26; 4 Macc. iv. 17; Joseph. Ant. xii. 5, § 1). He labored in every way to introduce Greek customs among the people, and that with great success (2 Macc. iv. Joseph, l. c.). In order to give permanence to the changes which he designed, he established a gymnasium at Jerusalem, and even the priests neglected their sacred functions to take part in the games (2 Macc. iv. 9, 14), and at

a Jason and Jesus occur together as Jewish names in the history of Aristobus (Hady, De Text. p. vii.)
JASPER.
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With Mes Silas, it seems 1 to the 1 "onyx" to the LXX. 18). It is often used in the Book of Exodus (xxviii. 13), and the first of the twelve used in the foundations of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 19): the difference in the order seems to show that no emblematical importance was attached to that feature. It was the stone employed in the superstructure (οὐδόμαςις) of the wall of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 18). It further appears among the stones which adorned the king of Tyre (Ez. xxviii. 13). Lastly, it is the emblematical image of the glory of the Divine Being (Rev. iv. 3). The characteristics of the stone, as far as they are specified in Scripture (Rev. xxi. 11), are that it was "most precious," and "like crystal" (κρυσταλλίαςωv; not exactly "clear as crystal," as in A. V., but of a crystal hue; the term is applied to it in this sense by Dioscorides (v. 160; λίθος ἰδιός, ὁ μῖν τίς ἦσσα σμαιρετής, ὁ δὲ κρυστάλλιαςωv;): we may also infer from Rev. iv. 3, that it was a stone of brilliant and transparent light. The stone which we name "jasper" does not accord with this description: it is an opaque species of quartz, of a red, yellow, green, or mixed brownish-yellow hue, sometimes striped and sometimes spotted, in no respect presenting the characteristics of the crystal. The only feature in the stone which at all agrees with the Scriptural account is that it admits of a high polish, and this appears to be indicated in the Hebrew name. With regard to the Hebrew name, LXX. and Vulg. render it by the "onyx" and "rubyl" respectively, and represent the jasper by the term γαθόβαν (A. V. "emerald"). There can be no doubt that the diamond would more adequately answer to the description in the book of Revelation, and unless that beautiful and valuable stone is represented by the Hebrew γαθόβαν and the Greek δαμάς, it does not appear at all in the passages quoted; for the term rendered "diamond" in Ex. xxviii. 18 really refers to the emerald. We are disposed to think, therefore, that though the names γαθόβαν, δαμάς, and jasper are identical,
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side of the hill lay the under stone of a very large all press — an undeniable evidence of the existence of olive-trees of old, where neither trace of tree or shrub remains. In several places we could perceive the ancient terracing in the hills, and there were many wells, all run dry, and partially choked with rubbish. The eastern face of the knoll consisted chiefly of natural caves once used as dwellings, enlarged, and with outer extensions of adobe. The only modern building in sight was a little Wady, or tomb of a Moslem saint, on the crest of the hill” (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 388 ff., 2d ed.).

JAVAN (יוֹנָן: [in Is. and Ez., Ἰα- λάδι; in Dan. and Zech.] Ἑλληνείς: Greci or Greci· J a· v· a· ν· o· v). 1. A son of Japheth, and the father of Shishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim (Gen. xx. 4). The name appears in Is. xvi. 19, where it is coupled with Tarshish, Pulp, and Lud, and more particularly with Tultural and the “isles afar off,” as representatives of the Gentile world: again in Ez. xxvii. 13, where it is coupled with Tubal and Meshech, as carrying on considerable commerce with the Tyrians, who imported from these countries slaves and brazen weapons: in Dan. ii. 21, xi. 2, in reference to the Macedonian empire; and lastly in Zech. ix. 13, in reference to the Graeco-Syrian empire. From a comparison of these various passages there can be no doubt that Javan was regarded as the representative of the Greek race: the similarity of the name to that branch of the Hellenic family with which the Orientals were best acquainted, namely, the Ionians, particularly in the older form in which their name appears (Ἰωάνν) is too close to be regarded as accidental: and the occurrence of the name in the cuneiform inscriptions of the time of Sargon (about n. c. 709), in the form of ῾Ιωάνν or ῾Ιωνν, as descriptive of the isle of Cyprus, where the Assyrians first came in contact with the power of the Greeks, further shows that its use was not confined to the Hebrews, but was widely spread throughout the East. The name was probably introduced into Asia by the Phoenicians, to whom the Ionians were naturally better known than any other of the Hellenic races, on account of their commercial activity and the high prosperity of their towns on the western coast of Asia Minor. The extension of the name westward to the general body of the Greeks, as they became known to the Hebrews through the Phoenicians, was but a natural process, analogous to that which we have already had to notice in the case of Chittim. It can hardly be imagined that the early Hebrews themselves had any actual acquaintance with the Greeks: it is, however, worth mentioning as illustrative of the communication which existed between the Greeks and the East, that among the artists who contributed to the ornamentation of Esrahalbin’s palaces the names of several Greek artists appear in one of the inscriptions (Rawlinson’s Herod., i. 484). At a later period the Hebrews must have gained considerable knowledge of the Greeks through the Egyptians. Pammachemus (n. c. 664-610) employed Ionians and Carianis as mercenaries, and showed them so much favor that the war-caste of Egypt forsook him in a body: the Greeks were settled near Bulusatis, in a part of the country with which the Jews were familiar (Herod. ii. 154). The same policy was followed by the succeeding monarchs, especially Anaxias (571-529), who gave the Greeks Naucratia as a commercial emporium. It is tolerably certain that any information which the Hebrews acquired in relation to the Greeks must have been through the indirect means to which we have adverted: the Greeks themselves were very slightly acquainted with the eastern coast of Syria until the invasion of Alexander the Great. The earliest notices of Palestine occur in the works of Hecataeus (n. c. 549-486), who mentions only the towns Canytis and Car- dutys; the next are in Herodotus, who describes the country as Syria Palastina, and notices incidentally the towns Ascalon, Azotus, Ezelatana (Ezetanoe?), and Cydysis, the same as the Canytis of Hecataeus, probably Gaza. These towns were on the border of Egypt, with the exception of the uncertain Ezelatana: and it is therefore highly probable that no Greek had, down to this late period, travelled through Palestine.

2. [Rom. Vat. Alex. omit: Comp. Ἰωάνν]: Ἱωάνν; Ἱωάννα: Græcia.] A town in the southern part of Arabia (Yemen), whither the Phenicians traded (Ez. xxvii. 19): the connection with Uzal decides in favor of this place rather than Greece, as in the Vulg. The same place may be noticed in Joel iii. 6; the parallelism to the Sabæans in ver. 8, and the fact that the Phenicians bought instead of selling slaves to the Greeks (Ez. xxvii. 13), are in favor of this view.

W. L. B.

JAVAN, SONS OF (יוֹנָן יִשְׂרְאֵל; ᾿Ιωάνν ᾿Ισραήλ; ᾿Ιωᾶνν ῾Ισραήλ) in the A. V., “the Grecians,” and in the margin, “sons of the Grecians,” Joel iii. 6 (iv. 6 Heb.). That the Ionians or Greeks are meant in this passage of Joel, and not a place or tribe in Arabia (see JAVAN, 2), is the generally adopted view of scholars (Hitzig, Havernick, Ritschel, Delitzsch). According to this supposition, it is true, the Sidonians and Tyrians are said by Joel to sell their Jewish captives to the Greeks, and by Ezekiel (xxvii. 13), to purchase prisoners possibly among them Greek slaves, from the Greeks themselves. The one statement, however, does not exclude the other. The traffic of the Phenician slave-dealers, like that of modern slave-dealers, would consist almost inevitably of both the buying and selling of slaves. Greek female slaves were in great request among the oriental nations, especially the Persians (see Herod. iii. 134), and Tyre and Sidon were the ports to which they would naturally be brought in the prosecution of this trade. The Greeks loved liberty for themselves, but, especially in the anti-historic times to which Joel belonged, were not above enslaving and selling those of their own race for the sake of gain. On the other hand, it is notorious that the Greeks at all periods were accustomed to capture or buy men of other nations as slaves, either for their own use, or to sell them to foreigners. On the slave-trade of the Phenicians and the Greeks, see the statements of Dr. Pusey, Joel, p. 134 f.

The name of the Arabian Javan (Ez. xxvii. 19) had no doubt the same origin as the Ionian or Greek Javan. But what that origin was is not certain. Some conjecture that Javan in Arabia was originally a Greek colony which had gone...
JAVELIN

quite similarity enough to allow of the one being a corruption of the other, though the fact is not ascertainable.

JEBERECHIAH (גֵּרֶכְיָה), with the final 
father of a certain Zechariah, in the reign of Ahaz, 
mentioned Is. vii. 2. As this form occurs nowhere else, and both the LXX. and Vulgate have Bere-
chiah, it is probably only an accidental corruption.
Possibly a was in some copy by mistake attached to the preceding תֹּז, so as to make it plural, and thence was transferred to the following word, Bere-
chiah. Berechiah and Zechariah are both common names among the priests (Zech. i. 1). These are 
not the Zacharias and Barachias mentioned as father and son, Matt. xxvii. 55, as it is certain that 
Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, in the reign of Josiah, is the same name, but here, be of the same family; and if Berechiah was the father of the house, not of the individuals, the same person might be meant in Is. vii. 2 and Matt. xxvii.
35. It is singular that Josephus (B. J. iv. 5, § 4) mentions another Zacharias, son of Barchus, who was slain by the Jews in the Temple shortly before the last siege of Jerusalem began. (See Whiston's note, ad loc.)

A. C. H.

JEBUS (גָּבָע) [see infra:] JEBOUS: Jebus), one of the names of Jerusalem, the city of the Je-
bsites, also called Jerus. It occurs only twice: 
first in connection with the journey of the Levite 
and his unhappy encounter with Bethlehem to 
Gilead (Judg. xii. 9, 11); and secondly, in the 
narrative of the capture of the place by David in 1 
Ch. xi. 4, 5. In 2 Sam. v. 9-9 the name Jerusa-
lem is employed. By Gesenius (Thes. 189, בֶּהָד) 
and Furst (Hebrah. 477) Jebus is interpreted to 
mean a place dry or down-trodden like a thresh-
ing-floor; an interpretation which by Delitzsch (55) 
and Stanley (§ 0. p. 177) is taken to prove that 
Jebus must have been the south-western hill of 
the "dry rock" of the modern Zion, and "not the 
Mount Moriah, the city of Solomon, in whose centre 
rose the perennial spring." But in the great un-
certainty which attends these ancient names, this 
is, to say the least, very doubtful. Jebus was the 
city of the Jebusites. Either the name of the town 
is derived from the name of the tribe, or the reverse. 
If the former, then the interpretation just quoted falls to the ground. If the latter, then the origin 
of the name of Jesus is thrown back to the very 
beginning of the Canaanite race — so far at any 
rate as to make its connection with a Hebrew root 
extremely uncertain.

G.

* Jebus and Jerusalem need not be understood as interchangeable or coextensive names in 2 Sam. 
v. 6, but differing only as a part from the whole, like Zion and Jerusalem in Joel ii. 32 (iii. 5, Hebr.). 
For evidence that Jesus was the southwest hill, afterward called Mount Zion or the City of David, 
see Dr. Weckott's addition to Jerusalem (Amer.
ed.). It has seemed hitherto almost inadmissible that the Jebusites could have kept this aeropilo for so 
long a time, while the Hebrews dwelt almost under its shadow (Judg. i. 21). Recent excavations have 
thrown light on this singular fact, for the Jebusites placed their citadel on this very hill; for though 
Jebus appears at present almost on a level with some parts of the city, it is now proved beyond a ques-
JEBUSI

In that it was originally an isolated summit, picturesque as implied in the account of its capture by David. It was protected not only by the deep ravine of Hinnom on the south and west, and the Tyropoön on the east, but by a valley which ran from the Jaffa gate to the Tyropoön on the north side of the mount. This last valley has been laid bare, showing at different points a depth of 20 and 33 feet below the present surface, and in one instance a depth of nearly 80 feet below the brow of Zion. It is one spot a fragment of the ancient northern rampart of Zion was brought to light. "It was built close against the cliff, and though only rising to the top of the rock behind, it was yet 30 feet high toward the ravine in front." (Recent Researches in Jerusalem, reprinted from the British Quarterly Review, October, 1897, in the Theol. Eccle. c. 393; and Ordinance Survey of Jerusalem, p. 61, Lond. 1889). It is not surprising, therefore, that the subjugation of this stronghold should be reserved for the prowess of David, and be recorded as one of his greatest exploits (2 Sam. v. 6-8).

The occurrence of this name in the account of the Levite's homeward journey (Judg. xix. 10 ff.) suggests a remark or two on the local allusions which occur in the narrative. Jebus or Jerusalem is a short 2 hours from Bethlehem, and hence, the party leaving the latter place somewhat late in the afternoon (as appears more clearly from the Hebrew than in the A. V., see Judg. ix. 9, 11), they would be off against Jerusalem near the close of the day, as stated in ver. 11. Their journey lay along the west side of that city: and this may be a reason why it is spoken of as Jebus rather than Jerusalem. The servant proposed that they should remain here over night, as the time now left was barely sufficient to enable them to reach the next halting-place. But the Levite objected to this, and insisted that they should proceed further and lodge either in Gibeah or in Kiriath, an association of the places which implies that they were near each other and on the route of the travellers. One of these exists still under its ancient name Er-Ruma, and the other, such explorers as Robinson, Van de Velde, Porter, identify with Tell el-Ful: both of them on heights which overlook the road, nearly opposite each other, 2 or 3 hours further north from Jerusalem. According to the road they that as the Levite and his company drew near Gibeah "the sun went down upon them," in precise accordance with the time and the distance. Here occurred the terrible crime which stands almost without a parallel in Jewish history. Shiloh was the Levite's destination, and on the morrow, pursuing still further this northern road, he would come into a few hours to that seat of the Tabernacle, or "house of the Lord," as it is called, ver. 18.

JEBUSI (יְבֻשִּׁי; יבושי; [Tisch.; יבושי], Holmes, Bes; Alex. יבושי) Jevousis, [Jebus], the name employed by the interpreter for the inhabitants only in the account do not describing the landmarks and the towns of the allotment of Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16, 28). In the first and last place the explanatory words, "which is Jerusalem," are added. In the first, however, our translators have given it as "the Jebusites." A parallel to this mode of designating the town by its inhabitants is found in this very list in Zemaraim (xviii. 22), Avim (23), Ophni (24); and Japhletite (xvi. 3), etc.

G.

JEBUSITE, JEBUSITES, THE. Although these two forms are indiscriminately employed in the A. V., yet in the original the name, whether applied to individuals or to the nation, is never found in the plural; always singular. The usual form is יְבֻשִּׁי; but in a few places — namely, 2 Sam. v. 6, xxiv. 16, 18; 1 Chr. xxii. 18 only — it is יבושי. Without the article, יבושי, it occurs in 2 Sam. v. 8; 1 Chr. xi. 6; Zech. ix. 7.

In the two first of these the force is much increased by removing the article introduced in the A. V., and reading "and smiteh a Jebusite." We do not hear of a progenitor to the tribe, but the name which would have been his, had he existed, has attached itself to the city in which we meet with the Jebusites in historic times. [Jerms.] The LXX. give the name Ἰβουράζων: [In Judg. xix. 11, Ιβουράων, Βατ. -ςει; in Ezek. i. 1, Ιβουράων, Βατ. Αλεξ.-ετίς] Vulg. Jebusus. 1. According to the table in Genesis x., the "Jebusite" is the third son of Canaan. His place in the list is between Heth and the Amorites (Gen. x. 16; 1 Chr. i. 14), a position which the tribe maintained in later times (Num. xxiv. 20; Lev. xxv. 35, 36), and the same connection is traceable in the words of Ezekiel (xiii. 4, 45), who addresses Jerusalem as the fruit of the union of an Amorite with a Hittite. But in the formula by which the Promised Land is so often designated, the Jebusites are uniformly placed last, which may have arisen from their small number, or their quiet disposition. See Gen. xv. 21; Ex. iii. 8, 17, xiii. 5, xxiii. 39, xxxiii. 2, xxiv. 11; Deut. vii. 1, xx. 17; Josh. iii. 10, ix. 4, xii. 8, xxiv. 11; 1 K. ix. 20; 2 Chr. vii. 7; Ezek. i. 1; Neh. ix. 3.

2. Our first glimpse of the actual people in the invaluable report of the spies — "the Hittite, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite dwell in the mountain" (Num. xiii. 29). This was forty years before the entrance into Palestine, but no change in their habitat had been made in the interval; for when Joshua organized his rising against Jehovah he sent amongst others "to the Amorite, the Hittite, the Perizzite, and the Jebusite in the mountain" (Josh. xi. 3). A mountain-tripe they were, and mountain-tripe they remained, "Jebus, which is Jerusalem," lost its king in the slaughter of Beth-horon (Josh. x. 1, 5, 26; comp. xii. 10) — was sacked and burnt by the men of Judah (Judg. ii. 21), and its citadel finally sealed and occupied by David (2 Sam. v. 9), and still the Jebusite, who inhabited Jerusalem, the "inhabitants of the land," could not be expelled from their mountain-seat, but continued to dwell with the children of Judah and Benjamin to a very late date (Josh. xvi. 8, 63; Judg. i. 21, xix. 11). This obstinacy is characteristic of mountain-dwellers, and the few traits we possess of the Jebusites show them as a warlike people. Before the conquest under Jabin, Adoni-Zedek, the king of Jerusalem, had himself headed the attack on the Gibeonites, which ended in the slaughter of Beth-horon, and cost him his life on that eventful evening under the trees at Makkedah. That they were established in the strongest natural

a In ver. 5 the king of Jerusalem is styled one of the "five kings of the Amorites." But the LXX. [both MSS.] have τιν εβουραζον of the Jebusites'
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After this they emerge from the darkness but once, in the person of Araunah the Jebusite, *"Aramman the king* (אֶרְמָן הַרְוָי), who appears before us in true kingly dignity in his well-known transaction with David (2 Sam. xxiv. 23; 1 Chr. xxi. 2). The picture presented us in these well-known passages is a very interesting one. We see the fallen Jebusite king and his four sons on their threshing-floor on the bald top of Mount Moriah, treading out their wheat (-hashem; A. V. "threshing") by driving the oven with the heavy sledges (קָרָא הָעַד). A. V. "threshing instruments") over the corn, round the central heap. We see Araunah on the approach of David fall on his face on the ground, and we hear him ask, "Why is my lord the king come to his slave?" followed by his willing surrender of all his property. But this reveals no traits peculiar to the Jebusites, or characteristic of them more than of their contemporaries in Israel, or in the other nations of Canaan. The early Judges and kings of Israel threshed wheat in the wine-press (Judg. vi. 11), followed the herd out of the field (1 Sam. xi. 5), and were taken from the sheep-cotes (2 Sam. vii. 8), and the pressing courtesy of Araunah is closely paralleled by that of Epherion the Hittite in his negotiation with Abraham.

We are not favored with further traits of the Jebusites, nor with any clue to their religion or race.

Two names of individual Jebusites are preserved. In אָדוֹנֵי-זֶבֶק the only remarkable thing is its Hebrew form, in which it means "Lord of justice."

That of Aramman is much more uncertain — so much as to lead to the belief that we possess it more nearly in its original shape. In the short narrative of Samuel alone it is given in three forms — "the Aramman" (ver. 10); Araunah (18); Araonah, or Uzziah (20, 21). In Chronicles it is Aram, while by the LXX. it is ὁ πρεσβύτερος, and by Josephus ‘Οφρεών. [Aramah; Orion.]

In the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles the ashes of Barnabas, after his martyrdom in Cyprus, are said to have been buried in a cave, "where the race of the Jebusites formerly dwelt," and previously to this is mentioned the arrival in the island of a "pious Jebusite, a kinsman of Ner" (Act. Apoc. Apoc. pp. 72, 73, ed. Tisch.).

JECAMIAH (יהכמן), i. e. Jekhamiah, as the name is elsewhere given [he who assembles the people]: יְהֹהֵךְ, [Vat. Alex. πρεσβύτερος; Jerusalem.]

This is the name of one of David's chief friends (2 Sam. xxi. 26; 2 Chr. xi. 14), and to have been expressly spared by him when the citadel was taken. If there is any truth in this, David no doubt made his friendship during his wanderings, when he also acquired that of Uriah the Hittite, Abimelech, Sibbecah, and others of his associates who belonged to the old nations.

Amaziah king of Judah, and mother of Amaziah or Uzziah his successor (2 K. xx. 2). Both this queen and Jehoadaiah, the mother of her husband, are specified as "of Jerusalem." In the A. V. of Chronicles her name is given as Jehocalia.

JECHONIYAS (ירכונייהו; Jerchonias). 1. The Greek form of the name of Jehochaniah, followed by our translators in the books rendered from the Greek, namely, Esth. xi. 4; Bar. i. 3, 9. Matt. i. 11, 12. 2. 1 Esdr. viii. 92. [Scherenhausi.

JECOLIAH (יהכלייהו; see above]: יְכַלִּיהו; [Vat. Alex. דניאל; Jer. xxviii. 3. In the original the name differs from its form in the parallel passage in Kings, only in not having the final n. [Jecollya.]

JECONIAH (יהכנייהו; excpeting once, יְכַנייהו, with the final n., Jer. xxviii. 1; and once in Esth. xxii. 3. Jer. xxviii. 20 [Jehovah esatablished]: יְכַנְיָהו; Jerchonia]. an altered form of the name of Jehovah, last but one of the kings of Judah, which is found in the following passages: 1 Chr. iii. 16, 17; Jer. xxiv. xvi. xxvii. xxviii. iv, xxiv. 2; Esth. ii. 6. It is still further abbreviated to Coniah. See also Jechonias and Joaam.

JECONTAS (ירכוניתא, Jerchoniah), 1 Esdr. i. 9. [Jechonias, 3.]

JEDAIJAH (יְדֹאֶיָהו; Jeshua joam): יְדֹאֶיָהו, יְדוֹאֶיָהו, יְדוֹאֶיָהו, etc.: [I. D.; Jeoh, Jeoh, Jeoh, Jeoh; Jer. xxxvii. 1]. Head of the second course of priests, as they were divided in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 7). Some of them survived to return to Jerusalem after the Babylonian Captivity, as appears from Esth. iv. 36, Neh. vii. 30 — "the children of Jedahiah, of the house of Jehuah, 973." The addition of "the house of Jehuah" indicates that there were two priestly families of the name of Jedahiah, which, it appears from Neh. xii. 6, 7, 19, 21, was actually the case. If these sons of Jedahiah had for their head Jeshua, the high-priest in the time of Zerubbabel, as the Jewish tradition says they had (Levi's Orig. Rel. ii. c. 1); this may be the reason why, in 1 Chr. xix. 10, and Neh. xi. 10, the course of Jedahiah is named before that of Joiarib, though Joiarib's was the first course. But perhaps Jehuah was another priest descended from Jehuah, from whom this branch sprung. It is certainly a corrupt reading in Neh. xi. 10 which makes Jehuah son of Joiarib. 1 Chr. xi. 10 preserves the true text. In Esdras the name is Jedahiah.

2. [u יְדֹאֶיָהו יַעֲלֵי: Jedubia]: A priest in the time of Jehuah the high-priest (Zech. vi. 10, 14).

JEDAIJAH [3 syl.] (יְדֹאֶיָהו; [praise of Je- roboh, Gen.]). This is a different name from the last, though the two are identical in the A. V.

1. (I. D.; [Vat. Edia]; Alex. Edia: Iedubia): A man named in the genealogies of Simeon as a forefather of Ziza, one of the chiefs of the tribe.

A. C. II.

JECHOLIYAH (יהכולייהו; Jerobiah is mighty), with the final n: יְכַלִּיָהו; [Vat. Xelia, Alex. יְכַלִּיָהו: Joseph, יְכַלִּיָהו: Jecheleth], wife a By Josephus (Ant. xiii. 7, § 9) Aramman is said to have been the son of David's chief friends (2 Sam. xxi. 26; 2 Chr. xi. 14), and to have been expressly spared by him when the citadel was taken. If there is any truth in this, David no doubt made his friendship during his wanderings, when he also acquired that of Uriah the Hittite, Abimelech, Sibbecah, and others of his associates who belonged to the old nations.
JEDDU

apparently in the time of king Hezekiah (1 Chr. v. 37).

2. ('Iṣaḥa; [Vat. Iṣaḥa; C'] Jēbūd; 1 Esdr. v. 24). Son of Harumaph; a man who did his part in the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 10).

JED'DU ('iṣḥāḏu; Jeduthun; 1 Esdr. v. 24. [Jedaiah, 1.]

JED'VE'S (ʼiṣḥāḏāš; Jediduah; 1 Esdr. x. 30. [Jedaiah, 5.]

JEDAI'EL (ʼiṣḥāḏā; [known of Cod.] ʼIṣḥāḏā; [Vat. Ḩēḏa; Ḩām; Alex. Ḩēḏa; Ḩām, Ḩām, Ḩām, *Aṣimā; Jēdālīk, Jēdīlīk]. 1. A chief patriarch of the tribe of Benjamin, from whom sprung many Benjaminite houses of fathers, numbering 17,250 mighty men of valor, in the days of David (1 Chr. vii. 6, 11). It is usually assumed that Jedidiah is the same as Ashbel (Gen. xlv. 31; Num. xxvi. 38; 1 Chr. viii. 1). But though this may be so, it cannot be affirmed with certainty. [Becher; Bella.]. Jedidiah might be a later descendant of Benjamin not mentioned in the Pentateuch, but who, from the fruitfulness of his house and the decadence of elder branches, rose to the first rank.

2. [ʼIṣḥāḏa; Vat. Ḩēḏa; Jēdiheth,] Second son of Meshlelethiam, a Levite, of the sons of Elishaph the son of Korah. One of the doorkeepers of the Temple in the time of David (1 Chr. xxvi. 1, 2.

A. C. H.

3. [ʼIṣḥāḏā; Vat. Ḫēḏerā; Jēdīlēk]. Son of Shimi; one of the heroes of David's guard in the enlarged catalogue of Chronicles (1 Chr. xii. 49). In the absence of further information, we cannot decide whether or not he is the same person as

[ʼIṣḥāḏa; Alex. [Ald.] ʼIṣḥāḏa; Jēdīlēk]. One of the chiefs (lit. "heads") of the thousands of Manasseh who joined David on his march from Aphek to Ziklag when he left the Philistine army on the eve of Gilboa, and helped him in his revenge on the marauding Amalekites (1 Chr. xii. 20; comp. 1 Sam. xxxix. 29.)

JEDI'DAH (ʼiṣḥāḏá), darling [or only one]: ʼIṣḥāḏa; [Vat. Iṣḥa; Alex. Ḩēḏāš; [C+w.] [产业园; Iṭēḏāša]: ʼIṣḥāḏa,] queen of Amon, and mother of the good king Josiah (2 K. xxii. 1). She was a native of Boshath near Lechith, the daughter of a certain Adiah. By Josephus (Ant. x. 4, § 1) her name is given as ʾIṣḥāḏa.

JEDID'AH (ʼiṣḥāḏā; [darling of Jehovah]; ʾIṣḥāḏā; [Vat. ʾIṣḥa; Alex. Eḏāša; Amonbale Dominc]: ʾIṣḥāḏa), the name bestowed, through Nathan the prophet, on David's son Solomon (2 Sam. xii. 25).

Bath-seba's first child had died — "Jehovah struck it" (ver. 15). A second son was born, and David — whether in allusion to the state of his external affairs, or to his own restored peace of mind — called his name Shelomōh ("Peaceful"); and Jehovah loved the child, i. e. allowed him to live. (1 K. i. 1). "Jedidah" was sent by the hand of Nathan to obtain through him some oracle or token of the Divine favor on the babe, and the babe's name was called Jedidah. It is then added that this was done "because of Jehovah." The clue to the meaning of these last words, and indeed of the whole circumstance, seems to reside in the fact that "Jedidah" and "David" are both derived from the same root, or from two very closely related (see Gesen. Thes. 565 a — "ʾiṣḥāḏ, idem quad ʾiṣḥāḏ"). To us these plays on words have little or no significance: but to the old Hebrews, as to the modern Orientals, they were full of meaning. To David himself, the "darling" of his family and his people, no more happyomen, no more precious seal of his restoration to the Divine favor after his late fall, could have been afforded, than this announcement by the prophet, that the name of his child was to combine his own name with that of Jehovah; "ah — Jehovah and peace." The practice of bestowing a second name on children, in addition to that given immediately on birth — such second name having a religious bearing, as Noor-ed-Din, Saleh-ed-Din (Saladin), etc. — still exists in the East.

* JEDITHUN. [Jeduthun.]

JEDUTHUN (ʼiṣḥuṯuṯ), except in 1 Chr. xvi. 38; Neh. xi. 7; Ps. xxxix. title; and lvii. title, where it is ʼIṣḥuṯuṯ, i. e. Jeduthun [pronosing, or he who pronounces], ʼIṣḥuṭuṯ, or ʼIṣḥuṭo; [Vat. Ḧēḏuṭuṯ, ʼIṣḥuṯuṯ, Ḧēḏuṭuṯ, etc.]: Ḧōḏuṭuṯ, Jeduthun, 15, Ḧēḏuṭuṯ, Vat. Ḫēḏuṭuṯ, Jedidum], a Levite of the family of Merari, who was associated with Heman the Kohathite, and Asaph the Gershonite, in the conduct of the musical service of the tabernacle, in the time of David; according to what is said 1 Chr. xxiii. 6, that David divided the Levites into courses among the sons of Levi, namely, Gershom, Kohath, and Merari. The prefix of his name being Merari, it depends upon his identification with Ethan in 1 Chr. xv. 17, who, we learn from that passage as well as from the genealogy in vi. 44 (A. V.), was a Merarite [Heb.]. But it may be added that the very circumstance of Ethan being a Merarite, which Jeduthun must have been (since the only reason of there being three musical chiefs was to have one for each division of the Levites), is a strong additional proof of this identity. Another proof may be found in the mention of Hosah (xvi. 38, 42), as a son of Jeduthun, and a gatekeeper, compared with xxvi. 10, where we read that Hosah was of the children of Merari. Assuming then that, as regards 1 Chr. vii. 44, xv. 17, 19, Ḧēḏuṯuṯ is a mere clerical variation for ʾIṣḥuṯuṯ — which a comparison of xv. 17, 19 with xvi. 41, 42, xxv. 1, 3, 6, 2 Chr. xxxv. 15, makes almost certain — we have Jeduthun's descents as son of Kish, or Kushhiah, from Mahli, the son of Mushli, the son of Merari, the son of Levi, being the fourteenth generation from Levi inclusive. His office was generally to preside over the music of the temple service, consisting of the nebel, or nabiim, the shoom, or harp, and the cymbals, together with the human voice (the trumpets being confined to the priests). But his peculiar part, as well as that of his two colleagues Heman and Asaph, was "to blow with the trumpets of brass," while the others played on the nabiim and the harp. This appointment to the office was by election of the chiefs of the Levites (ʾIṣḥuṯuṯ).

[2 Sam. vi. 10] mentioned in the same verse who was probably a Kohathite (Josh. xxi. 24).
at David's command, each of the three divisions probably choosing one. The first occasion of Jeda- thun's ministering was when David brought up the ark to Jerusalem. He then took his place in the procession, and played on the cymbals. But when the division of the Levitical services took place, owing to the tabernacle being at Gibeaon and the ark at Jerusalem, while Asaph and his brethren were appointed to minister before the ark, it fell to Jehuthun and Heman to be located with Zadok the priest, to give thanks "before the tabernacle of the Lord in the high place that was at Gibeon," still by playing the cymbals in accommodation to the other musical instruments (comp. Ps. cl. 5). In the account of Josiah's Passover in 2 Chr. xxxv. reference is made to the singing as conducted in accordance with the arrangements made by David, and by Asaph, Heman, and Jehuthun the king's (1224 1245 (HEMAN.). Perhaps the phrase rather means the king's adviser in matters connected with the musical service. The sons of Jehuthun were employed (1 Chr. xxv.) partly in music, namely, six of them, who prophesied with the harp — Gedaliah, head of the 20th, Zerii, or Zeri, of the 4th, Josiah of the 8th, Shimeii of the 10th, Hashbshiah of the 12th, and Mat- tithiah of the 14th; and partly as gatekeepers (A. V. "porters") (xxxv. 42), namely, Obed-Edom and Hosah (v. 38), which last had thirteen sons and brothers (xxxv. 11). The triple division of the Levitical musicians seems to have lasted as long as the Temple, and each to have been called after their respective leaders. At the dedication of Sol- omon's temple the Levites which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jehuthun, performed their proper part. In the reign of Hez- kiah, again, we find the sons of Asaph, the sons of Heman, and the sons of Jehuthun, taking their part in purifying the Temple (2 Chr. xxi. 13, 14): they are mentioned, we have seen, in Josiah's reign, and so late as Nehemiah's time we still find de- scendants of Jehuthun employed about the singing; (Neh xi. 17, 1 Chr. ix. 16). His name stands at the head of the 39th, 62d, and 77th Psalms, indicat- ing probably that they were to be sung by his choir. A. C. H.

In the title of Ps. xxxix. Jehuthun doth not appear as the precursor or choir-master under whose lead the psalm was to be sung. But in the titles of Ps. liii. and lxxvii. (where the proposition is the 32nd, and not the 31st, as in the other case) Jehuthun probably denotes a body of singers named after this chorister, and consisting in part, at least, of his sons or descendants (see 2 Chr. xxiii. 14), though not excluding others. The A. V. does not recog- nize this difference of the propositions. Of all the conjectures, that least satisfactory, says Hulpefeld, which makes Jehuthun the name of a musical instru- ment, or of a particular melody. The ready interchange of 59, and 57 accounts for the two-fold orthography of the name.

JEELI (Israel) (Vat. -i-ei); Alex. -i-ei (-eli, 1 Esdr. v. 33. [HAAIIR].

JEELI (Israel) (Vat. -i-ei); Alex. -i-ei (-eli, 1 Esdr. v. 33. [HAAIIR].

JEELUS (Israel; Alex. -i-ei: Jeelus), 1 Esdr. viii. 92. [JERUSALEM].

JEEZER (JEEZER [father, or author of help] (Myriotes: Hizer), the form assumed in the list in Numbers (xxvi. 40) by the name of a descendent of Manasseh, eldest son of Gilead, and founder of one of the chief families of the tribe 47; as exa- rist). In parallel lists the name is given as ABEZER, and the family as the ABEZERITES — the house of Gideon. Whether this change has arisen from the accidental addition or omission of a letter, or is an intentional variation, akin to that in the case of Abel and Jethul, cannot be ascer- tained. The LXX. perhaps read BAEZER.

JEEZERITES. THE (JEEZER) [patronym.] - (Alex. Myriotes; famille Hizereret), the family of the foregoing (Num. xxxv. 9).

JEGAR SAHADUTHA (Margar-Saddutha; Jager, magus, heep of testimony: Bovnus tis maioritias [see below]: tumultus testis). The Armenian name given by Laban the Syrian to the heap of stones which he erected as a memorial of the compact between Jacob and himself, while Jacob commemorated the same by giving it a pillar (Gen. xxxv. 17), as was his custom on several other occasions. Galeed, a "witness heap," which is given as the Hebrew equivalent, does not exactly represent Jegar-sahadutha. The LXX. have preserved the distinction accurately in rendering the latter by Bovnus tis majoritias [Alex. magistros], and the former by Μαρτύρας [Alex. marturos]. The Vulgate, oddly enough, has transposed the two, and translated Galeed by "acervus testimoni," and Jegar-sahadutha by "tumultus testis." But in the mind of the writer they were evidently all but identical, and the manner in which he has adapted the name to the circumstances narrated, and to the locality which was the scene of the transaction, is a curious instance of a tendency on the part of the Hebrews, of which there are many examples in the O. T., so to modify an already existing name that it might convey to a Hebrew an intellligible idea, and at the same time preserve essentially its original form. There is every reason to believe that the name Gil- ead is derived from a root which points to the natural features of the region to which it is applied, and to which it was in all probability attached be- fore the meeting of Jacob and Laban, or at any rate before the time at which the historian was writing. In fact it is used in verses 23 and 25 of this chapter. The memorial heap erected by Laban marked a crisis in Jacob's life which severed him from all further intercourse with his Syrian kindred, and henceforth his wanderings were mainly confined to the land which his descendants were to inherit. Such a crisis, so commemorated, was thought by the historian of sufficient importance to have left its impress upon the whole region, and in Galeed "the witness heap" was found the original name of the mountainous district Gilead. A similar etymology is given for Mizraim in the parenthetical clause consisting of the latter part of illustrations of this ; and there are many such. This tendency is not peculiar to the Hebrews. It exists in every language, but has not yet been recognized in the case of Hebrew.
JEHALELEEL

48 and 49, which is not likely to have been suggested, though it is not so stated, by the similarity between הָאַלְעָה, nitegeh, and הָאַלְעָה, natazethah, the “standing stone” or “statue” which Jacob set up to be his memorial of the transmigration, as the heap of stones was Laban’s. On this pillar or standing stone he swore by Jehovah, the “fear of his father’s house,” as Laban over his heap invoked the God of Abraham, and Nahor, the God of their father Terah; each marking, by the most solemn form of adjuration he could employ, his own sense of the grave nature of the compact.

W. A. W.

JEHALELEEL (םֹּלְכֹּל) [he who praises God]: [Vat. יָבָּהָל; Alex. יָבָּהָל Jaledel]. Four men of the Bene-Jehaleleel are introduced abruptly into the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 16). The name is identical with that rendered in the A. V. JEHALELEEL. Neither form is, however, quite correct.

JEHALLELEL (םֹּלְלֹל) [as above]: [Vat. יָבָּהָל; Alex. יָבָּהָל: Jabuleel], a Moraite Levite, whose son Azariah took part in the restoration of the Temple in Hezekiah’s time (2 Chr. xxix. 12).

JEHDEIAH [3 syl.] (יהַדִּיָּה), i.e., Yechde-ya’hu; [whom Jehovah makes joyful]. 1. (יְהַדִּיָּה: [Vat. יָהַדִּיָּה]: Alex. יָהַדִּיָּה: Jadael). The representative of the Bene-Shubael, — descendants of Gershom, son of Moses — in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 20). But in xxvi. 21, a man of the name of Shubael or Shubal, is recorded as the head of the house; charge in this passage the family itself, and not an individual, be intended.

2. (יְהַדִּיָּה: Judatis). A Meronothite who had charge of the she-asses — the riding and breeding stock — of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 30).

JEHEZEKEEL (יהַזֵּקֵל) [whom God makes strong]: [Vat. יֵהַזֵּקֵל: Alex. יֵהַזֵּקֵל: Hexeziel], a priest to whom was given the charge of David the twenty-four courses in the service of the house of Jehovah (1 Chr. xxiv. 10). The name in the original is almost exactly similar to EZEKIEL.

JEHIAH (יהִיָּה) [perh. = יָיָה, see below, Ges.]: [Vat. יִהְיָה: Alex. יִהְיָה: Jehite]. He and Obad-edom were “doorkeepers for the ark” (יְהִיָּה, the word elsewhere expressed by “porters”) at the time of its establishment in Jerusalem (1 Chr. xxv. 24). The name does not recur, but it is possible it may be exchanged for the similar JEHIEL or JIEKEL in xvi. 5.

JEHIEL (יהִיֵּל) [God lives]: Jehiel.

1. (יְהִיֵּל: [Vat. FA. in xv. 20 corrupt; Vat. xvi. 5. יֵהַיֵּל]): One of the Levites appointed by David to assist in the service of the house of God (1 Chr. xv. 18, 20; xvi. 5). One of the sons of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, who was put to death by his brother Jehoram shortly after his becoming king (2 Chr. xxi. 2).

2. (יְהִיֵּל): One of the rulers of the house of God at the time of the reforms of Josiah (2 Chr. xxv. 6). [SYELEUS.]

3. (יְהִיֵּל): A Gershonite Levite, head of the Bene-Laadan in the time of David (1 Chr. xxiii. 8), who had charge of the treasures (xxix. 9). His family — JEHIEL, i.e. Jehielite, or as we should say now Jehielites — is mentioned, xxvi. 21.

5. (ייֵהִיֵּל, Alex. יֵהַיֵּל: Son of Hachmoni, or of a Hachmonite, named in the list of David’s officers (1 Chr. xxvii. 32) as “with (םָנֶא) the king’s sons,” whatever that may mean. The mention of Abibophel (33) seems to fix the date of this list as before the revolt. In Jerome’s Questions HEBRAICAE this passage, Jehiel is said to be David’s son Chileab or Daniel; and “Achimoni,” interpreted as Sippenielus, is taken as an alias of David himself.

6. (In the original text, יֵהַיֵּל: Jehuel — the A. V. follows the alteration of the Keri: יֵהַיֵּל: [Vat. יֵהַיֵּל]). A Levite of the Bene-Heman, who took part in the restorations of king Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxix. 14).

7. (Vat. יֵהַיֵּל: Another Levite at the same period (2 Chr. xxxii. 13), one of the “oversers” (םֹּלְלֹל) of the articles offered to Jehovah. His parentage is not mentioned.

8. (יְהִיֵּל: [Vat. יֵהָיֵל]: Alex. יֵהָיֵל). Father of Obadiah, who headed 215 men of the Bene-Josh in the return from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr. viii. 9). In Esdras the name is YELEUS, and the number of his clan is stated at 212.

9. (יְהִיֵּל, Alex. יֵהָיֵל: Jehiel). One of the Bene-Iam, father of Shechaniah, who encouraged Ezra to put away the foreign wives of the people (Ezr. x. 2). In Esdras it is JIEKEL.

10. (יְהִיֵּל: [Vat. יֵהָיֵל]: Alex. יֵהָיֵל: Jiekel). A member of the same family, who had himself to part with his wife (Ezr. x. 26). [HIEKELUS.]

11. (יְהִיֵּל, Alex. יֵהָיֵל: Jehiel). A priest, one of the Bene-Harim, who also had to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 21). [HIEKEL.]

JEHIEL,a a perfectly distinct name from the last, though the same in the A. V. 1. (יֵהִיִּל): so the Keri, but the Tetbal has יֵהָיִל, i.e. Jeuel; יִהְיִל: [Vat. יֵהָיִל: Alex. יֵהָיִל: Jiekel], a man described as Abi-Gibeon — father of Gibeon; a forfather of king Saul (1 Chr. ix. 35). In vii. 29 the name is omitted. The presence of the stubborn letter Aia in Jehiel forbids our identifying it with Abiel in 1 Sam. ix. 1, as some have been tempted to do.

2. (Here the name is as given in No. 1). [Vat. FA. 1ea.]: One of the sons of Itham the Arcorite; a member of the guard of David, included in the extended list of 1 Chr. xi. 44.

JEHIELI (יֵהָיֵל, Alex.: [Vat. FA. 1ea.]: Jehiel), according to the A. V. a Gershouite Levite of the family of LAADAN. The Bene-Jehiel had charge of the treasures of the house of Jehovah (1 Chr. xxvi. 21, 32). In other lists it is given as JEHIEL. The name appears to be strictly a patronymic — Jehielite.

JEHIZKIAH (יהִזְקִיָּה), i.e. Yechizkiya’hu; same name as Hezekiah [whom Jehovah

a Here our translators represent אָיָה by A, unless they simply follow the Vulgate. Comp. JERUSALEM.
strengthen
eKias' and losa

JOEHODAH (יְהוֹוָדָע, i. e. Jehoaddah 
whom Jehoaddah 
was slain, &c. J. n. 
Stis; l'ahd; &c. 
Alex. Iouas: Jowhd), one of 
the heads of Saul (1 Chr. viii. 36), great 
grandson to Merib-baal, i. e. Mephibosheth. 
in the duplic

te text has 
and so the LXX. 
Vat. Ioanav, &c. Alex. Ioanav (in 2 
Ch. xliii). 
Vat. Ioanav; 
Iouas; Jowhd. 1. The son and 
successor of Jehu, reigned 17 years u. c. 830-813 over Israel 
in Samaria. His inglorious history is given in 2 
K. xiii. 1-9. Throughout his reign (ver. 22) he 
was kept in subjection by Hazael king of Damascus, 
who, following up the successes which he had 
previously achieved against Jehu, compelled Jehoaddah 
to reduce his army to 50 horsemen, 10 chariots, 
and 10,000 infantry. Jehoaddah maintained 
the idolatry of Jeroboam; but in the extremity of his 
humiliation he besought Jehovah; and Jehovah 
gave Israel a deliverer—probably either Jehoach (vv. 23 and 24), or Jeroboam II. (2 K. xiv. 24, 25) 
(see Keil, 
Commentary on Kings). The prophet 
Elisha survived Jehoaddah; and Ewald (Gesch. Isr. iii. 557) is disposed to place in his reign the incursions of the Syrians mentioned in 2 K. v. 2, vi. 8, 
and of the Ammonites mentioned in Amos i. 13.

2. [Vat. in 2 K., Ioanav, and so Alex. 2 K. xxi. 41.] Jehoaddah, otherwise called Stramma, the fourth (see to 1 Chr. iii. 15), or third, if Zedekiah's age be correctly stated (2 Chr. xxxvi. 11), son of Josiah, whom he succeeded as king of Judah. 
He was chosen by the people in preference to his elder 
(2 Chr. xxxii. 31 and 36) brother, u. c. 610, and he reigned three months in Jerusalem. 
His anointing (ver. 30) was probably some addi

tional ceremony, or it is mentioned with peculiar 
emphasis in order to make up for his want of the 
ordinary title to the throne. He is described by 
his contemporaries as an evil-doer (2 K. xiii. 32) 
and an oppressor (Ez. xiii. 3), and such is his tradi

tional character in Josephus (Ant. x. 5, § 2); but 
his deposition seems to have been lamented by the 
people (Jer. xxvii. 10, and Ez. xiii. 1). Pharaoh

nachal on his return from Carchemish, perhaps 
recollecting the election of Jehoaddah, sent to Jeru

usalem to depose him, and to fetch him to Rabbah. 
There he was cast into chains, and from thence he 
was taken into Egypt, where he died (see Prideaux, 
Connection, anno 610; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. iii. 719; 
Eisenmuller, Schlo in Jerem. xiii. 11).

JEHOAHANAN (יהוֹהָנָן, also 
Jehovah's gift, 
answering to Theodore: [Vat. Ioanav, &c. Alex. Ioanav (in 2 
K., Ioanav, and so Alex. 2 K. xxi. 41.) A Levite, one of the bookkeepers (A. V. "porters") 
to the house of Jehovah, i. e. the Tri-eruca, 
according to the appointment of David (1 Chr. xxxvi. 3; comp. xxxv. 1). He was the sixth of the seven 
sons of Mehemediah: a Koheshite, that is descended 
from Korah, the founder of that great Kohathite 
house. He is also said (ver. 1) to have been of the 
Bene-Assaph; but Asaph is a contraction for Bashan, as is seen from the genealogy in xvi. 18. The well-known Asaph too was not a Kohathite 
but a Gershonite. 

2. [Ioanav.] One of the principal men of 
Judah, under king Jehoshaphat; he commanded 
280,000 men, apparently in and about Jerusalem 
(2 Chr. xviii. 15; comp 13 and 19). He is named 
second on the list, and is entitled "the captain," a title also given to Jehu in the pre

ceeding verse, though there rendered "the chief.

He is probably the same person as —

3. Father of Ishmael, one of the "captains 
(2 Chr. xxiv.), as before of hundred," evidently 
residing in or near Jerusalem; whom Jehoiada the 
priest took into his confidence about the restoration 
of the line of Judah (2 Chr. xxiii. 1).

4. [Ioanav.] Fa. Ioanav. One of the Bene

Behai [sons of B.], a levy Israelite who was forced 
by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 28) 
In Edras the name is JOAHANIS.
5. [*To Ward.] A priest (Neh. xii. 15); the representative of the house of Amariah (comp. 2), during the high-priesthood of Joiakim (ver. 12), that is to say in the generation after the first return from Captivity.

6. (Vat. LXX. omits [so Alex. FA.; Comp. FA.; *To Ward;*]) A priest who took part in the musical service of thanksgiving, at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah (Neh. xii. 42). In two other cases this name is given in the A. V. as Joahaz.

JEHOIACHIN (יהואכן;) = appointed of Jehovah; once only, Ex. i. 2, contrasted to יְהוֹיָהָן; in Kings لֹא יָהָן. Chron. Τύχων, Jer. and Ez. Ιωακίμ [Vat. Alex. Iωακέων throughout except in Chron.; Joseph. Ιωακίμος: Joachin]. Elsewhere the name is altered to Jecosiah, and Coniah. See also JECOZIAS, JOAIZIK, and JOAICHIN.

Son of Jehoiakim and Nebushta, and for three months and ten days king of Judah, after the death of his father, being the nineteenth king from David, or twentieth, counting Jehoiakaz. According to 2 K. xiv. 8, Jehoiachin was eighteen years old at his accession; but 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9, as well as 1 Esdr. i. 43, has the far more probable reading eight years, which fixes his birth to the time of his father's captivity, according to Matt. i. 11.

Jehoiachin came to the throne at a time when Egypt was still prostrate in consequence of the victory at Carchemish, and when the Jews had been for three or four years harassed and distracted by the incursions of the armed bands of Chaldeans, Ammonites, and Jebelites, sent against them by Nebuchadnezzar in consequence of Jehoiakim's rebellion. [JEHOIACHIN.] Jerusalem at this time, therefore, was quite defenseless, and unable to offer any resistance to the regular army which, Nebuchadnezzar sent to besiege it in the 8th year of his reign, and which he seems to have joined in person after the siege was commenced (2 K. xxiv. 10, 11). In a very short time, apparently, and without any losses from famine or fighting which would indicate a serious resistance, Jehoiachin surrendered at discretion; and he, and the queen-mother, and all his servants, captains, and officers, came out and gave themselves up to Nebuchadnezzar, who carried them, with the harem and the eunuchs, to Babylon (Jer. xxix. 2; Ez. xii. 12, xix. 9). All the king's treasures, and all the treasures of the Temple, were seized, and the golden vessels of the Temple, which the king of Babylon had left when he pillaged it in the fourth of Jehoiakim, were now either cut up or carried away to Babylon, with all the nobles, and men of war, and skilled artisans, none but the poorest and weakest being left behind (2 K. xxiv. 13: 2 Chr. xxxvi. 19). According to 2 K. xxiv. 14, 16, the number taken at this time into captivity was 10,000, namely, 7,000 soldiers, 1,000 craftsmen and smiths, and 3,000 whose calling is not specified. But, according to Jer. ii. 28 (a passage which is omitted in the LXX.), the number carried away captive at this time (called the seventh of Nebuchadnezzar, 2 K. xxiv. 13) was 3,023. Whether this difference arises from any corruption of the numerals, or whether only a

portion of those originally taken captive were actually carried to Babylon, the others being left with Zedekiah, upon his swearing allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar, cannot perhaps be decided. The numbers in Jeremiah are certainly very small, only 4,000 in all, whereas the numbers who returned from captivity, as given in Esr. ii. and Neh. vii. were 42,300. However, Jehoiachin himself fled away captive to Babylon, and there he remained a prisoner, actually in prison (2 K. xxiv. 2, and Jer. ii. 28, 30), and wearing prison garments, for thirty-six years, namely, till the death of Nebuchadnezzar, when Evil-Merodach, succeeding to the throne of Babylon, treated him with much kindness, brought him out of prison, changed his garments, raised him above the other subject or captive kings, and made him sit at his own table. Whether Jehoiachin outlived the two years of Evil-Merodach's reign or not does not appear, nor have we any particulars of his life at Babylon. The general description of him in 2 K. xxiv. 9, "He did evil in the sight of Jehovah, according to all that his father had done," seems to apply to his character at the time he was king, and lost a child: and so does the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxii. 24-30; Ez. xix. 5-9). We also learn from Jer. xxviii. 4, that four years after Jehoiachin had gone to Babylon, there was a great expectation at Jerusalem of his return, but it does not appear whether Jehoiachin himself shared this hope at Babylon. [HAY-AMAN.] The tenor of Jeremiah's letter to the elders of the Captivity (xxix.) would, however, indicate that there was a party among the Captivity, encouraged by false prophets, who were at this time looking forward to Nebuchadnezzar's overthrow and Jehoiachin's return; and perhaps the fearful death of Ahik the son of Kohah (ib. v. 22), and the close confinement of Jehoiachin through Nebuchadnezzar's reign, may have been the result of some disposition to conspire against Nebuchadnezzar on the part of a portion of the Captivity. But neither Daniel nor Ezekiel, who were Jehoiachin's fellow-captives, make any further allusion to him, except that Ezekiel dates his prophecies by the year + of King Jehoiachin's captivity" (i. 2, viii. 1. xxv. 1, &c.; the latest date being the twenty-seventh year") (xxix. 17, xl. 1). We also learn from Nebuchadnezzar, that from Evil-Merodach, when Evil-Merodach...
JEHOIADA

which suits Jehoiachin. Africanus (Ep. ad Orig.; Routh, Rel. Sac. ii. 113) expressly calls Susanna's husband "king," and says that the king of Babylon had made him his royal companion (σεφαρωσα). He is also mentioned 1 Esdr. v. 5, but the text seems to be corrupt. It probably should be "Zorobabel, the son of Salathiel, the son of Joaah," i.e. Jehoiachin. It does not appear certain from Scripture whether Jehoiachin was married or had any children. That Zedekiah, who in 1 Chr. iii. 16 is called "his son," is the same as Zedekiah his uncle called "his brother," 2 Chr. xxxvi. 10, who was his successor on the throne, seems certain. But it is not impossible that Assir (נפח = captive), who is reckoned among the "sons of Jehonniah" in 1 Chr. iii. 17, may have been so really, and either have died young or been made an eunuch (Is. xxxix. 7). This is quite in accordance with the term "childless," נפח, applied to Jehonapha by Jerem. (xxii. 30). [GENEALOGY OF CHRIST, vol. i. p. 886.]

Jehoiachin was the last of Solomon's line, and on its failure in his person, the right to the succession passed to the line of Nathan, whose descendant, Shalliel, or Salathiel, the son of Neri, was consequently reckoned in the genealogy of Christ. Hence his place in the genealogy of Christ (Matt. i. 11, 12). For the variations in the Hebrew forms of Jehonniah's name see HANNAH, 8; and for the confusion in Greek and Latin writers between Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, Ioseph. and Ioseph., see GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, and Hervey's Genealogy, pp. 71-73.

X. B. The compiler of 1 Esdr. gives the name of Jehoanina to Jehoaah, the son of Josiah, who reigned three months after Josiah's death, and was deposed and carried to Egypt by Pharaoh-Necho (1 Esdr. i. 34; 2 K. xxiii. 30). He is followed in this blunder by Epiphanius (vol. i. p. 21), who says, "Josiah begat Jehoanina, who is also called Shallum. This Jehoanina begat Jehoninah who is called Zedekiah and Joakim." It has its origin doubtless in the confusion of the names when written in Greek by writers ignorant of Hebrew. A. C. H.

JEHOIADA (יהויא = known of Jehovah; товд: Alex. Iωνας, Iωάνας, Iωανάς, and also as Vat.; Ιωάνας: Iωάνα): In the latter books the name is contracted to JOIAH.

1. Father of BENAIAH, David's well known warrior (2 Sam. viii. 18; 1 K. i. and ii. passion; 1 Chr. xvii. 17, &c.). From 1 Chr. xxvii. 5, we learn that Beniah's father was the chief priest, and he is therefore doubtless identical with —

2. (Iωανάν: [Vat. Τωανας: ΠA Τωανάς: Alex. Iωανας.] Leader (יויא) of the Aaronites (accurately "of Aaron") i.e. the priests; who joined David at Hebron, bringing with him 3,700 priests (1 Chr. xxi. 27).

3. According to 1 Chr. xxvii. 34, son of Benahad, and one of David's chief counsellors, apparently having succeeded Ahithophel in that office. But in all probability Benahad the son of Jehoiada is meant, by a confusion similar to that which has arisen with regard to Ahimelech and Abiathar (1 Chr. xiii. 16; 2 Sam. viii. 17).

4. High-priest at the time of Athaliah's usurpation of the throne of Judah (n. 848-878), and during the greater portion of the 40 years' reign of Joash. It does not appear when he first became high-priest, but it may have been as early as the latter part of Jehoshaphat's reign. Anyhow, he probably succeeded Amariah. [HIGH-PRIEST.] He married Jehoshera or Jehovahbeath, daughter of king Jehoram, and sister of king Ahaziah (2 Chr. xxii. 11); and when Athaliah slew all the royal family of Judah after Ahaziah had been put to death by Jeho, he and his family, among the king's sons, and hid him for six years in the Temple, and eventually replaced him on the throne of his ancestors. [JOASH; ATHALIAH.] In effecting this happy revolution, by which both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses were rescued from imminent danger of destruction, Jehoiada displayed great ability and prudence. Waiting patiently till the tyranny of Athaliah, and, we may presume, her foreign practices and preferences, had produced disgust in the land, he at length, in the 7th year of her reign, entered into secret alliance with all the chief partisans of the house of David and of the true religion. He also collected at Jerusalem the Levites from the different cities of Judah and Israel, probably under cover of providing for the Temple services, and then concentrated them and armed them for the Temple, by an expedient of not dismissing the old corps of priests and Levites when their successors came to relieve them on the Sabbath. By means of the consecrated shields and spears which David had taken in his wars, and which were preserved in the treasure of the Temple (comp. 1 Chr. xviii. 7-11, xxvi. 20-23; 1 K. xiv. 29, 27), he supplied the captains of hundreds with arms for their men. During their division the priests and Levites into three bands, which were posted at the principal entrances, and filled the courts with people favorable to the cause, he produced the young king before the whole assembly, and crowned and anointed him, and presented to him a copy of the Law, according to Deut. xvii. 18-20. [HILKIHITE.] The excitement of the moment did not make him forget the sanctity of God's honor. None but the priests and ministering Levites were permitted by him to enter the Temple; and he gave strict orders that Athaliah should be carried without its precincts before she was put to death. In the same spirit he inaugurated the new reign by a solemn covenant between himself, as high priest, and the people and the king, to renounce the Baal-worship which had been introduced by the house of Ahab, and to serve Jehovah. This was followed up by the immediate destruction of the altar and temple of Baal, and the death of Mattan his priest. He then took order for the due celebration of the Temple service, and at the same time for the perfect reestablishment of the monarchy; all which seems to have been effected with great vigor and success, and without any cruelty or violence. The young king himself, under this wise and virtuous counsellor, ruled his kingdom well and prosperously, and was forward in works of piety during the lifetime of Jehoiada. The reparation of the Temple in the 23rd year of his reign, of which a full and interesting account is given 2 K. xii. and 2 Chr. xxiv., was one of the most important works at this period. At length, however, Jehoiada died, n. c. 834, and though for advanced years, too soon for the welfare of his country, and the weak, unstable character of Joash. The text of 2 Chr. xxiv. 15, supported by the L.XX. and Josephus, makes him 130 years old when he died. But supposing him to
JEHOIAKIM

vare lived to the 36th year of Josiah (which only
cares 5 years for all the subsequent events of the
reign), he would in that case have been 95 at the
time of the insurrection against Athaliah; and 15
years before, when Jehoram, whose daughter was
his wife, was only 32 years old, he would have been
50: than which nothing can be more improbable.
There must therefore be some early corruption of
the numeral.

Perhaps we ought to read "כְּלָאָה (83), instead of כְּלָאָה (80). Even
103 (as suggested, Gener. of our Lord, p. 304)
would have an improbable age at the two above
named epochs. If 93 at his death, he would have
been 33 years old at Joram's accession. For his
signal services to his God, his king and his coun
ty, which have earned him a place among the very
foremost well-doers in Israel, he had the unique
honor of burial among the kings of Judah in the
city of David. He was probably succeeded by his
son Zechariah. In Josephus's list (Ant. xviii. §
6), the name of כְּלָאָה by an easy corruption is
transformed into קְלָאָה, and in the Seder Olam
into Phaedia.

In Matt. xxiii. 35, Zechariah the son of Jehoiada
is mentioned as the "son of Barachiah," i.e. Bere
chiah. This is omitted in Luke (xvi. 51), and has
probably been inserted from a confusion between
this Zechariah and 2, the prophet, who was son of
Berechiah; or with the son of Jehorechiah (Is. viii.
2).

[5. [Vulg. pro Joiaide.] Second priest, or sagan,
to Serahai the high priest. He was deposed at the
beginning of the reign of Zedekiah, probably for
adhering to the prophet Jeremiah; when Zepha
iah was appointed sagan in his room (Jer. xxix.
25-28; 2 K. xxi. 18). This is a clear instance of
the title "the priest" being applied to the second
priest. The passage in Jeremiah shows the nature of
the sagan's authority at this time, when he was

doubtless "ruler of the house of Jehovah" (דר
נַיְנָה נְנָה).

[High-priest.] Winer (Recon.) has quite misunderstood the passage, and makes
Jeremiah the same as the high-priest in the reign of
Josiah.

6. (יֵוָי, i.e. Josiah: [Vulg. Iovinae:] Alex. Iovina: Jiojuda), son of Paseah, who as
istered to repair the "old gate" of Jerusalem (Neh.
iii. 6).

A. C. H.

JEHOIAKIM (רֵוָי נָי: [Jehoreh sets up
or appoints]: יֵוָי, or -el: Joseph. Iovikymos:
Josikia), 18th (or, counting Jehohaz, 19th) king
of Judah from David inclusive — 56 years old at his
accession, and originally called Eliaah. He was
the son of Josiah and Zebadah, daughter of Pe
deiah of Ramah, possibly identical with Arumah of
Judg. ix. 41 (where the Vulg. has Romach), and in
that case in the tribe of Manasseh.

His younger brother Jehohaz, or Shallum, as he is
called (Jer. xxii. 11), was in the first instance made
king by the people on the land on the death of his
father Josiah, probably with the intention of fol
lowing up Josiah's policy, which was to side with
Nebuchadnezzar against Egypt, being, as Profess
thinks, bound by oath to the kings of Babylon (1.
50). Pharaoh-Necho, therefore, having borne down
all resistance with his victorious army, immediately
deposed Jehoahaz, and had him brought in chains
to Riblah, where, it seems, he was on his way to
Carcemies (2 K. xiii. 36, 94; Jer. xxii. 10-12).
He then set Eliakim, his elder brother, upon the
throne, changed his name to Jehoiakim, and hav
charged him with the task of collecting a tribu
ute of 100 talents of silver, and 1 talent of gold =
nearly 40,000l, in which he muleted the land for
the part Josiah had taken in the war with Babylon,
he eventually returned to Egypt taking Jehoahaz
with him, who died there in captivity (2 K. xiii.
94; Jer. xxi. 20-22; Ez. xix. 4)." Pharaoh-Necho
also himself returned no more to Jerusalem, for
after his great defeat at Carcemies in the fourth
year of Jehoiakim he lost all his Syrian possessions
(2 K. xiv. 7; Jer. xvi. 2), and his successor
Pianmis (Herod. ii. cxx.) made no attempt to
re recover them. Egypt, therefore, played no part in
Jewish politics during the seven or eight years of
Jehoiakim's reign. After the battle of Carcemies
Nebuchadnezzar came into Palestine as one of the
Egyptian tributary kings, the capture and robbery
of which was the natural fruit of his victory over
Necho. He found Jehoiakim quite defenseless. After
a short siege he entered Jerusalem, took the king
prisoner, bound him in fetters to carry him to Ba
y lion, and took also some of the precious vessels
of the Temple and carried them to the land of Shinar
to the temple of Bel his god. It was at this time,
in the fourth, or, as Daniel reckons, in the third
year of his reign, that Daniel, and Hananiah,
Mishael, and Azariah, were taken captives to Ba
ylon; but Nebuchadnezzar seems to have changed
his purpose as regarded Jehoiakim, and to have ac
sumed his submission, and reinstated him on the
throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of
his father Josiah. What is certain is, that Jehoi
aked became tributary to Nebuchadnezzar after his
invasion of Judah, and continued so for three years,
until that time broke his resistance to captivity,
and rebelled against him (2 K. xxiv. 1). What moved
or encouraged Jehoiakim to this rebellion it is dif
cult to say, unless it was the rest
less turbulence of his own bad disposition and the
dislike of paying tribute to the king of Babylon,
which he would have rather lavished upon his own
luxury and pride (Jer. xxi. 13-17), for there is
nothing to bear out Winer's conjecture, or Josep
hus's assertion, that there was anything in the
attitude of Egypt at this time to account for such
a step. It seems more probable that, seeing Egypt
entirely severed from the affairs of Syria since the
battle of Carcemies, and the king of Babylon
wholly occupied with distant wars, he hoped to
make himself independent. But whatever was the
motive of this foolish and wicked proceeding, which
was contrary to the repeated warnings of the
prophet Jeremiah, it is certain that it brought

a The words corresponding to "son of Barachias"

b Matt. xxiii. 35 are omitted in the Sinaitic manu
script a prima mansa, and a few other authorities.

[1] It is, however, possible that Jehoiakim vacated the

2 It does not appear from the narrative in 2 K
xxii. (which is the fullest) whether Necho went
straight to Egypt from Jerusalem, or whether the
calamitous campaign on the Euphrates intervened.

It is possible that this diversity of reckoning may
be caused by some reckoning a year for Jehohaz
reign, while some omitted it.
misery and ruin upon the king and his country. Though Nebuchadnezzar was not at that time to come in person to chastise his rebellious vassal, he sent against him numerous bands of Chaldeans, with Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, who were all now subject to Babylon (2 K. xxiv. 7), and who cruelly harassed the whole country. It was perhaps at this time that the great drought occurred described in Jer. xiv. (comp. Jer. xx. 4 with 2 K. xxiv. 2, 3). The closing years of this reign must have been a time of extreme suffering; the Ammonites appear to have overrun the land of Gad (Jer. xiv. 1), and the other neighboring nations to have taken advantage of the helplessness of Israel to ravage their land to the utmost (Ex. xxvii.). There was no rest or safety out of the walled cities. We are not acquainted with the details of the close of the reign. Probably as the time approached for Nebuchadnezzar himself to come against Judaea the desultory attacks and invasions of his troops became more concentrated. Either in an engagement with some of these forces, or else by the hand of his own oppressed subjects, who thought to condescend the Babylonians by the murder of their king, Jehoiakim came to a violent end in the 11th year of his reign. His body was cast out ignominiously on the ground; perhaps thrown over the walls of Jerusalem, in a manner that he was dead; and then, after being left exposed for some time, was dragged away and buried "with the burial of an ass," without pomp or lamentation, "beyond the gates of Jerusalem" (Jer. xxii. 18, 19, xxxvi. 30). Within three months of his death Nebuchadnezzar arrived, and put an end to his dynasty by carrying Jehoiachin off to Babylon. [Jehoiachin.] All the evidences we have of Jehoiachin concur in ascribing to him a vioiy and irreligious character. The writer of 2 Chr. xxii. 37 tells us that "he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," a statement which is repeated xxiv. 9, and 2 Chr. xxxvi. 5. The latter writer uses the yet stronger expression, "the acts of Jehoiakim, and the abominations which he did." (ver. 8.) But it is in the writings of Jeremiah that we have the fullest portrait of him. It is probable, the 14th chapter of Jeremiah belongs to this reign, and have a detailed of the abominations of idolatry practiced at Jerusalem under the king's sanction, with which Ezekiel's vision of what was going on six years later, within the very precincts of the Temple, exactly agrees; incense offered up to "abominable beasts:" "women weeping for Tammuz," and men in the inner court of the Temple "with their backs towards the temple of the Lord," worshipping "the sun towards the east." (Ex. vii.) The vindictive pursuit and murder of Urijah the son of Shemaria, and the indignities offered to his corpse by the king's command, in revenge for his faithful prophesying of evil against Jerusalem and Judah,

"the passage seems to be corrupt. The words χωριωμενων χωριωμενων, to be repeated, the present transit time but one, and ἀποκροτρικαῖς ἀποκροτρικαῖς is a paraphrase of Jeremiah.

[23, 23] άπόκροτρικαῖς και άπόκροτρικαῖς."

35. Nothing can be more improbable than an invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar at this time. All the Syrian possessions of Egypt fell into the power of Babylon soon after the victory at Carchemish, and the king of Egypt retired thenceforth into his own country no more. The Syrian wars seem to have engaged Nebuchadnezzar's attention for the next 7 years; and in like manner the king of Egypt seems to have confined himself to his own boundaries, the first hint we have of Egypt aiming at recovering her lost influence in Syria is at the accession of Pharaoh-Hophra, in the 4th of Zedekiah. [Hammah.] He made several abortive attempts against Nebuchadnezzar in Zede-

Jehoiakim only narrowly escaped the fate of Jer.

xxvi. 20-24). The curious notice of him in 1 Esdr. i. 38, that he put his nobles in chains, and caused Zerubb to his brother in Egypt a and brought him up thence to Jerusalem, also points to his cruelty. His daring impetivity in cutting up and burning the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecy, at the very moment when the national fast was being celebrated, is another specimen of his character, and drew down upon him the sentence, "He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David" (Jer. xxxixi.). His oppression, injustice, covetousness, luxury, and tyranny, are most severely re-

laxed (xxiii. 13-17), and it has been frequently observed, as indicating his thorough selfishness and indifference to the sufferings of his people, that, at a time when the land was so impoverished by the heavy tributes laid upon it by Egypt and Babylon in turn, he should have squandered large sums in building luxurious palaces for himself (xxii. 14, 15). Josephus's history of Jehoiakim's reign is consistent neither with Scripture nor with itself. His account of Jehoiakim's death and Jehoiachin's accesi

appears to be only his own inference from the Scripture narrative. According to Josephus (Ant. x. 6) Nebuchadnezzar came against Judaea in the 8th year of Jehoiakim's reign, and compelled him to pay tribute, which he did for three years, and then revoked in the 11th year, on hearing that the king of Babylon was gone to invade Egypt. b He then inserts the account of Jehoiakim's burning Jeremiah's prophecy, in his 5th year, and con- cludes by saying, that a little time afterwards the king of Babylon made an expedition against Jehoi-

akim, who admitted Nebuchadnezzar into the city. upon certain conditions, which Nebuchadnezzar immediately broke: that he slew Jehoiakim and the flower of the citizens, and sent 3,400 captives to Babylon, and set up Jehoiachin for king, but least the young king should avenge his father's death, and so sent back his army to besiege Jerusalem; that Jehoiakim, being a man of just and gentle disposition, did not like to lose the city without regaining on his own account, and therefore surrendered himself, his mother, and kindred, to the king of Babylon's officers on condition of the city suffering no harm; but that Nebuchadnezzar, in direct violation of the conditions, took 10,852 prisoners, and made Zedekiah king in the room of Jehoiachin, whom he kept in custody—a statement the principal portion of which seems to have no foundation whatever in facts. The account given above is derived from the various statements in Scripture, and seems to agree perfectly with the probabilities of Nebuchadnezzar's movements and with what the most recent discoveries have brought to light con- cerning him. [Nebuchadnezzar.] The reign

a The name is sagu.
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Jehoiakim extends from n. c. 609 to b. c. 598, as some reckon, 589.

The name of Jehoiakim appears in a contracted form in JORAIM, a high-priest. A. C. II.

Hardly any single act of Jehoiakim reveals so much of his own character and that of his times as his burning of Jeremiah's "roll." It was the "roll," on which Baruch, the prophet's amanuensis, and the scribe of his drudges, had written the warnings uttered by Jeremiah, to arouse the king and nobles to a sense of their danger. An attempt was made to read these warnings to the people, on one of the public fasts. "On that day," as Stanley describes the scene, "a wintry day in December, Baruch appeared in the chamber of a friendly noble, Gemariah, the son of Shaphan, which was apparently over the new gateway already mentioned. There, from the window or balcony of the chamber, or from the platform or pillar on which the kings had stood on solemn occasions, he recited the long alteration of lament and inventive to the vast congregation assembled for the national fast. Miciah, the son of his host, alarmed by what he heard, descended the Temple hill, and communicated it to the princes who, as usual through these disturbed reigns, were seated in council in the palace in the apartments of the chief secretary. One of them, Jehudi, the descendant of a noble house, acted apparently as an agent or spokesman of the rest, and was sent to summon Baruch to their presence. He sat down in the attitude of an eastern teacher (Jer. xxxvi. 13, comp. Luke iv. 20), and as he went on his recital struck terror into the hearts of his hearers. They saw his drudges; they charged him and his master to conceal themselves, and deposited the sacred scroll in the chamber where they had heard it, whilst they announced to the fierce and lawless king its fearful contents. A third time it was recited — this time not by Baruch, but by the courtier Jehudi — to the king as he sat warming himself over the charcoal brazier, with his princes standing round him. Three or four columns exhausted the royal patience. He seized a knife, such as eastern scribes wear for the sake of erasures, cut the parchment into strips, and threw it into the brazier till it was burnt to ashes. Those who had heard from their fathers of the effect produced on Josiah by the recital of the warnings of Deuteronomy, might well be startled at the contrast. None of those well-known signs of astonishment and grief were seen; neither king nor attendants rent their clothes. It was an outrage long remembered. Baruch, in his hiding-place, was overwhelmed with despair (Jer. xlv. 3) at this failure of his mission. But Jeremiah had now ceased to waver. He bade his timid disciples take up the pen, and record once more the terrible messages. The country was doomed. It was only individuals who could be saved.

But the divine oracle could not be destroyed in the destruction of its outward framework. It was the new form of the vision of the 'Flash burning, but not consumed'; a sacred book, the form in which Divine truths were now first beginning to be known, burnt as sacred books have been burnt again and again, in the persecutions of the fourth or of the sixteenth century, yet multiplied by that very cause: springing from the flames to do their work, living in the voice and life of men, even when their outward letter seemed to be lost. Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah, who wrote therein the mouth of Jeremiah. And the king, which Jehoiakim, the king of Judah, had burned in the fire, and there were added besides unto them many like words (Jer. xxxvi. 32). In this record of the prophet's feeling, thus emphasized by his own repetition, is contained the germ of the 'Liberty of Unlicensed Printing,' the inextinguishable vitality of the written word. (History of the Jewish Church, ii. 291 ff.)

JEHOARIB (Jer. xxvii. 20). 1 Chr. ix. 10, xxiv. 7, only; elsewhere, both in Hebrew and A. V., the name is abbreviated to JOARIB (Jehorib a defender): 'Isepiai [N. of Isepiai, Isepiai, A. J. 'Isepiai and Irepia; Jorib], head of the first of the 24 courses of priests, according to the arrangement of King David (1 Chr. xxiv. 7). Some of his descendants returned from the Babylonish Captivity, as we learn from 1 Chr. ix. 10, Neh. xi. 10. [JEZIRAH]. Their chief in the days of Josiah the son of Jehosua was Mattenai (Neh. xii. 6, 10). They were probably of the house of Eleazar. To the course of Josiah belonged the Asmonean family (1 Macc. ii. 1), and Josephus, as he informs us (Ant. xii. 6, § 1, and Life, § 1). [HIGH-PRIEST]. Prideaux indeed (Connection, i. 129), following the Jewish tradition, affirms that only 4 of the courses returned from Babylon, Eleazar, Immer, Pashur, and Harim — for which last, however, the Babylonian Talmud has Jorib — because these 4 only are enumerated in Ex. ii. 30-39, Neh. vii. 39-42. And he accounts for the omission of other courses, as of Jorib (1 Macc. ii. 1), and Abiah (Luke i. 5), by saying that those 4 courses were subdivided into 6 each, so as to keep up the old number of 24, which took the names of the original courses, though not really descended from them. But this is probably an invention of the Jews, to account for the mention of only these 4 families of priests in the list of Ex. ii. and Neh. vii. And however difficult it may be to say with certainty why only those 4 courses are mentioned in that particular list, we have the positive authority of 1 Chr. ix. 10, and Neh. xi. 10, for asserting that Jorib did return; and we have two other lists of courses, one of the time of Nehemiah (Neh. x. 2-8), the other of Zerubbabel (Neh. xii. 1-7); the former enumerating 21, the latter 22 courses; and the latter naming Jorib as one of them, and adding, at ver. 19, the name of the chief of the course of Jorib in the days of Josiah. So that there can be no reasonable doubt that Jorib did return. The notion of the Jews does not receive any confirmation from the statement in the Latin version of Josephus (Cont. Apion. ii. § 8), that there were 4 courses of priests, as it is a manifest corruption of the text of 39 as Whiston and others have shown (Notes of Life of Josephus, § 1). The subjoined table gives the three lists of courses which

---

\[a\] It is, however, very singular that the names after Shemaiah in Neh. xii. 6, including Jorib and Jediah, have the appearance of being added on to the previous names; the last name in each list, which ended with Shemaiah, as "Jos that in Neh. x. 2-5. For Jorib's is introduced with the copula and; it is quite out of its right place in the list.
returned, with the original list in David's time to compare them by: —

COURSES OF PRIESTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In David's reign,</th>
<th>In list in Ezr. ii., Neh. vii.</th>
<th>In Nehemiah's time, Neh. x.</th>
<th>In Zerubbabel's time, Neh. xii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Elizaphiah.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dishebath.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bilgah.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hizir.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Akesib.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pezahiah.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Jessek.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Gareb.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Deliah.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The courses which cannot be identified with the original ones, but which are enumerated as existing after the return, are as follows: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neh. x.</th>
<th>Neh. xii.</th>
<th>Neh. xii., 1 Chr. ix.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serahah.</td>
<td>Serahah. (Serahah)</td>
<td>Serahah (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah.</td>
<td>Jeremiah.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashur.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah.</td>
<td>Obadiah.</td>
<td>Obadiah (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillon.</td>
<td>Gillon.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshullam.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallu.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanka.</td>
<td>Amanka.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilkiah.</td>
<td>Hilkiah.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehiel (2).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For some account of the courses, see Lewis’s Orig. Heb: bk. ii. ch. vii.

In Ezra the name is given Johiab.

A. C. II.

JEHONADAB, and JONADAB (the longer form, לֶוֶת יְהוֹנָדָב לֶוֶת יְהוֹנָדָב; is employed in 2 K. x. and 1 Chr. xxv. 8, 14, 16, 18; the shorter one, לֶוֶת יְהוֹנָדָב; in Jer. xxxvii. 4, 6, 10, 19) [Jehovah makes, Ges.]:

Jehovah is mentioned by the name of Jehoahaz, the son of Rechab, founder of the Rechabites. It appears from 1 Chr. ii. 56, that his father or ancestor Rechab ("the rider") belonged to a branch of the Kenites: the Arabian tribe which entered Palestine with the Israelites. One settlement of them was to be found in the extreme north, under the chieftainship of Heber (Judg. iv. 11), retaining their Bedouin customs under the oak which derived its name from their nomadic habits. The main settlement was in the south. Of these, one branch had nestled in the cliffs of Euegeli (Judea: i. 16; Num. xxiv. 21). Another had returned to the frontier of their native wilderness on the south of Judah (Judg. i. 16). A third was established, under a fourfold division, at or near the town of Jabesh in Judah (1 Chr. ii. 55). To these last belonged Rechab and his son Jehoahaz. The Bedouin habits, which were kept up by the other branches of the Kenite tribe, were inculcated by Jehovah, and the utmost minute-ness on his descendants; the more so, perhaps, from their being brought into closer connection with the inhabitants of the settled districts. The vow or rule which he prescribed to them is preserved to us: "Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons for ever. Neither shall ye build houses, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye be strangers" (Jer. xxxv. 6, 7). This life, partly monastic, partly Bedouin, was observed with the tendency which from generation to generation such customs are continued in Arab tribes; and when, many years after the death of Jehovah, the Rechabites (as they were called from his father) were forced to take refuge from the Chaldaean invasion within the walls of Jerusalem, nothing would induce them to transgress the rule of their ancestor: and in consequence a blessing was pronounced upon him and them by the prophet Jeremiah (xxxv. 19): "Jehonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." [Rechabites.]

Bearing in mind this general character of Jehovah as an Arab chief, and the founder of a half-religious sect, perhaps in connection with the austere Elijah, and the Nazarites mentioned in Amos ii. 11 (as Ewald, Afterbester, pp. 92, 93), we are the better able to understand the single occasion on which he appears before us in the historical narrative.

Jehu was advancing, after the slaughter of Bethon, on the city of Samaria, when he suddenly met the austere Beduin coming towards him (2 K. x. 15). It seems that they were already known to each other (Jos. Ant. ix. 6, § 6). The king was in his chariot; the Arab was on foot. It is not clear, from the present state of the text, which was the first to speak. The Hebrew text— followed by the A. V. — implies that the king blessed (A. V., "saluted") Jehonadab. The LXX. and Josephus (Ant. ix. 6, § 6) imply that Jehonadab blessed the king. Each would have its peculiar appropriateness. The king then proposed their close union — "Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart"? The answer of Jehonadab is slightly varied. In the Hebrew text he vehemently replies — "It is, it is: give me thine hand." In the LXX., and in the A. V., he replies simply, "It is;" and Jehu now rejoins them hands, "If it be so, give me thine hand." The hand, whether of Jehonadab or Jehu, was offered and grasped. The king lifted him up to the edge of the chariot, apparently that he might whisper his secret into his ear, and said, "Come with me, and see my zeal for Jehovah." It was the first indication of Jehu's design upon the wor
JEHONATHAN

ship of Baal, for which he perceived that the stern zealot would be a fit coadjutor. Having intrusted him with the secret, he (lxx.) or his attendants (Heb. and A. V.) caused Jehonadab to proceed with him to Samaria in the royal chariot.

So completely had the worship of Baal become the national religion, that even Jehonadab was able to conceal his purpose under the mask of conformity. No doubt a great number had started with Jehonadab out; but the only occasion on which he is expressly mentioned is when (probably from his previous knowledge of the secret worshippers of Jehovah) he went with Jehu through the temple of Baal to turn out any that there might happen to be in the mass of Pagan worshippers (2 K. x. 23). [Jehu.] This is the last we hear of him.

A. P. S.

JEHONATHAN (יהונתן) [jehom Jehovah gave = his gift]: 'Toradav: Jonathan], the more accurate rendering of the Hebrew name, which is most frequently given in the A. V. as JONATHAN.

It is ascribed to three persons:—

1. Son of Uzziah; superintendent of certain of king David's storehouses (הנהנ traditions = treasures) earlier in the verse, and in 27, 28 "cells";) 1 Chr. xxvii. 23. 2. One of the Levites who were sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah to teach the people (2 Chr. xvii. 8). 3. [Vat. Alex. FA.] omit. A priest (Neh. xii. 18); the representative of the family of Shemaiah (ver. 6), when Joakim was high-priest, that is in the next generation after the return from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

JEHORAM (יהורם = exalted by Jehovah: 'Torad: Joseph, 'ta'orups: Jorʾim). The name is more often found in the contracted form of JORAM. 1. Son of Ahaziah of Israel, who succeeded his brother Ahaziah (who had no son) upon the throne at Samaria, n. c. 899, and died n. c. 884. During the first four years of his reign he contemporary on the throne of Judah was Jehoshaphat, and for the next seven years and upwards Joram the son of Jehosaphat, and for the last year, or portion of a year, Ahaziah the son of Joram, who was killed the same day that he was (2 K. ix. 27). The alliance between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, commenced by his father and Jehoshaphat, was very close throughout his reign.

We first find him associated with Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom, at that time a tributary of the kingdom of Judah, in a war against the Moabites. Meshah, their king, on the death of Ahab, had revolted from Israel, and refused to pay the customary tribute of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams. Jorʾam asked and obtained Jehoshaphat's help to reduce him to his obedience, and accordingly the three kings, of Israel, Judah, and Edom, marched through the wilderness of Edom to attack him. The three armies were in the utmost danger of perishing for want of water. The piety of Jehoshaphat suggested an inquiry of some prophet of Jehovah, and Elisha the son of Shaphat, at that time and since the latter part of Ahah's reign Elijah's attendant (2 K. iii. 11; 1 K. xix. 19-21), was found with the host. [Elisha 3, vol. i. p. 717.] From him Jehoram received a severe rebuke, and was bid to inquire of the prophets of his father and mother, the prophets of Baal. Nevertheless for Jehoshaphat's sake Elisha inquired of Jehovah, and received the promise of an abundant supply of water, and of a great victory over the Moabites; promise which was immediately fulfilled.

The same water which, filling the valley, and the trenches dug by the Israelites, supplied the whole army and all their cattle with drink, appeared to the Moabites, who were advancing, like blood, when the morning sun shone upon it. Concluding that the allies had fallen out and slain each other, they marched slowly enough to the attack, and were put to the rout. The allies pursued them and sent great slaughter into their own land, which they utterly ravaged and destroyed with all its cities. Kirha-raseth alone remained, and there the king of Moab made his last stand. An attempt to break through the besieging army having failed, he resorted to the desperate expedient of offering up his eldest son, the heir to his throne, as a burnt-offering, upon the wall of the city, the sight of the enemy. Upon this the Israelites retired and returned to their own land (2 K. iii.). It was perhaps in consequence of Elisha's rebuke, and of the above remarkable deliverance granted to the allied armies according to his word, that Jehoram, on his return to Samaria, put away the image of Baal which Ahab his father had made (2 K. iii. 2). For in 2 K. iv. we have an evidence of Elijah's being on friendly terms with Jehoram, in the offer made by him to speak to the king in favor of the Shunammite. The impression on the king's mind was probably strengthened by the subsequent incident of Nahum's cure, and the temporary cessation of the invasions of the Syrians, which doubtless resulted from it (2 K. v.). Accordingly when, a little later war broke out between Syria and Israel, we find Elisha befriending Jehoram. The king was made acquainted by the prophet with the secret councils of the king of Syria, and was thus enabled to defeat them; and on the other hand, when Elisha had led a large band of Syrian soldiers whom God had blinded, into the midst of Samaria, Jehoram reverently asked him, "My father, shall I smite them?" and, at the prophet's bidding, not only forbore to kill them, but made a feast for them, and then sent them home unhurt. This procured another cessation from the Syrian invasions for the Israelites (2 K. vi. 23). What happened after this to change the relations between the king and the prophet, we can only conjecture. But putting together the general bad character given of Jehoram (2 K. iii. 2, 3) with the fact of the prevalence of Baal-worship at the end of his reign (2 K. x. 21, 28), it seems probable that when the Syrian invasions ceased, and he felt less dependent upon the aid of the prophet, he relapsed into idleness, and was rebuked by Elisha, and threatened with a return of the calamities from which he had escaped. Refusing to repent, a fresh invasion by the Syrians, and a close siege of Samaria, actually came to pass, according probably to the word of the prophet. Hence, when the terrible incident arose, in consequence of a famine, of a woman having slain her own child, the king immediately attributed the evil to Elisha the son of Shaphat, and determined to take away his life. The message which he sent by the messenger whom he commissioned to cut off the prophet's head, "Behold this evil is from Jehovah, why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" coupled with the fact of his having on sackcloth at the time (2 K. vi. 30, 31), indicates that many misfortunes and warnings, similar to those given by Jeremiah to the kings of his day, had passed between the prophet and the weak
and unstable son of Ahabs. The providential interposition by which both Elisha's life was saved and the city delivered, is narrated 2 K. vii. viii. Jehoram appears to have returned to friendly feelings towards Elisha (2 K. viii. 4). His life, however, was now drawing near to its close. It was very soon after the above events that Elisha went to Damascus, and predicted the revolt of Hazael, and his accession to the throne of Syria in the room of Benhadad; and it was during Elisha's absence, probably, that the conversation between Jehoram and Gideon appeared in the vision of the Shunammite for did not begin to reign till the fifth of Jehoram (2 K. viii. 16); and it seems highly probable that the note of time in 2 K. i. 17, "in the second year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat," which is obviously and certainly out of its place where it now is, properly belongs to the narrative in ch. ii. With regard to the other discordant dates at this epoch, it must suffice to remark that all attempts to reconcile them are vain. That which is based upon the supposition of Joram having been associated with his father in the kingdom for three or seven years, is of all perhaps the most unfortunate, as being utterly inconsistent with the history, annihilating his independent reign, and after all failing to produce even a verbal consistency. The table given below is intended on the supposition that Jehoshaphat's reign really lasted only 8 years, and Ahaziah only 2 as years from the texts cited; that the statement that Jehoshaphat reigned 25 years is caused by the probable circumstance of his having taken part in the government during the three last years of Asa's reign, when his father was incapacitated by the disease in his feet (2 Chr. xvi. 12); and that three years were then added to Ahaziah's reign, to make the whole number of the years of the kings of Israel agree with the whole number of these of the kings of Judah, thus unduly lengthened by an addition of three years to Jehoshaphat's reign. This arrangement, it is believed, reconciles the greatest number of existing texts, agrees best with history, and especially coincides with what is the most certain of all the elements of the chronology of this time, namely, that the twelve years' reign of Jehoram son of Ahab, and the few months' reign of Ahaziah, the successor of Joram son of Jehoshaphat, ended simultaneously at the accession of Jehu.

KINGS OF ISRAEL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz (reigned 19 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram (reigned 14 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xiv. 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 23 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xiv. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah (reigned 3 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xvi. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KINGS OF JUDAH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 22 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat (reigned 21 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xix. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 23 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisha (reigned 20 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xix. 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram (reigned 3 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram (reigned 12 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jehoram, 2d (reigned 6 yrs.)

Jehoshaphat (reigned 22 yrs.)

Ahab (reigned 22 yrs.)

Ahaziah (reigned 3 yrs.)

Jehoram (reigned 3 yrs.)

Jehoram (reigned 12 yrs.)

Ahaziah (reigned 2 yrs.)

2. [In 2 Chr. xxi. 1, Rom. 1. 10, 11, but 1. xiv. 10, 15, as elsewhere.] Elisha son of Jehoshaphat, succeeded his father on the throne of Judah.

order of time to ch. iii., or that, though the raising from the dead of the Shunammite's son was subsequent to it, it probably was not the only effect; and therefore all the preliminary circumstances related in ch. iv. were so likewise. Neither again does the expression (2 K. iii. 11), "Here is Elisha," which poured water on the hands of Elijah," imply that this ministration had at that time ceased, and still less that Elijah was removed from the earth. We learn, on the contrary, from 2 Cor. xxi. 12, that he was still on earth in the reign of Jehoram. (See Jas. vii. 16.) This, and the supposition of Jehoram's son of Jehoshaphat who did not begin to reign till the fifth of Jehoram (2 K. viii. 16); and it seems highly probable that the note of time in 2 K. i. 17, "in the second year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat," which is obviously and certainly out of its place where it now is, properly belongs to the narrative in ch. ii. With regard to the other discordant dates at this epoch, it must suffice to remark that all attempts to reconcile them are vain. That which is based upon the supposition of Joram having been associated with his father in the kingdom for three or seven years, is of all perhaps the most unfortunate, as being utterly inconsistent with the history, annihilating his independent reign, and after all failing to produce even a verbal consistency. The table given below is intended on the supposition that Jehoshaphat's reign really lasted only 8 years, and Ahaziah only 2 as years from the texts cited; that the statement that Jehoshaphat reigned 25 years is caused by the probable circumstance of his having taken part in the government during the three last years of Asa's reign, when his father was incapacitated by the disease in his feet (2 Chr. xvi. 12); and that three years were then added to Ahaziah's reign, to make the whole number of the years of the kings of Israel agree with the whole number of these of the kings of Judah, thus unduly lengthened by an addition of three years to Jehoshaphat's reign. This arrangement, it is believed, reconciles the greatest number of existing texts, agrees best with history, and especially coincides with what is the most certain of all the elements of the chronology of this time, namely, that the twelve years' reign of Jehoram son of Ahab, and the few months' reign of Ahaziah, the successor of Joram son of Jehoshaphat, ended simultaneously at the accession of Jehu.

Kings of Israel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 22 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram (reigned 14 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xiv. 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 23 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisha (reigned 20 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xix. 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram (reigned 3 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram (reigned 12 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah (reigned 2 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kings of Judah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 22 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat (reigned 21 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xix. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab (reigned 23 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisha (reigned 20 yrs.)</td>
<td>2 K. xix. 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram (reigned 3 yrs.)</td>
<td>1st yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram (reigned 12 yrs.)</td>
<td>30th yr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ahaziah (reigned 2 yrs.) 1st yr.

2. [In 2 Chr. xxi. 1, Rom. 1. 10, 11, but 1. xiv. 10, 15, as elsewhere.] Elisha son of Jehoshaphat, succeeded his father on the throne of Judah.
JEHOASHABEATH

*JEHOSHABEATH* ([רעהב] [perh. sweeter by Jehovih, i.e. his worshippers]: *Iowaab-* *Beeth; *Vat. Iowaabeet.* *Alex. Iowaabub: Josaboth*), the form in which the name of JEHOSHABEATH is given in 2 Chr. xxii. 11. We are here informed, what is not told us in Kings, that she was the wife of Jehoada the high-priest.

JEHOASHAPAT ([ירעהב] [Jehorah is judge]: *Iowaab: Josaphat*). 1. The son of Azariah and Azubah, succeeded to the throne n. c. 914, when he was 32 years old, and reigned 25 years. His history is to be found among the events recorded in 1 K. xv. 34; 2 K. viii. 16, or in a continuous narrative in 2 Chr. xxi. i-xxi. 3. He was contemporary with Abah, Abashah, and Jehoram. At first he strengthened himself against Israel by bribing and garrisoning the cities of Judah and the Ephraimitish conquas of Asa. But soon after, when he was son Jehoram, who was Jehoshaphat's brother, they being common danger from Damascus and the tribes on their eastern frontier, came to an understanding. Israel and Judah drew together for the first time since they parted at Shechem sixty years previously. Jehoshaphat's eldest son Jehoram married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. His marriage was not in accordance with the Levitical laws, and he did not appear how far Jehoshaphat encouraged that ill-starred union. The closeness of the alliance between the two kings is shown by many circumstances: Athaliah's reluctance when in exile to set foot within the territory of Judah (2 Kings, xii. 26-33); the identity of names given to the children of the two royal families; the admission of names compounded with the name of Jehovah into the family of Jezreel, the zealous worshipper of Baal; and the extreme acerbity with which Jehoshaphat afterwards accompanied Ahab to the field of battle.

But in his own kingdom Jehoshaphat ever showed himself a zealous follower of the commandments of God: he tried, it would seem not quite successfully, to put down the high places and the groves in which the people of Judah burnt incense. In his third year, apprehending perhaps the evil example of Israel and foreign idolatry, and considering that the Levites were not fulfilling satisfactorily their function of teaching the people, Jehoshaphat sent out a commission of certain princes, priests, and Levites, to go through the cities of Judah, teaching the people out of the Book of the Law. He made a generous provision for each of his sons as they grew up, perhaps with a foreboding of their melancholy end (2 Chr. xxi. 4). Riches and honors increased around him. He received tribute from the Philistines and Aramans; and kept up a large standing army in Jerusalem.

It was probably about the 16th year of his reign (n. c. 898) when he went to Samaria to visit Ahab and to become his ally in the great battle of Ramoth-gilead—not very decisive in its result, though fatal to Ahab. From thence Jehoshaphat returned to Jerusalem in peace; and, after receiving a rebuke from the prophet Jehu, went himself through the people "from Beer-sheba to Mount Ephraim," reclaiming them to the law of God. He also took measures for the better administration of justice throughout his dominions; on which see Selden, *De Synodis* ii. cap. 8, §4. Turning his attention to the religious duties, he built Ezion-geber, with the help of Ahaziah, a navy designed to go to Tarshish: but, in accordance with a prediction of a prophet, Eliezer, it was wrecked at Ezion-geber; and Jehoshaphat resisted Ahaziah's proposal to renew their joint attempt.

Before the close of his reign he was engaged in two additional wars. He was miraculously delivered from a threatened attack of the people of Ammon, Moab, and Seir; the result of which is thought by some critics to be celebrated in Ps. 48 and 92, and to be alluded to by the prophet Joel, iii. 2, 12. After this, perhaps, must be dated the war which Jehoshaphat, in conjunction with Jehoram king of Israel and the king of Edom, carried on against the rebellious king of Moab (2 K. iii.). After this the realm of Jehoshaphat was quiet. In his declining years the administration of affairs was placed (probably n. c. 901) in the hands of his son Jehoram, who was able to defend the land against foreign attack, and to mediate between the tribes of Judah and the Ephraimites. But when the more pressing danger of Damascus and the tribes on their eastern frontier came to an understanding, Israel and Judah drew together for the first time

---

*Geuenius and Professor Newman are of opinion that the narratives in 2 K. iii. and 2 Chr. xx. relate to one event. Their view has been successfully opposed by Keil and Movers in Germany, and by the Rev. H. Browne, *Unda Sacrorum,* p. 335.*
contact, we cannot describe the character of this good king without a mixture of blame. Emissarily
pious, gentle, just, devoted to the spiritual and
temporal welfare of his subjects, active in mind
and body, he was wanting in firmness and consis-
tency. His character has been carefully sketched
in a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Kessey, *Biographies
of the Kings of Judah*, ii.

2. [*Isaiah*, 6:1]. Alex. in 2 Sam. viii. i6.

Joel. [Son of Ahilod, who filled the office of
recorder or annalist in the court of David (2 Sam.
viii. 16, &c.), and afterwards of Solomon (1 K. iv.
3). Such officers are found not only in the courts
of the Hebrew kings, but also in those of ancient
and modern Persia, of the Eastern Roman Empire
(Gesenius), of China, etc. (Keil). An instance of
the use made of their writings is given in Easht.
vi. 1

3. One of the priests who, in the time of David
(1 Chr. xv. 24), were appointed to blow trumpets
before the ark in its transit from the house of
Obed-Edom to Jerusalem.

4. [Rom. Vat. omit; Alex. *Isaiah*]. Son of
Paruah; one of the twelve purveyors of King Sol-
omon (1 K. iv. 17). His district was Issachar,
from whence, at a stated season of the year, he
collected such taxes as were paid in kind, and sent
them to the king's court.

5. [*Isaiah*, Vat. om.]. Son of Nimshi, and
father of king Jehu (2 K. iv. 2, 14). W. T. B.

JEHOUSHAPAT, VALLEY OF (יהוֹשֶׁפאת)
[valley where Jehovah judges]; Koldai
*Isaiah* (Tallis Josephat), a valley mentioned by
the prophet Joel only, as the spot in which, after
the return of Judah and Jerusalem from captivity,
Jehovah would gather all the heathen Joel iii. 2;
Heb. iv. 2, and would there sit to judge them for
their misdeeds to Israel (iii. 12; Heb. v. 4). The
passage is one of great boldness, ascending in the
verbal turns in which Hebrew poetry so much de-
lights, and in particular there is a play between
the name given to the spot — Jehoshapat, i. e. "Je-
hovah's judgment," and the "judgment" there to
be pronounced. The Hebrew prophets often refer
to the ancient glories of their nation: thus Isaiah
speaks of the "day of Micah," and of the triumphs
of David and of Joshua in "Mount Perazim," and
in the "Valley of Gideon:" and in like manner
Joel, in announcing the vengeance to be taken
on the strangers who were annoying his country (iii.
14), seems to have glanced back to that triumphant
day when king Jehoshapat, the greatest king the
nation had seen since Solomon, and the greatest
champion of Jehovah, led out his people to a valley
in the wilderness of Tekoa, and was there blessed
with such a victory over the hordes of his enemies
as was without a parallel in the national records
(2 Chr. xx.).

But though such a reference to Jehoshapat
is both natural and characteristic, it is not certain
that it is intended. The name may be only an
imaginary one conferred on a spot which existed
nowhere but in the vision of the prophet. Such
was the view of some of the ancient translators.

Thus Theodotion renders it γάναι επιεικείας; and
so the Targum of Jonathan — "the plain of the
division of judgment." Michaelis (Ribe für Un-
gelehrten, Remarks on Joel) takes a similar view,
and considers the passage to be a prediction of the
Maccabean victories. By others, however, the
prophet has been supposed to have had the end of
the world in view. And not only this, but the
scene of "Jehovah's judgment" has been localized,
and the name has come down to us attached to the
deep ravine which separates Jerusalem from the
Mount of Olives, through which at one time the
Kedron forced its stream. At what period the
name was first applied to this spot is not known.
There is no trace of it in the Bible or in Josephus.
In both the only name used for this gorge is Kir-
ron (N. T. Codex). We first encounter its new
title in the middle of the 4th century in the
*Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (art. Calus),
and in the Commentary of the latter father on
Joel. Since that time the name has been recog-
nized and adopted by travellers of all ages and all
faiths. It is used by Christians — as Arnulfl at
700 (Everett Tetr. i. 4), the author of the *Ciz de
Hermesiole* in 1187 (Rob. ii. 592), and Mansfield
in 1607 (Ever. Tetr. p. 490); and by Jews — as
Benjamin of Tudela about 1170 (Asher, i. 71; and
see Rekud, p. 556). By the Moslems it is still
said to be called Wadi Jishefet (Seetzen, ii. 23, 26),
or Shoafat, though the name usually given to
the valley is Wadi Silt-Maryam. Both Mos-
lems and Jews believe that the last judgment is
to take place there. To find a grave there is the
desire of the latter (Briins, Heathen and Holy
Lands, p. 290), and the former show — as they have
done for certainly two centuries — the place on
which Mohammed is to be seated at the Last
Judgment, a stone jutting out from the east wall
of the Haram area near the south corner, one of
the pillars which once adorned the churches of
Helena or Justinian, and of which mutilations are
now imbedded in the rude masonry of the more
modern mosque and buildings. The steep sides of
the ravine, wherever a level strip allows the opportu-
nity, are crowded — in places almost paved — by
the sepultures of the Moslems, or the simpler shas
of the Jewish tombs, alike awaiting the assembly
of the Last Judgment.

So narrow and precipitous a] a glen is quite un-
suited for such an event; but this inconsistency
does not appear to have disturbed those who
framed or those who held the tradition. It is how-
ever implied in the Hebrew terms employed in the
two cases. That by Joel is *Enmek* (אֶ-
נְמָק), a word applied to spacious valleys, such as those of Es-
drachen or Gileon (Stanley, N. & P. App. § 1).
On the other hand the ravine of the Kidron is in-
vitably designated by *Nachal* (גַָנָּה) answering
b St. Cyril of Alexandria] either did not know the
spot, or has another valley in his eye; probably the
former. He describes it as not many stadia from
Jerusalem; and says he is told (φησι) that it is "bare
and apt for horses" (ψάραι καὶ ἑρμομένη. Comm. on
Joel, quoted by Rekud, p. 336). Perhaps this indi-
cates that the tradition was not at that time quite
fixed.
and this fact alone would warrant the inference that the tradition of the identity of the Emek of Jehoshaphat with the Valley of the Kerdonan, and not vice versa until Hebrew had begun to define a dead language. A. The grounds on which it did arise were probably two: (1.) The frequent mention throughout this passage of Joel of Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple (ii. 32; iii. 1, 6, 16, 17, 18), may have led to the belief that the locality of the great judgment would be in their immediate neighborhood. This would be assisted by the mention of the Mount of Olives in the somewhat similar passage in Zechariah (xiv. 3, 4).

(2.) The belief that Christ would reappear in judgment on the Mount of Olives, from which He had ascended. This was at one time a received article of Christian belief, and was grounded on the words of the Angels, "He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." A (Adrichonius, Theatr. Ter. Suntet, Jerusalem, § 192; Corn. d' Lapidé, on Acts i.)

(3.) There is the alternative that the Valley of Jehoshaphat was really an ancient name of the Valley of the Kerdon, and that from the name, the connection with Joel's prophecy, and the belief in its being the scene of Jehoval's last judgment have followed. This may be so; but then we should expect to find some trace of the existence of the name before the 4th century after Christ. It was certainly used as a burying-place as early as the reign of Josiah (2 K. xxii. 6), but no inference can fairly be drawn from this.

But whatever originated the tradition, it has held its ground most firmly. (a) In the valley itself, one of the four remarkable monuments which exist at the foot of Olivet was at a very early date connected with Jehoshaphat. At Arculf's visit (about 700) the name appears to have been borne by that now called "Absalom's tomb," but then the "tower of Jehoshaphat." (Enc. Trac. p. 4).

In the time of Maunder the "tomb of Jehoshaphat" was, what it still is, an excavation, with an architectural front, in the face of the rock behind "Absalom's tomb." A tolerable view of this is given in plate 33 of Munk's Palæstina, and a photograph by Salzmann, with a description in the Texte (p. 31) to the same. The name may, as already observed, really point to Jehoshaphat himself, though not to his tomb, as he was buried like the other kings in the city of David (2 Chr. xxxi. 1). (b)

One of the gates of the city in the east wall, opening on the valley, bore the same name. This is plain from the Cité de Jérusalem, where the Porte de Jofia is said to have been a "postern" close to the golden gateway (Porte d'Or), and to the south of that gate (pars devers mids; § iv., near the end, Rob. ii. 559). It was therefore at or near the small walled-up doorway, to which M. de Saulcy has restored the name of the Porte de Joseph, and which is but a few feet to the south of the golden gateway. However this may be, this

**postern** is evidently of later date than the wall in which it occurs, as some of the enormous stones of the wall have been cut through to admit it; and so far, therefore, it is a witness to the date of the tradition being subsequent to the time of Herod, by whom this wall was built. It is probably the "little gate" leading down by steps to the valley," of which Arculf speaks (Early Trac.). Benjamin of Tudela (1163) also mentions the gate of Jehoshaphat, but without any nearer indication of its position than that it led to the valley and the monuments (Aher, i. 71). (c) Lastly, leading to this gate was a street called the street of Jehoshaphat (Cité de J. § vii., Rob. ii. 551).

The name would seem to be generally confined by travellers to the upper part of the glen, from about the "Tomb of the Virgin" to the southeast corner of the wall of Jerusalem. [Tomb.]

* First speaks of the present Valley of Jehoshaphat as on the south of Jerusalem (Húndr., i. 497). That must be an oversight. He thinks that the valley was so named from a victory or victories achieved there by Jehoshaphat over heathen enemies, but that the name was not actually given to the place till after the time of Joel.

The correct view, no doubt, is that the valley to which Joel refers is not one to be sought on any topographical map, of one period of Jerusalem's history or another, but is a name formed to localize an idealized scene. It is an instance of a bold, but truthful figure, to set forth the idea that God's persecuted, suffering people have always in Him an Almighty defender, and that all opposition to His kingdom and His servants must in the end prove vanishing. To convey this teaching the more impressively the prophet represents Jehovah as appointing a time and a place for meeting his enemies; they are commanded to assemble with all their forces, to concentrate, as it were, both their enmity and their power in one single effort of resistance to his purposes and will. They accept the challenge. Jehovah meets them thus united, and making trial of their strength against his omnipotence. The conflict then follows. The irresistible One scatters the adversaries at a single blow; he overwhelms them with horror (iii. 2-17; A. V., and iv. 12-17, Heb.). The prophet calls the scene of this encounter "the Valley of Jehoshaphat," (i. e. where "Jehovah judges"), on account of this display of God's power and justice, and the pledge thus given to his people of the final issue of all their labors and sufferings for his name's sake. With the same import Joel interchanges this expression in ver. 14 with "valley of decision," (ג릇), i. e. of a case decided, judgment declared.

H. JEHOSEPHA [Jehoshaphat, the south, by whom one sweats] C. LXIX. ix.. Joseph. "Iosaphath,(h) daughter of Joram king of Israel, and wife of Jehoahaz the high-priest (2 K. xi. 2). Her name in the Chronicles is given Jaho-
JEHOSHUA

JEHOVAH

SHABATHI. It thus exactly resembles the name of the only two other wives of Jewish priests who are known to us, namely, Elissera (LXX. and N. T. Elissaer, whence our Elisabeth), the wife of Aaron, Ex. vi. 23, and the wife of Zechariah, Luke i. 7. In the former case the word signifies "Jeho-
vah's oath"; in the second "God's oath."

As she is called, 2 K. ii. 2, "the daughter of Jocum, sister of Athaliah," it has been conjectured that she was the daughter, not of Athaliah, but of Joram, by another wife; and Josephus (Ant. i. 7, § 1) calls her Ωχρια ἡ αδελφή τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. This may be; but it is also possible that the omission of Athaliah's name may have been occasioned by the detestation in which it was held — in the same way as modern commentators have, for the same reason, eagerly embraced this hypothesis. That it is not absolutely needed is shown by the fact that the worship of Jehovah was tolerated under the reigns both of Joram and Athaliah — and that the name of Jehovah was incorporated into both of their names.

She is the only recorded instance of the marriage of a princess of the royal house with a high-priest. Only Joram ( xxii. 11) was permitted to be present in the temple on this provisoial occasion ("for she was the sister of Athaliah," 2 Ch. xxii. 11), as inducing and probably enabling her to rescue the infant Josiah from the massacre of his brothers. By her, he and his nurse were concealed in the palace, and afterwards in the Temple (2 K. ii. 2-3; 2 Chr. xxii. 11), where he was brought up probably with her sons (2 Chr. xxii. 11), who assisted at his coronation. One of these was Zechariah, who succeeded her husband in his office, and was afterwards murdered (2 Chr. xxiv. 20). A. P. S.

JEHOVASHUA (יהושוע; [Jehovah a helper]: "I̓ηραός; Josue"). In this form — contracted in the Hebrew, but fully the usual in the A. V. — is given the name of Joshua in Num. xiii. 16, on the occasion of its bestowal by Moses. The addition of the name of Jehovah probably marks the recognition by Moses of the important part taken in the affair of the spies by him, who till this time had been Hoshen, "helper," but henceforward to be Je-hoshua, "help of Jehovah" (Ewshw, i. 306). Once more only the name appears in its full form in the A. V. — this time with a redundant letter — as—

JEHOVAH (the Hebrew is as above: "Iηραός, in both MSS.: Josue"). In the genealogy of Ephram (1 Chr. vii. 27). We should be thankful to the translators of the A. V. for giving the first syllables of this great name their full form, if only in these two cases; though why in these only it is difficult to understand. Nor is it easier to see whence they got the final h in the latter of the two. [The final h is not found in the original edition of the A. V., 1611. — A.]

JEHOVAH (יְהוָּה), usually with the vowel points of יְהוֹוה; but when the two occur together the former is pointed יְהוָָה; that is, with the vowels of יְהוֹוה; as in Odad. i. 1, Hab. iii. 19; 1 the LXX. generally render it by Κύσων, the Vulgate by Dominus; and in this respect they have been followed by the A. V., where it is translated "The Lord". The true pronunciation of this name, by which God was known to the Hebrews, has been entirely lost, the Jews themselves scrupu-

ously avoiding every mention of it, and substituting in its stead one or other of the words with whose proper vowel-points it may happen to be written. This custom, which has its origin in reverence, and has almost degenerated into superstition, was founded upon an erroneous rendering of Lev. xxiv. 16, from which it was inferred that the mere utterance of the name constituted a capital of-

fense. In the rabbinical writings it is distinguished by various euphemistic expressions; as simply "the name," or "the name of four letters" (the Greek tetragrammaton); or "the great and terrible name;" "the perfect name;" i.e. appropriated to God alone; "the separate name," etc. whether the name which is separated or removed from human knowledge, or, as some render, "the name which has been interpreted or revealed" (נְאָנִית, skethumusaphiash). The Samaritans followed the same custom, and in reading the Pentateuch substituted for Jehovah (יְהוָָה, sketha) "the name," at the same time perpetuating the practice in their alphabetical poems and later writings (Geiger, Uerschrift, etc. p. 292). According to Jewish tradition, it was pronounced but once a year by the high-priest on the day of Atonement when he entered the Holy of Holies. At this point there is some doubt. Maimonides (Mor. Neb. i. 61) asserting that the use of the word was con-
fined to the blessings of the priests, and restricted to the sanctuary, without limiting it still further to the high-priest alone. On the same authority we learn that it ceased with Simeon the Just (Ant. c. 14, § 10), having lasted through two genera-
tions, that of the men of the Great Synagogue and the age of Schneid, while others include the generation of Zedekiah among those who possessed the use of the skethumusaphiash (Midrash on Ps. xxxvi. 11, quoted by Buxtorf in Ireland's Deos Exercit.). But even after the destruction of the second temple we meet with instances of individuals who were in possession of the mysteries se-
cet. A certain Bar Kanizaz is mentioned in the Mishna (Yoma, iii. § 11) who was able to write this name in Hebrew; but whether his evidence or such evidence as may conclude that after the siege of Jerusalem the true pronunciation almost if not entirely dis-
appeared, the probability being that it had been lost long before. Josephus, himself a priest, con-

fesses that on this point he was not permitted to speak (Ant. ii. 12, § 4); and Philo states (de Leg. Mos. iii. 519) that for those alone whose ears and tongue were purged by wisdom it was lawful to hear or utter this awful name. It is evident, there-

fore, that no reference to ancient writers can be expected to throw any light upon the question, and any quotation of them will only render the darkness in which it is involved more palpable. At the same time the discussion, though barred of actual results, may on other accounts be interesting; and as it is one in which great names are ranged on both sides, it would for this reason alone be im-
pertinent to dismiss it with a cursory notice. In the decade of dissertations collected by Ewald, Fuller, Gataker, and Lensden do battle for the pro-
nunciation Jehovah, against such formidable antagonists as Perins, Amama, Cappellus, Buxtorf, and Altingus, who, it is scarcely necessary to say, fairly beat their opponents out of the field; the only argument, in fact, of any weight, which has been played by the advocates of the pronunciation of the
word as it is written being that derived from the form in which it appears in proper names, such as Jehovah, Jehovah, etc. Their antagonists make a strong point of the fact that, as has been noticed above, two different sets of vowels are applied to the same consonants under certain circumstances. To this Leusden, of all the champions on his side, but feebly replies. The same may be said of the argument derived from the fact that the letters יוהס, when prefixed to ייוהו, take, not the vowels which they would regularly receive were the present punctuation true, but those with which they would be written if ייוהו, were the reading; and that the letters ordinarily taking דגשׂ לenes when following ייוהו would, according to the rules of the Hebrew points, be written without dagesh, whereas it is uniformly inserted. Whatever, therefore, be the true pronunciation of the word, there can be little doubt that it is not Jehovah.

In Greek writers it appears under the several forms of Ιαω (Diod. Sic. i. 94; Iren. i. 4, § 1), 'Ιαω (Euseb. Præpar. Evang. iii. 9, § 31), ΑΑω (Opp. Alex. Stenom. p. 606), and in a catena to the Pentateuch in a MS. at Turin 'אוה; both Theodoret (Quast. 15 in Exod.) and Epiphanius (Her. xx.) give ΑΑω, the former distinguishing it as the pronunciation of the Samaritans, while Αה represents that of the Jews. But even if these writers were entitled to speak with authority, their evidence only tends to show in how many different ways the four letters of the word ייוהו could be represented in Greek characters, and throws no light either upon its real pronunciation or its punctuation. In like manner Jerome (on Ps. viii.), who acknowledges that the Jews considered it an ineffable name, at the same time says it may be read יָהוּ,—of course, supposing the passage in question to be genuine, which is open to doubt. In the absence, therefore, of anything satisfactory from these sources, there is plainly left a wide field for conjecture. What has been done in this the following pages will show. It will be better perhaps to ascend from the most improbable hypotheses to those which carry with them more show of reason, and thus prepare the way for the considerations which will follow.

I. Von Bohlen, at once most skeptical and most credulous, whose hasty conclusions are only paralleled by the rashness of his assumptions, unequivocally asserts that beyond all doubt the word Jehovah is not Semitic in its origin. Pinning his faith upon the Abraxas genus, in which he finds it in the form Jero, he connects it with the Sanskrit देवस, devo, the Greek Διός, and Latin Jovis or Diius. But, apart from the consideration that his authority is at least questionable, he omits to explain the striking phenomenon that the older form which has the झ should be preserved in the younger languages, the Greek and ancient Latin, while not a trace of it appears in the Hebrew. It would be desirable also that, before a philological argument of this nature can be admitted, the relation between the Semitic and Indo-Germanic languages should be more clearly established. In the absence of this any inferences which may be drawn from apparent resemblances (the resemblance in the present case not being even apparent) will lead to certain error.

That the Hebrews learned the word from the Egyptians is a theory which has found some advocates. The foundations for this theory are sufficiently slight. As has been mentioned above, Diodorus (i. 94) gives the Greek from 'Iah'; and from this it has been inferred that 'Iah was a deity of the Egyptians, whereas nothing can be clearer from the context than that the historian is speaking especially of the God of the Jews. Again, in Macrobius (Sat. i. c. 18), a line is quoted from an oracular response of Apollo Clarius:

Φασέρε τον πάντων ὑπατόν θεόν Ἰησοῦν 'Ιαω, which has been made use of for the same purpose. But Jablonsky (Panth. Ag. ii. § 5) has proved incontrovertibly that the author of the verses from which the above is quoted, was one of the Judaizing Gnostics, who were in the habit of making the names יאא and יסנְד the subjects of mystical speculations. The Egyptians, who were Egyptians, are known to have given the name יאא to the Moon (Neanders, Gnost. 252), but this, as Tholuck suggests, may have arisen from the fact that in Copit the Moon is called יאא (Verm. Schriften, i. 858). Movers (Phön. i. 540), while defending the genuineness of the passage of Macrobius, connects יאא, which denotes the Sun or Dionysus, with the root ייוהו, so that it signifies "the life-giver."

In any case, the fact that the name יאא is found among the Greeks and Egyptians, or among the Orientals of Further Asia, in the 6th or 3rd century, cannot be made use of as an argument that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of the word from any one of these nations. On the contrary, that can be but little doubt that the process in reality was reversed, and that in this case the Hebrews were, not the borrowers, but the lenders. We have indisputable evidence that it existed among them, whatever may have been its origin, many centuries before it is found in other records; of the contrary we have no evidence whatever. Of the singular manner in which the word has been introduced into other languages, we have a remarkable instance in a passage quoted by M. Rémusat, from one of the works of the Chinese philosopher Lao-tseu, who flourished, according to Chinese chronology, about the 6th or 7th century n. c., and hold the opinions commonly attributed to Pythagoras, Plato, and others of the Greeks. This passage M. Rémusat translates as follows: "Celui que vous regardez et que vous ne voyez pas, se nomme Hi; celui que vous écoutez et que vous n'entendez pas, se nomme Hi; ce sont trois êtres qu'on ne peut comprendre, et qui, confondus, n'en font qu'un." In these three letters J H V Rémusat thinks that he recognizes the name Jehovah of the Hebrews, which might have been learnt by the philosopher himself or some of his pupils in the course of his travels; or it might have been brought into China by some exiled Jews or Gnostics. The Chinese interpreter of the passage maintains that these mystical letters signify "the void," so that in his time every trace of the origin of the word had in all probability been lost. And not only does it appear, though perhaps in a questionable form, in the literature of the Chinese. In a letter from the missionary Plissant to the Vicar Apostolic Bouché, dated 18th Feb. 1847, there is mention made of a tradition which existed among a tribe in the jungles of Burmah, that the divine being was called Jora or Karu-Jova, and that the peculiarities
of the Jehovah of the Old Testament were attributed to him (Ricnke, *Beiträge*, iii. 65). But all this is very vague and more curious than convincing. The inscription in front of the temple of Isis at Sais quoted by Plutarch (de Is. et Os. § 9), "I am all that hath been, and that is, and that shall be," which has been employed as an argument to prove that the name Jehovah was known among the Egyptians, is mentioned neither by Herodotus, Diodorus, nor Strabo; and Proclus, who does allude to it, says it was in the admixture of the temple.

But, even if it be genuine, its authority is worthless for the purpose for which it is adduced. For, supposing that Jehovah is the name to which such meaning is attached, it follows rather that the Egyptians borrowed it and learned its significance from the Jews, unless it can be proved that both in Egyptian and Hebrew the same combination of letters conveyed the same idea. Without, however, having recourse to any hypothesis of this kind, the peculiarity of the inscription is sufficiently explained by the place which, as is well known, Isis holds in the Egyptian mythology as the universal mother. The advocates of the Egyptian origin of the name have shown no lack of ingenuity in trying to find in the name itself in connection to their aid authorities the most unpromising. A passage from a treatise on interpretation (προφητευματα, § 71), written by one Demetrius, in which it is said that the Egyptians hymned their gods by means of the seven vowels, has been tortured to give evidence on the point. Scaliger was in doubt whether it referred to Serapis, called by Hesychius "Serapis of seven letters" (τὰ ἑπτά
γράμματα Σαράπις), or to the exclamation τυχερ, "He is Jehovah." Of the latter there can be but little doubt. Gesner took the seven Greek vowels, and arranging them in the order ἹΕΘΟΤΑ, found therein Jehovah. But he was triumphantly refuted by Didymus, who maintained that the vowels were merely used for musical notes, and in this very probable conjecture he is supported by the Milesian inscription elucidated by Hartenberg and others. In this the invocation of God is denoted by the seven vowels five times repeated in different arrangements, ἹΕΘΟΣΑ, ἹΕΘΟΑ, ἹΕΘΟΙ, ἹΕΘΟΕ, ἹΕΘΟΥ: each group of vowels precedes a "holy" (ὅσιά), and the whole concludes with the following: "the city of the Milesians and all the inhabitants are guarded by archangels." Muller, with much probability, concludes that the seven vowels represented the seven notes of the cataract. One more argument for the Egyptian origin of Jehovah remains to be noticed. It is found in the circumstance that Pharaoh changed the name of Eliakim to Jehoiakim (2 K. xxiii. 31), which it is asserted is not in accordance with the practice of conquerors towards the conquered, unless the Egyptian king imposed upon the king of Judah the name of one of his own gods. But the same reasoning would prove that the origin of the word was Babylonian, for the king of Babylon changed the name of Mattaniah to Zedekiah (2 K. xxi. 17).

But many, abandoning as untenable the theory of an Egyptian origin, have sought to trace the name among the Phoenicians and Canaanite tribes. In support of this, Hartmann brings forward a passage from a pretended fragment of Sanchoniatho quoted by Philo Byblius, a writer of the age of Nero. But it is now generally admitted that the so-called fragments of Sanchoniatho, the ancient Phoenician chronicler, are most impudent forgeries concocted by Philo Byblius himself. Besides, the passage to which Hartmann refers is not found in Philo Byblius, but is quoted from Porphyry by Eusebius (*Prep. Evan. i. 9, § 21*), and genuine or not, evidently alludes to the Jehovah of the Jews.

It is there stated that the most trustworthy authority in matters connected with the Jews was Sanchoniatho of Beyrut, who received his information from Hieromades (Joseph. Antiq. x. 3). The priest of the god Tēmōk. From the occurrence of Jehovah as a compound in the proper names of many who were not Hebrews, Hammack (*Misc. Phan. p. 174, &c.*), contends that it must be known among heathen people. But such knowledge, if it existed, was no more than might have been obtained by their necessary contact with the Hebrews. The names of Urijah the Hitite, of Aramah or Arana, and the Jehofer, the Ammonite, and of the cunamitish town Biţjadhjah, may be all explained without having recourse to Hammack's hypothesis. Of as little value is his appeal to 1 K. v. 7, where we find the name Jehovah in the mouth of Hiram, king of Tyre. Apart from the consideration that Hiram would necessarily be acquainted with the name as that of the Hebrews' national god, its occurrence is sufficiently explained by the tenor of Solomon's message (1 K. v. 5–5). Another point on which Hammack relies for support is the name Ἀββαῖος, which occurs as that of a Tyrian suflete in Menander (Joseph. *Ajphon. i. 21*), and which he identifies with Obadiah (יוֹבָדָה). But both Furst and Hengstenberg represent it in Hebrew characters by יַבָּדָה, 'abadah, which even Hammack thinks more probable.

II. Such are the principal hypotheses which have been constructed in order to account for a non-
Hellenic origin of Jehovah. To attribute much value to them requires a large share of faith. It remains now to examine the theories on the opposite side: for on this point authorities are by no means agreed, and have frequently gone to the contrary extreme. S. D. Luzzatto (*Subi. in Jes. Vat. in Rosenmüller's *Compend. xxiv*) advances with singular naivete the extraordinary statement that Jehovah, or rather לִבְדִּית, divided points of, is compounded of two interjections, לִבְדִּית, of pain, and לִבְדִּית, of joy, and denotes the author of good and evil. Such an etymology, from one who is unquestionably among the first of modern Jewish scholars, is a remarkable phenomenon. Ewald, referring to Gen. xix. 24, suggests as the origin of Jehovah, the Arabic אֲבָדָה, which signifies 'height, heaven,' 'a conjecture, of the honor of which no one will desire to rob him. But must have taken for the basis of their explanations, and the different methods of pronunciation which they propose, the passage in Ex. iii. 14, to which we must naturally look for a solution of the question. When Moses received his commission to be the deliverer of Israel, the Almighty, who appeared in the burning bush, communicated to him the name which he should give as the credentials of his mission: 'And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM (Ex. iii. 14), נָאֵל אַהֲבָדָה (shahok abar shahok); and he said, Thus
JEHOVAH

That thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you: That this passage is intended to indicate the etymology of Jehovah, as understood by the Hebrews, no one has ventured to doubt: it is in fact the key to the whole mystery. But, though it certainly supplies the etymology, the interpretation must be determined from other considerations. According to this view then, יְהוָה must be the 3d sing. masc. fut. of the substantive verb יְהֹウェ, the older form of which was יִהֹוָאָה, still found in the Chaldee יַהֹוה, and Syriac יַהֹוה, a fact which will be referred to hereafter in discussing the antiquity of the name. If this etymology be correct, and there seems little reason to call it in question, one step towards the true punctuation and pronunciation is already gained. Many learned men, and among them Grotius, Galatinus, Crusius, and Leusden, in an age when such fancies were rife, imagined that, reading the name with the vowel points usually attached to it, they discovered an indication of the eternity of God in the fact that the name by which He revealed himself to the Hebrews was compounded of the present participle, and the future and preterite tenses of the substantive verb. This derivative verb, as has already been suggested by the expression in Rev. iv. 8 (ד וֹיֶלֶה יַהֹוה יְהֹוה יְהֹוה יִדּוּקֹנָו), and received apparent confirmation from the Targ. Jon. on Deut. xxxii. 39, and Targ. Jer. on Ex. iii. 14. These passages, however, throw no light upon the composition of the name, and merely assert that in its significance it embraces past, present, and future. But having agreed to reject the present punctuation, it is useless to discuss any theories which may be based upon it, had they even greater probability in their favor than the one just mentioned. As one of the forms in which Jehovah appears in Greek characters is Ιαω, it has been proposed by Cappellus to punctuate it יַהֹוָא, which is clearly contrary to the analogy of יַהֹוה verbs. Gussetius suggested יַהֹוה, יַהֹוה, or יַהֹוה, יַהֹוה, in the former of which he is supported by the authority of First; and Mercer and Corn. a Lapide read it יַהֹוה, יַהֹוה: but on all these suppositions we should have יַהֹוה for יַהֹוה in the terminations of compound proper names. The suffrages of others are divided between יַהֹוה or יַהֹוה, supposed to be represented by the יַהֹוה of Epiphanius above mentioned, and יַהֹוה or יַהֹוה, which First holds to be the יַהֹוה of Porphyry, or the יַהֹוה of Clemens Alexandrinus. Caspari (Mikhe, p. 5, &c.) decides in favor of the former on the ground that this form only would give rise to the contraction יַהֹוה in proper names, and opposes both First's punctuation יַהֹוה or יַהֹוה, as well as that of יַהֹוה or יַהֹוה, which would be contracted into יַהֹוה. Gesenius punctuates the word יַהֹוה, from which, or from יַהֹוה, are derived the abbreviated form יַהֹוה, יַהֹוה, used in poetry, and the form יַהֹוה (so יַהֹוה becomes יַהֹוה) which occurs at the commencement of compound proper names.
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Hitzig, Jerusa, p. 4. Delitzsch maintains that, whichever punctuation be adopted, the quiescent sheva under יָהֹוה is ungrammatical, and Chatepl. Vatich is the proper vowel. He therefore writes יָהֹוה, יָהֹוה, to which he says the 'Ašā of Theodoret corresponds; the last vowel being Kanetz instead of Segel, according to the analogy of proper names derived from יָהֹוה verbs (e.g. יָהֹוה, יָהֹוה, יָהֹוה, and others). In his opinion the form יָהֹוה is not an abbreviation, but a concentration of the Tetragrammaton (Comm. über den Psalter, Einl.). There remains to be noticed the suggestion of Gesenius that the form יָהֹוה, which he adopted, might be the High. fut. of the substantive verb. Of the same opinion was Renn. Others again would make it Piel, and read יַהֹוה. Fürst (Handb. s. v.) mentions some other etymologies which affect the meaning rather than the punctuation of the name; such, for instance, as that it is derived from a root יָהֹוה, "to overthrow," and signifies "the destroyer or storm-sender;" or that it denotes "the light or heaven," from a root יָהֹוה יָהֹוה, "to be bright," or "the life-giver," from the same root יָהֹוה יָהֹוה, "to live." We have therefore to decide between יָהֹוה or יָהֹוה, and accept the former, i.e. יָהֹוה, as the more probable punctuation, continuing at the same time for the sake of convenience to adopt the form "Jehovah" in what follows, on account of its familiarity to English readers.

III. The next point for consideration is of vastly more importance: what is the meaning of Jehovah, and what does it express of the being and nature of God, more than or in distinction from the other names applied to the deity in the O. T.? That there was some distinction in these different appellations was early perceived, and various explanations were employed to account for it. Tertullian (Onir. Hermog. c. 3) observed that God was not called Lord (καιόπος) till after the Creation, and in consequence of it: while Augustine found in it an indication of the absolute dependence of creation, and of the necessity of a personal God (De Gen. ad Lit. viii. 2). Chrysostom (Hom. xiv. in Gen.) considered the two names, Lord and God, as equivalent, and the alternate use of them arbitrary. But all their arguments proceed upon the supposition that the καιόπος of the LXX. is the true rendering of the original, whereas it is merely the translation of יָהֹוה, דִּדְוַא, whose points it bears. With regard to יָהֹוה יָהֹוה, דִּדְוַא, the other chief name by which the Deity is designated in the O. T., it has been held by many, and the opinion does not even now want supporters, that in the plural form of the word was shadowed forth the plurality of persons in the godhead, and the mystery of the Trinity was inferred therefrom. Such, according to Peter Lombard, was the true significance of Elohim. But Calvin, Mercer, Drusius, and Beltramini have given the weight of their authority against an explanation so fanciful and arbitrary. Among the Jewish writers of the Middle Ages the question much more nearly approached its solution. R. Jehuda Hallevi (12th cent.), the author of the
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book Conri, known as the usage of Elohim a protest against idolaters, who call each personified power "Elah, and all collectively Elohim. He interpreted it as the most general name of the Deity, distinguishing Him as manifested in the exhibition of his power, without reference to moral qualities, or any special relation which He bears to man. Jehovah, on the contrary, is the revealed and known God. While the meaning of the former could be evolved by reasoning, the true significance of the latter could only be apprehended by that prophetic vision by which a man is, as it were, separated and withdrawn from his own kind, and approaches to the angelic, and another spirit enters into him." In like manner Mainmonides (Maimon. ii. 6) saw in Jehovah the name which teaches the substance of the Creator, and Abarbanel (quoted by Buxtorf, de Nom. Dei, § 34) distinguishes Jehovah, as denoting God according to what He is in himself, from Elohim which conveys the idea of the impression made by his power. In the opinion of Astry, a Belgian physician, with whom the documentary hypothesis originated, the alternate use of the two names was arbitrary, and determined by no essential difference. Hasse (Entdeckungen) considered them as historical names, and Sauck (de Leg Novi. Dei, etc.) regarded Elohim as a vague term denoting "a certain infinite, omnipotent, incomprehensible existence, from which things finite and visible have derived their origin," while to God, as Revealing himself, the more definite title of Jehovah was applied. Elohim, in his tract on the composition of names (written when he was nineteen), maintained that Elohim denoted the Deity in general, and is the common or lower name, while Jehovah was the national god of the Israelites. But in order to carry out his theory he was compelled in many places to alter the text, and was afterwards induced to modify his statements, which were opposed by Cranberg and Stihelin. Doubtless Elohim is used in many cases of the gods of the heathen, who included in the same title the God of the Hebrews, and denoted generally the Deity when spoken of as a supernatural being, and when no national feeling influenced the speaker. It was Elohim who, in the eyes of the heathen, delivered the Israelites from Egypt (1 Sam. iv. 8), and the Egyptian had adjured David by Elohim, rather than by Jehovah, of whom he would have no knowledge (1 Sam. xxx. 15). So Elohim announces to the Moabite king a message from Elohim (Judg. iii. 21); to the Syrians the Jehovah of the Hebrews was only their national God, one of the Elohim (1 K. xx. 24. 28), and in the mouth of a heathen the name Jehovah would convey no more intelligible meaning than this. It is to be observed also that when a Hebrew speaks with a heathen he uses the more general term Elohim. Joseph, in addressing the king of Meah to protect his family (2 Sam. xxi. 3), designate the Deity by the less specific title; and on the other hand the same rule is generally followed when the heathen are the speakers, as in the case of Amos (Gen. xxii. 23), the Hittites (Gen. xxvii. 6), the Midianites (Judg. vii. 14), and Joseph in his assumed character as an Egyptian (Gen. xlii. 8). But, although this distinction between Elohim, as the general appellation of Deity, and Jehovah, the national God of the Israelites, contains some superficial truth, the real nature of their difference must be sought for far deeper, and as a foundation for the arguments which will be adduced recourse must again be had to etymology.

IV. With regard to the derivation of מַלְכָּם, Elohim, the pl. of מַלְכָּם, etymologists are divided in their opinions; some connecting it with מַלְכָּם, -ל, "to be strong," while others refer it to the Arabic מַלְכָּם, אָדָם, "to worship, adore," Elohim thus denoting the Supreme Being who was worthy of all worship and adoration, the dread and awful One. But, first, with much greater probability, takes the noun in this as the primitive from which is derived the idea of worship contained in the verb, and gives as the true root מַלְכָּם = מַלְכָּם, to be strong; Delitzsch would prefer a root מַלְכָּם, מַלְכָּם = מַלְכָּם (Symb. ad Parad. illu. p. 29). From whatever root, however, the word may be derived, most are of opinion that the primary idea contained in it is that of strength, power, so that Elohim is the proper appellation of the Deity, as manifested in his creative and universally sustaining agency, and in the general divine guidance and government of the world. Hengstenberg, who adheres to the derivation above mentioned from the Arab., אָדָם and אָדָם, deduces from this etymology his theory that Elohim indicates a lower, and Jehovah a higher stage of the knowledge of God, on the ground that the feeling of fear is the lowest which can exist in reference to God, and merely in respect of this feeling is God marked by this designation. But the same inference might also be drawn on the supposition that the idea of simple power or strength is the most prominent in the word; and it is more natural that the Divine Being should be conceived of as strong before He became the object of fear and adoration. To this view Gesenius accedes, when he says that the notion of worshipping and fearing is rather derived from the power of the Deity which is expressed in his name. The question now arises, What is the meaning to be attached to the plural form of the word? As has been already mentioned, some have discovered therein the mystery of the Trinity, while others maintain that it points to polytheism. The Rabbis generally explain it as the plural of majesty; Rabbi Iechai, as signifying the lord of all powers. Abraham and Kimchi consider it a title of honor, in accordance with the Hebrew idiom, of which examples will be found in Is. liv. 5, Job xxxvi. 10, Gen. xxxiii. 19, xili. 30. In Prov. ix. 1, the plural מַלְכָּם, מַלְכָּם, "wisdoms," is used for wisdom in the abstract, as including all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Hence it is probable that the plural form Elohim, instead of pointing to polytheism, is applied to God as comprehending in himself the fullness of all power, and uniting in a perfect degree all that which the name signifies, and all the attributes which the heathen ascribe to the several divinities of their pantheon. The singular מַלְכָּם, Elohim, with few exceptions (Neh. ix. 17; 2 Chr. xxxii. 13), occurs only in poetry. The
Jehovah will be found, upon examination of the passages in which Elohim occurs, that it is chiefly in places where God is exhibited only in the plentitude of his power, and where no especial reference is made to his unity, personality, or holiness, or to his relation to Israel and the theocracy. (See Ps. xvi. 1, xix. 1, 7, 8.) Hengstenberg's etymology of the word is disputed by Delitzsch (Synth. od Pros. illustr. p. 29 n.), who refers it, as has been mentioned above, to a root indicating power or might, and sees in it an expression not of what men think of God, but of what He is in Himself, as far as He is life omnipotent in Himself, and according as He is the beginning and end of all life. For the true explanation of the name he refers to the revelation of the mystery of the Trinity. But it is at least extremely doubtful whether to the ancient Israelites any idea of this nature was conveyed by Elohim: and in making use of the more advanced knowledge supplied by the New Testament, there is some danger of discovering more meaning and a more subtle significance than was ever intended to be expressed.

V. While Elohim exhibits God displayed in his power as the creator and governor of the physical universe, the name Jehovah designates his nature as He stands in relation to man, as the only, almighty, true, personal, holy Being, a spirit, and "the Holy One of Israel" (Num. xvi. 17); and it is by John iv. 24), who revealed himself to his people, a made a covenant with them, and became their lawgiver, and to whom all honor and worship are due. If the etymology above given be accepted, and the name be derived from the future tense of the substantive verb, it would denote, in accordance with the general analogy of proper names of a similar form, "He that is," "the Being," whose chief attribute is eternal existence. Jehovah is represented as eternal (Gen. xxvi. 33; comp. I Tim. vi. 16), unchangeable (Ex. iii. 14; Mal. iii. 6), the only being (Josh. xxii. 22; Ps. l. 1), creator and lord of all things (Ex. xx. 11; comp. Num. xvii. 22 with xxvii. 16; Is. xii. 5). It is Jehovah who made the covenant with his people (Gen. xv. 18; Num. x. 33, &c.). In this connection Elohim occurs but once (Ps. lxxiii. 10), and even with the article, in which Elohim is used. Where such expression as Elohim alone, without Elohim, is found but seldom (Judg. xx. 27; I Sam. iv. 4). The Israelites were enjoined to observe the commandments of Jehovah (Lev. iv. 27, &c.), to keep his law, and to worship Him alone. Hence the phrase "to serve Jehovah" (Ex. x. 7, 8, &c.) is applied to denote true worship, whereas "to serve his-Elohim" is used but once in this sense (Ex. iii. 12), and Elohim occurs in the same association only when the worship of idols is spoken of (Deut. iv. 28; Judg. iii. 6). As Jehovah, the only true God, is the only object of true worship, to Him belong the sabbaths and festivals, and all the ordinances connected with the religious services of the Israelites (Ex. x. 9, xii. 11; Lev. xxvii. 2). His are the altars on which offerings are made to the true God; the priests and ministers are his (1 Sam. ii. 11, xiv. 3), and so on. Hence, what a prominent place is always associated with idolatrous worship. To Jehovah alone are offerings made (Ex. viii. 8), and if Elohim is ever used in this connection, it is always qualified by pronoun suffixes, or some word in construction with it, so as to indicate the true God: in all other cases it refers to idols (Ex. xxii. 20, xxxiv. 15). It follows naturally that the Temple and Tabernacle are Jehovah's, and if they are attributed to Elohim, the latter is in some manner restricted as before. The prophets are the prophets of Jehovah, and their announcements proceed from him, seldom from Elohim. The Israelites are the people of Jehovah (Ex. xxvii. 20), the congregation of Jehovah (Num. xvi. 3), as the Moabites are the people of Chemosh (Jer. xlviii. 46). Their king is the mounted of Jehovah; their wars are the wars of Jehovah (Ex. xiv. 25; 1 Sam. xviii. 17); their enemies are the enemies of Jehovah (2 Sam. xii. 14); it is the hand of Jehovah that delivers them up to their foes (Judg. vi. 1, xiii. 1, &c.), and be it is who raises up for them deliverers and judges, and on whom they call in times of peril (Judg. ii. 18, iii. 9, 15; Josh. xxiv. 7; 1 Sam. xvii. 37). In fine, Jehovah is the theocratic king of his people (Judg. viii. 21), by him their kings reign and achieve success against the national enemies (1 Sam. xix. 14. xxv. 3). Their heroes are inspired by his Spirit (Judg. iii. 10, vi. 34), and their hand steed their foes (2 Sam. vii. 23); the watchword of Gideon was "The Sword of Jehovah, and of Gideon!" (Judg. xvi. 20). The day on which God executes judgment on the wicked is the day of Jehovah (Is. ii. 12, xxxiv. 8; comp. Rev. xvi. 14). As the Israelites were in a remarkable manner distinguished as the people of Jehovah, who became their lawgiver and government ruler, it is not strange that He should be put in strong contrast with Chemosh (Judg. xii. 4), Ashtaroth (Judg. x. 6), and the Baalim (Judg. iii. 7), the national deities of the surrounding nations, and thus be preeminently distinguished as the tutelary deity of the Hebrews in one aspect of his character. Such and no more was He to the heathen (1 K. xxii. 25); but all this and much more to the Israelites, to whom Jehovah was a distinct personal subsistence,—the living God, who reveals himself to man by word and deed, helps, guides, saves, and delivers, and is to the old what Christ is to the New Testament. Jehovah was no abstract name, but thoroughly practical, and stood in intimate connection with the religious life of the people. While Elohim represents God only in his most outward relation to man, and distinguished as his name expresses his character; Jehovah describes him according to his inwardmost being. In Jehovah the moral attributes are presented as constituting the essence of his nature, whereas in Elohim there is no reference to personality or moral character. The relation of Elohim to Jehovah has been variously explained. The former, in Hengstenberg's opinion, indicates a lower and the latter a higher, stage of consciousness of God: Elohim becoming Jehovah by a historical process, and to show how he became so being the main object of the sacred history. Kurtz considers the two names as related to each other as power and evolution; Elohim the God of the beginning, Jehovah the God of the beginning, Jehovah the mediator. Elohim is God of the beginning and end, the creator and the judge; Jehovah the God of the middle, the promised, which lies between the beginning and end (Die Einheit der Gen.). That Jehovah is identical with Elohim, and not a separate being, is indicated by the joint use of the names Jehovah-Elohim.

VI. The antiquity of the name Jehovah among

---

*a * "For Jehovah and for Gideon is the same translation. The A. V. interpolates "the word of."
the Hebrews has formed the subject of much discussion. That it was not known before the age of Moses has been inferred from Ex. vi. 3; while Von Bohlen assigns it to a much more recent date, and contends that we have "no conclusive proof of the worship of Jehovah anterior to the ancient hymns of David" (Int. to Gen. i. 150, Eng. tr.). But, on the other hand, it should be inclined to infer from the etymology of the word that it originated in an age long prior to that of Moses, in whose time the root יְהוָֹה, יְהוָֹה, was already antiquated. From the Aramaic form in which it appears (comp. Chald. יְהוָֹה, Syr. יהוה), Jahh refers to the earliest times of Abraham for its date, and to Mesopotamia or Ur of the Chaldees for its place of birth. Its usage in Genesis cannot be explained, as Le Clerc suggests, by supposing it to be employed by anticipation, for it is introduced where the persons to whom this Scripture relates are speaking, and not only where the narrator adopts terms familiar to himself; and the same difficulty remains whatever hypothesis be assumed with regard to the original documents which formed the basis of the history. At the same time it is distinctly stated in Ex. vi. 3, that to the patriarchs God was not known by the name Jehovah. If, therefore, this passage be a reference to the first revelation of Jehovah simply as a name and title of God, there is clearly a discrepancy which requires to be explained. In renewing his promise of deliverance from Egypt, "God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by (the name of) God Almighty (El Shaddai, יְהוָֹה reiterated), but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." It follows then that, if the reference were merely to the name as a name, the passage in question would prove equally that before this time Elohim was unknown as an appellation of the Deity, and God would appear to Jahh only as El Shaddai, the patriarchal history. But although it was held by Theodore (Quast. xx. in Ec.) and many of the Fathers, who have been followed by a long list of moderns, that the name was first made known by God to Moses, and then introduced by him among the Israelites, the contrary was maintained by Cajetan, Lyra, Calvin, Rosenmuller, Hengstenberg, and others, who deny that the passage in Ex. vi. alludes to the introduction of the name. Calvin saw at once that the knowledge there spoken of could not refer to the syllables and letters, but to the recognition of God's glory and majesty. It was, he said, the true name, but the true depth of its significance which was unknown to and uncomprehended by the patriarchs. They had known God as the omnipotent, El Shaddai (Gen. xiii. 1, xviii. 3), the ruler of the physical universe, and of man as one of that greatness as a god eternal, immutable, and true to his promises he was yet to be revealed. In the character expressed by the name Jehovah he had not hitherto been fully known; his true attributes had not been recognized (comp. Jarchi on Ex. vi. 3) in his working and acts for Israel. Aben Ezra explained the occurrence of the name in Genesis as simply indicating the knowledge of it as a proper name, no more a qualitative expressing the attributes and qualities of God. Referring to other passages in which the phrase "the name of God" occurs, it is clear he had something more is intended by it than a mere appellation, and that the proclamation of the name of God is a revelation of his moral attributes, and of his true character as Jehovah (Ex. xxxii. 3, xxxiv. 6, 7) the God of the covenant. Maimonides (Mor. Neb. i. 64, ed. Buxtorf) explains the name of God as signifying his essence and his truth, and Oldhauser (on Matt. xviii. 20) interprets "name" (לְוָֹה) as denoting "personality and essential being, and that not as is incomprehensible or unknown, but in its manifestation." The name of a thing represents the thing itself, so far as it can be expressed in words. That Jehovah was not a new name Havernick concludes from Ex. iii. 14, where "the name of God Jehovah is evidently presupposed as already in use, and is only explained, interpreted, and applied... . It is certainly not a new name that is introduced; on the contrary, the יְהוָֹה יְהוָֹה יְהוָֹה יְהוָֹה יְהוָֹה יְהוָֹה (I am that I am) would be unintelligible, if the name itself were not presupposed as already known. The old name of antiquity, whose precious significance had been forgotten and neglected by the children of Israel, here is it to rise again to life and is again brought home to the consciousness of the people;" (Introd. to the Pent. p. 61). The same passage supplies an argument to prove that by "name" we are not to understand merely letters and syllables, for Jehovah appears at first in another form, נְּכֹּֽה. The correct collective view of Ex. vi. 3, Hengstenberg conceives to be the following — "Hitherto that Being, who in one aspect was Jehovah, in another had always been Elohim. The great crisis now drew nigh in which Jehovah Elohim would be changed into Jehovah. In prospect of this event God solemnly announced himself as Jehovah." Great stress has been laid, by those who deny the antiquity of the name Jehovah, upon the fact that proper names compounded with it occur but seldom before the age of Samuel and David. It is undoubtedly true that, after the revival of the true faith among the Israelites, proper names so compounded did become more frequent, but if it can be shown that prior to the time of Moses any such names existed, it will be sufficient to prove that the name Jehovah was not entirely unknown. Among those which have been quoted for this purpose are Jechebed the mother of Moses, and daughter of Levi, and Moriah, the mountain on which Abraham was commanded to offer up Isaac. Against the former it is urged that Moses might have changed her name to Jechebed after the name Jehovah had been communicated by God; but this is very improbable, as he was at this time eighty years old, and his mother in all probability dead. If this only be admitted as a genuine instance of a name compounded with Jehovah, it takes us at once back into the patriarchal age, and proves that a word which was employed in forming the proper name of Jacob's grand-daughter could not have been unknown to that patriarch himself. The name Moriah (מֹרְחָא) is of more importance, for in one passage in which it occurs it is accompanied by an etymology intended to indicate what was then understood by it (2 Chr. iii. 1). Hengstenberg regards it as a compound of מֹרְחָא, the Hiph. Part. of מֹרָֽה, and יָּהָה, the abbreviated form of יְהוָֹה, so that, according to this etymology, it would signify "shown by Jehovah." Gesenius, adopting the meaning of מֹרָֽה in Gen. xiv. 8, renders it: cho-
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"men by Jehovah," but suggests at the same time what he considers a more probable derivation, according to which Jehovah does not form a part of the compound word. But there is reason to believe from various allusions in Gen. xxii. that the former was regarded as the true etymology.

Having thus considered the origin, significance, and antiquity of the name Jehovah, the reader will be in a position to judge how much of truth there is in the assertion of Schwind (quoted by Reiske, Bibelkrit. iii. 135, n. 10) that the terms Elohim, Jeho-
vah Elohim, and then Jehovah alone applied to God, show "to the philosophic inquirer the progress of the human mind from a plurality of gods to a superior god, and from this to a single Almighty Creator and ruler of the world."

The principal authorities which have been made use of in this article are Hengstenberg, On the Authenticity of the Pentateuch, i. 215-307, Engl. trans.; Reiske, Phil. hist. Abhandl. über den Gottesnamen Jehovah, Beiträge, vol. iii.; Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften, th. i. 377-405; Kurta, Die Einheit der Genesi. xliii.-liii.; Keil, Über die Gottesnamen im Pentateuch, in Rudelbach and Guericke's Zeitschrift; Ewald, Die Composition der Genesis; Gesenius, Theaurus; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, and Reland, Dei exercitationum philosophicarum usurpo primum omnium nomina Jehovah, besides those already quoted.

W. A. W.

* In regard to the use of יְהֹוָה in the O. T., especially in the Pentateuch and the Psalms, considered as a mark of antiquity and authorship, the reader is referred to the articles on those books. The article by Dr. Tholuck (see above) first published in his Literarischer Anzeiger (1832, May, §), was translated by Dr. Robinson in the Bibl. Repository, iv. 89-108. It examines "the hypothesis of the Egyptian and Indian origin of the name Jehovah," and shows that it has no proper foundation. It is held that "the true derivation of the word is that which the earliest Hebrew records present, namely, from the verb יָהַה." Prof. E. Ballentine discusses the significance of the name in the same periodical (iii. 730-744), under the head of "Interpretation of Ex. vi. 2, 3." Of the eleven different explanations which he reviews, he adopts the one which supposes Jehovah "to imply simply real existence, that which is, as distinguished from that which is not." Hence, when it is said that God appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai (the Almighty), but was not known to them as Jehovah, it is "a formal declaration by God himself of the commencement of a new dispensation of religion and providence, the grand design of which was to make known God as Jehovah, the only true and living God," in opposition to idols and all other false gods. It is not meant that the name itself of Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs; but that the object of God's dealing with them was different from that of the Mosaic dispensation, namely, to vindicate the truth concerning Him (expressed by יָהַה), that He alone is the living God. Dr. Wordsworth's view of the introduction of the name is very similar to this. There is not a contrast in the passage (Ex. vi. 2, 3) between the two names Shaddai and Jehovah; but a comparison of attributes, and of the degree of blessings with which they were revealed. Hence the assertion is not that "the name Jehovah was not known before, but that its full meaning had not been made known" (Holy Bible, with Notes, ii. 216).

The more common view (stated in the preceding article), restricts the idea of this fuller revelation to God's immutability as the one essential to his promises. This explanation is preferred by Rev. J. Quarry, in his able work on Genesis and its Authorship (Lond., 1869). "The Patriarchs had only the promises unfulfilled; in respect to the fulfillment of them they received not the promises." God is now about to fulfill the great promise to give the land of Canaan to their seed, and so He announces himself to Moses in the words, 'I am Jehovah,' and tells him that while the Patriarchs had manifestations of God in his character as El Shaddai, they had no experience of him as regards this name, which implied the continuousness and unchangeableness of his gracious purpose toward them (p. 296). Ebrard (Historische Theol. Zeitschrift, 1849, iv.) agrees with those who infer the later origin of the name from Ex. vi. 2, 3. He maintains that "Jehovah" occurs in Genesis only as prophe-
tic, and on that ground denies that its use there affords any argument against the unity of the authorship of that book. Recent discussions have rendered this latter branch of the subject specially important. (For the fuller literature which belongs here, see under Pentateuch, Amer. ed.) In regard to the representation of יְהֹוָה by קְיוֹפָא in the Septuagint, we refer the reader to Prof. Stuart's article on קְיוֹפָא in the Bibl. Repository, i. 786 ff. It is shown that this Greek title is employed in the great majority of instances to designate that most sacred of all the Divine appellations. II.

JEHOVAH-JIREH (יְהֹוָה-יִרְּה): Kýpios oéteS: Dominus videt, i.e. Jehovah wilt see, or provide, the name given by Abraham to the place on which he had been commanded to offer Isaac, to commemorate the interposition of the angel of Jehovah, who appeared to prevent the sacrifice (Gen. xxii. 14) and provided another victim. The immediate allusion is to the expression in the 8th verse, "God will look out for Himself a lamb for a burnt offering," but it is not unlikely that there is at the same time a covert reference to Moriah, the scene of the whole occurrence. The play upon words is followed up in the latter clause of ver. 11, which appears in the form of a popular proverb: "as it is said this day, In the mountain of Jehovah, He will be seen," or "provision shall be made." Such must be the rendering if the received punctuation be accepted, but on this point there is a division of opinion. The text from which the LXX. made their translation must have been יִרְּה יְהֹוָה-יִרְּה, וְזֶה אֵשׁ קְיוֹפָא אֱלֹהִים, "on the mountain Jehovah appeared," and the same, with the exception of יִרְּה יְהֹוָה, for the last Jehovah "(i.e. as regards my name Jehovah) I was not known to them." The A. V. interpolates "the name of" in the first part of the verse, and then, at it for the sake of correspondence, says, by my name' in the second part.
word, must have been the reading of the Vulgate and Syriac. The Targum of Onkelos is obscure.

W. A. W.

JEHOVAH-NISSI (עְנַיִים) : Kêpôs karaôpôrôn noun: Dominus exaltatio ment; i. e. Jeho\rth n.bunner, the name given by Moses to the altar which he built in commemoration of the dis-\conquur of the Amalekites by Joshua and his\nchosen warriors at Kadesh-Baali (Ex. xxvii. 15). It was erected either upon the hill overlooking the battle-field, upon which Moses sat with the staff of God in his hand, or upon the battle-field itself. According to Aen. Ezra it was on the Horeb. The Targum of Onkelos paraphrases the verse thus: "Moses built an altar and worshipped upon it before Jehovah, who had wrought for him miracles (נְיִים, nûm)." Such too is Jarchi's explanation of the name, referring to the miraculous interposi-\tion of God in the defeat of the Amalekites. The LXX. in their translation, "the Lord my refuge;" evidently supposed nûm to be derived from the root נְיִים, nûm, "to flee," and the Vulgate traced it to נוּמ, "to lift up." The significance of the name is probably contained in the allusion to the staff which Moses held in his hand as a banner during the engagement, and the raising or lowering of which turned the fortune of battle in favor of the Israelites or their enemies. God is thus recognized in the memorial altar as the deliverer of his people, who leads them to victory, and in their rallying point in time of peril. On the figurative use of "banner," see Ps. lx. 4; Is. xi. 10.

W. A. W.

JEHOVAH-SHATOM (עְנַיִים) : Kêpôs wajî: Domini pres, i. e. Jehovah (is) peace, or, with the ellipsis of נְיִים, нûm, "Jehovah, the God of peace." The altar erected by Gideon in Ophrah was so called in memory of the salvation addressed to him by the angel of Jehovah; "Peace be unto thee" (Judg. vi. 24). Piscator, however, following the Hebrew accentuation, which he says requires a different translation, renders the whole passage, without introducing the proper name, "when Jehovah had proclaimed peace to him:" but his alteration is harsh and unnecessary. The LXX. and Vulg. appear to have inserted the words as they stand in the present Hebrew text, and to have read נְיִים, נûm, but they are supported by no MS. authority.

W. A. W.

* JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH (עְנַיִים) : Kêpôs xamâh: Dominus ibolom, i. e. Jehovah there, or, lit. builder, is the marginal reading (A. V.) of Ezek. xxviii. 35. In the text the trans-\lators have put "The Lord is there." In both respects the A. V. has followed the Bishops' Bible. It is the name that was to be given to the new city which Ezekiel saw in his Vision, and has so gorgeously described (chap. xl-xlviii.). Compare Rev. xxii. 3, 4.

W. A. W.

* JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU (עְנַיִים) : Jehovah our righteousness; in Jer. xxxii. 6 and xxiii. 10, where the text has "The Lord our righteousness." It will be seen that the LXX. makes a proper name of יִים (our righteousness) in the first of the above passages. The hesitation of our translators whether they should render or transfer the expression may have been the \greater from their supposing it to be one of the Messianic titles. The long exegetical note in the margin of the Bishops' Bible (Jer. xxxiii. 16) is curious and deserves to be read.

H.

JEHOZ'ABAD (עְנַיִים) (jemeh Jehovah gives): 'Iwâgâîd: [Alex. Iwâigâîd.] Jozabed. 1. A Korachite Levite, second son of Obed-edom, and one of the porters of the south gate of the temple, and of the storeroom there (סִדָּּר הַיּוֹם) in the time of David (1 Chr. xxvi. 4, 15, compared with Neh. xii. 25).

2. (Iwâigâîd.) Joseph. 'Oxîbârôn. A Benja-nite, captain of 180,000 armed men, in the days of king Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xiv. 18).

3. (In 2 K., Iwâigâîd: in 2 Chr., Iwââîdâî: Vat. Zhââîdâîd: Alex. Zâ'dh.) Son of Shomer or Shammah, a Calebite woman, and possibly a de-scendant of the preceding, who with another as-\pired against king Josiah and slew him in his bed (2 K. xii. 21; 2 Chr. xxiv. 20). [Joash.] The similarity in the names of both conspirators and their parents is worth notice.

This name is commonly abbreviated in the He-\brew to JOZABAD.

A. C. H.

JEHOZ'ADAK (עְנַיִים) (jemeh Jehovah makes just): 'Iwasâ'âîdâî: [Alex. Iwasâ'âîdâî: Jowashe.] son of the high-priest JEREMIAH (1 Chr. vi. 14, 15) in the reign of Zedekiah. When his father was slain at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar, in the 11th of Zedekiah (2 K. xxv. 18, 21), Jehozadak was led away captive to Babylon (1 Chr. vi. 15), where he doubtless spent the remainder of his days. He himself never attained the high-priesthood, the Temple being burnt to the ground, and so con-\tinuing, and he himself being a captive all his life. But he was the father of JESUS the high-priest — who with Zerubbabel headed the Return from Captivity — and of all his successors till the pontificate of M. Akib (Exod. xxiii. 16; Neh. xii. 26). [Hasan-\pries!]. Nothing more is known about him. It is perhaps worth remarking that his name is com-\bounded of the same elements, and has exactly the same meaning, as that of the contemporary king Zedekiah — "God is righteous:" and that the righteousness of God was signally displayed in the simultaneous suspension of the throne of David and the priesthood of Aaron, on account of the sins of Zedekiah. This remark perhaps acquires weight from the fact of his successor Josiah, who restored the priesthood and rebuilt the Temple, having the same name as Joshua, who brought the nation into the land of promise, and JESUS, a name significative of salvation.

In Haggai and Zechariah, though the name in the original is exactly as above, yet our translators have chosen to follow the Greek form, and present it as JOSIDBACH.

In Ezra and Nehemiah it is all-revivified, both in Hebrew and A. V., to JOZADAK.

A. C. H.

JEHUSALÉM (עְנַיִים) =Jehovah is He; [in 1 K., 2 K., 1 Jo. [Vat. Eouo: in 2 Chr. 15th, 1 Jo. lous; in Hos., 1ouâîd.] Alex. [commonly]
JEHU

Ieou; Joseph. 'Ιωακ. The founder of the fifth dynasty of the kingdom of Israel. His history was told in the lost "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (2 K. x. 34). His father's name was Jehoshaphat (2 K. ix. 2); his grandfather's, as being better known, was sometimes affixed to his own—(2 K. ix.) was Nausith. In his youth he had been one of the goodly sons of Israel. His place of appearance in history is when, with a comrade in arms, Bidkar, 2 Bar-Dahar (Ephrem. Syr. Opq. iv. 540), he rode a behind Atha in the fatal journey from Samaria to Jezreel, and laid up in his heart, the warning of Elijah against the murder of Naboth (2 K. ix. 25). But he had already, as it seemed, been known to Elijah as a youth of promise, and, accordingly, in the vision at Horeb he is mentioned as the future king of Israel, whom Elijah is to anoint as the minister of vengeance on Israel (1 K. xix. 16, 17). This injunction, for reasons unknown to us, Elijah never fulfilled. It was reserved long afterwards for his successor Elisha.

Jehu meantime, in the reigns of Ahaziah and Jehoram, had risen to importance. The same activity and vehemence which had fitted him for his earlier distinctions still continued, and he was known far and wide as a charioteer whose rapid driving, as if of a madman (2 K. x. 20), could be distinguished even from a distance. He was, under the last-named king, captain of the host in the siege of Ramoth-Gilead. According to Ephraim Syrus (who omits the words "saw the Lord" in 2 K. xi. 26, and makes "I" refer to Jehu) he had, in a dream the night before, seen the blood of Naboth and his sons (Ephrem. Syr. Opq. iv. 540). Whilst in the midst of the officers of the besieging army a youth suddenly entered, of wild appearance (2 K. x. 11), and insisted on a private interview with Jehu. They retired into a secret chamber. The youth uncovered a vial of the sacred oil (Jos. Ant. ix. 6, 1) which he had brought with him, poured it over Jehu's head, and after announcing to him the message from Elisha, that he was appointed to be king of Israel and destroyer of the house of Ahab, rushed out of the house and disappeared.

Jehu's countenance, as he reentered the assembly of officers, showed that some strange tidings had reached him. He tried at first to evade their questions, but then revealed the situation in which he found himself placed by the prophetic call. In a moment the enthusiasm of the army took fire. They threw their garments—the large square blanket, similar to a wrapper or plaid—under his feet, so as to form a rough carpet of state, placed him on the throne of the stairs, as on an extemporaneous throne, blew the royal salute on their trumpets, and thus ordained him king. He then cut off all communication between Ramoth-Gilead and Jezreel, and set off full speed, with his ancient comrade Bidkar, whom he had made captain of the host in his place, and a band of horsemen. From the tower of Jezreel a watchman saw the cloud of dust (τρονίσματος, κοινόρωτον; A. V. "company") and announced his coming (2 K. ix. 17). The messengers that were sent out to him he detained, on the same principle of secrecy which had guided all his movements. It was not till he had almost reached the city, and was identified by the watchman, that alarm was taken. But even then it seems as if the two kings in Jezreel anticipated news from the Syrian war rather than a revolution at home. It was not till he had answered the watchman's question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" that Jehu's fierce denunciation of Jezebel at once revealed the danger. Jehu seized his opportunity, and taking full aim at Jehoram, with the bow which, as captain of the host, was always with him, shot him through the heart (ix. 24). The body was thrown out on the fatal field, and whilst his soldiers pursued and killed the king of Judæa, Jehu-gan (A. V. "the garden-house"), probably Engannim, Jehu himself advanced to the gates of Jezreel and fulfilled the divine warning on Jezebel as already on Jehoram.

[JEZEBEL.] He then entered on a work of extermination hitherto unparalleled in the history of the Jewish monarchy. All the descendants of Ahab that remained in Jezreel, together with the officers of the court, and hierarchy of Astarte, were swept away. His next step was to secure Samaria. Every stage of his progress was marked with blood. At the gates of Jezreel he found the heads of seventy princes of the house of Ahab, ranged in two heaps, sent to him as a propitiation by their guardians in Samaria, whom he had defied to withstand him, and on whom he thus threw the responsibility of destroying their own royal charge. Next, at "the shearing-house" (or Beth-elek) between Jezreel and Samaria he encountered forty-two sons or nephews (2 Chr. xxiii. 8) of the late king of Judah, and therefore connected by marriage with Ahab, on a visit of compliment to their relatives, of whose fall, seemingly, they had not heard. These also were put to the sword at the fatal well, as, in the later history, of Mizzah, and, in our own days, of Cawnpore (2 K. x. 14). [ISHMAEL, 6.] As he drove on he met and subdued a strong figure, such as might have reminded him of the great Elijah, but it was Jehonadab, the austere Arabian sexton, the son of Rechab. In him his keen eye discovered a ready ally. He took him into his chariot, and they concocted their schemes as they entered Samaria (x. 15, 16). [JEHONADAB.] Some stragglers of the house of Ahab in that city still remained to be destroyed. But the great stroke was yet to come; and it was conceived and

---

a The Hebrew word is דַּבָּרָא, usually employed for the coupling together of oxen. This the LXX understood as though the two soldiers rode in separate chariots—ἐνιαύτεις ξύλοι ἐν ἑαυτῷ (2 K. ix. 25). Josephus (Ant. ix. 6, § 8) as though they sat in the same chariot with the king (καταταγμένοι ἐπιστειάδας τοῦ ἄρματος τοῦ 'Αχαβίου).

b This is the force of the Hebrew word, which, as in 2 K. xi. 11, the LXX translate ἐν παραλλαγῇ. Josephus (Ant. ix. 6, § 8) says συναντοῦσιν τὰ καὶ μὲν ἑαυτὸν τὰ γυναικῶν, τὰ δὲ βραγμάτεια.

c The expression translated "on the top of the stairs" is one the clue to which is lost. The word is שָׁיְיָא.
He must be regarded, like many others in history, as an instrument for accomplishing great purposes rather than as great or good in himself in the long period during which his destiny, though known to others and perhaps to himself, lay dormant; in the suddenness of his rise to power; in the ruthless with which he carried out his purposes; in the union of profound silence and sudden and violent action, of wild, fanatic, wayward zeal,—he has not been without his likenesses in modern times. The Scripture narrative, although it fixes our attention on the services which he rendered to the cause of religion by the extermination of a worthless dynasty and a degrading worship, yet on the whole leaves the sense that it was a reign barren in great results. His dynasty, indeed, was firmly seated on the throne longer than any other royal house of Israel (2 K. x.), and under Jeroboam II. it acquired a high name amongst the oriental nations. But Elisha, who had raised him to power, as far as we know, never saw him.

In other respects it was a failure; the original sin of Jeroboam's worship continued; and in the Prophet Hosea there seems to be a retribution exacted for the bloodshed by which he had mounted the throne:

"I will avenge the blood of Jeroboam upon the house of Jehu" (Hos. i. 4). As in the similar condemnation of Baasha (1 K. xii. 2). See a striking poem to this effect on the character of Jehu in the Lyra Apostolica.

2. [In 1 K., 166, Vat. Sinon, Alex. Sinon.: 2 Chr., 166, Vat. Sin. in, Sinon.] Jehu, son of Hanani: a prophet of Judah, but whose ministrations were chiefly directed to Israel. His father was probably the seer who accredited Asa (2 Chr. xvi. 7). He must have begun his career as a prophet when very young. He first denounced Baasha, both for his imitation of the dynasty of Jeroboam, and also (as it would seem) for his cruelty in destroying it (1 K. xvi. 1, 7), and then, after an interval of thirty years, reappears to denounce Jehoshaphat for his alliance with Ahab (2 Chr. xix. 2, 5). He survived Jehoshaphat and wrote his life (xv. 25). From another district in the text of 1 K. xvi. 7 the Vulgate has represented him as killed by Baasha. But this is not required by the words, and (except on the improbable hypothesis of two Jehus, both sons of Hanani) is contradicted by the later appearance of this prophet.

3. [160; Vat. Sinon. in: Jehua:] A man of Judah of the house of Hezron (1 Chr. ii. 28). He was the son of a certain Ileed, descended from the union of an Egyptian, Jada, with the daughter of Sheshan, whose slave Jarha was (comp. 34).

4. [160; Vat. uro.]; A Ninevite, son of Josiah (1 Chr. iv. 35). He was one of the chief men of the tribe, apparently in the reign of Hezekiah (comp. 41).

5. [160;] Jehu the Antiiothite, i.e. native of Anthoth, was one of the chief of the heroes of Benjamin, who forsaw the cause of Saul for Ahab, king of Samaria, seeing the import of the crisis, sent a contingent of 10,000 men, and 2,000 chariots to the confederate force,—a contingent which took part in the first great battle between the armies of Israel and the united kingdom of Syria. The text gives the interesting information that among Benhadad's allies, when he was attacked by the Assyrians in b. c. 853, was "Jehu of Israel." It appears that the common danger of subjection by the Assyrian arms, united in one, not only the Hitites, Hamathites, Syrians of Damascus, Phœnicians, and Ezion-geber, but the people of Israel also...
JEBUBBAH

that of David when the latter was at Ziklag (1 Chr. xii. 3). He does not reappear in any of the later lists.

A. P. S.

JEBUBBAH (יהָבְבָא) [the verb will be hidden]:

'tashâ: [Vat. corrupt:] Alex. Ḍbâa: Hebâh, a man of Asher; son of Shamer or Shomer, of the house of Beriah (1 Chr. vii. 34).

JEHU'CAL (יהָעָל) [potent, Ges.]: δ 'Ιαυδιά: Alex. Ἰαώκχοι; [FA. Ἰαώκχοι] (Jehudah), son of Shekoniah; one of the personages so called in the genealogy of Zedekiah to Jeremiah, to entreat his prayer and advice (Jer. xxxvii. 3). His name is also given as "Jucal, and he appears to have been one of the "princes of the king" (comp. xxxviii. 1, 4).

JEHUD (יהָעָד) [praise]: ἈχGreek: 1. Jehud; Alex. Ieouθ: Judah, one of the towns of the tribe of Dan (Jos. xix. 45), named between Baalath and Bne-bereak.

Neither of these two places, however, has been identified. By Eusebius and Jerome Jehud is not named. Dr. Robinson (ii. 242) mentions that a place called el-'Tchudiah exists in the neighborhood of Lydda, but he did not visit it. It is, however, inserted on Van de Velde's map at 7 miles east of Jersi and 5 north of Lydli. This agrees with the statement of Schlag (141) that "Jehud is the village Jehudid, 7 1/2 miles S. E. of Jaffa," except as to the direction, which is nearer E. than S. E.

JEHUDI'I (יהָעֲדִי) = Jews: δ 'Iowdhâ: Alex. Iouθί: Judi, son of Nathaniah, a man employed by the princes of Jehoiakin's court to fetch Baruch to read Jeremiah's denunciation (Jer. xxxvi. 14), and then by the king to fetch the volume itself and read it to him (21, 23).

JEHUDI'JAH (יהָעֲדִיָה) [the Jewess]: Ἀδαία; [Vat. Αδαῖα] Alex. Ἀδαία: Judivio. There is really no such name in the Heb. Bible as that which our A. V. exhibits at 1 Chr. iv. 18. If it is a proper name at all it is Ha-jehudiyah, like Ham-melech, Hak-koz, etc.; and it seems to be rather an appellative, "the Jewess." As far as an opinion can be formed of so obscure and apparently corrupt a passage, Mered, a descendant of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, and whose towns, Gedor, Soco, Adullam, Lachish, and Jericho, were assigned to the tribe of Judah, married two wives—one a Jewess, the other an Egyptian, a daughter of Pharaoh. The Jewess was sister of Nahum, the father of the cities of Kielah and Eshtheno. The descendants of Mered by his two wives are given in vv. 18, 19, and perhaps in the latter part of ver. 17. Hodiah in ver. 19 is doubtless a corruption of Ha-jehudiyah, "the Jewess," the letters היל having fallen out from the end of היל and the beginning of the following word; and the full stop at the end of ver. 18 should be removed, so as to read as a recapitulation of what precedes: "These are the sons of Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took (for his wife), and the sons of his wife, the Jewess, the sister of Nahum (which Nahum was) the father of Kielah, whose inhabitants are Garnites, and of Eshtheno, whose inhabitants are Maakahites: the last being named possibly from Mashaach, Caleb's conspicuous, as the Ephrathites were from Ephrata. Bertheau (Chronik) arrives at the same general result, by proposing to place the closing words of ver. 18 before the words "And she bare Miriam," etc., in ver. 17. See also Vatpalus. A. C. H.

JEBUSH (יהָעָשּו) [collecting, bringing together]: First, Dicht.: Πἐρ: [Vat. Γαύτης] Alex. Ιας; son of Eshok, a remote descendant of Saul (1 Chr. viii. 39). The parallel genealogy in ch. ix. stops short of this man.

For the representation of Ain by Π, see JEHEIL, MEHUNIM, etc.

JEEP'EL (יהָעָפֶל) [perh. treasure of God, Ges.]: Jebel. 1. (Ἰαφελ). A chief man among the Reubenites, one of the house of Joel (1 Chr. vi. 7).

2. (Ἰεφάλα: Alex. once Ἰεφάλα: [Vat. FA. in xvi. 5, Eeuben.] A Merarite Levite, one of the gatekeepers (Ἰαφελά) A. V. "porters," and "doorkeepers") to the sacred tent, at the first establishment of the Ark in Jerusalem (1 Chr. xv. 18). His duty was also to play the harp (ver. 21), or the psaltery and harp (xvi. 5), in the service before the Ark.

3. (Ἐαφελά, [Vat. Εαϕελά] Alex. Εαφελά) A Gershonite Levite, one of the Bene-Assaph sons of A., forefather of Jahaziel in the time of king Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xxii. 14).

4. (Ἰαφελλι, i. e. Jebel, but the A. V. follows the correction of the Keri: Ἰεφαλῆ) The Scribe (Ἰαφελίων) who kept the account of the numerals of king Uzziah's irregular predatory warriors (Ἰαφελίων), A. V. "bands," 2 Chr. xxvi. 11.

5. (Jebel, as in the preceding; but the A. V. again follows the Keri: Ἰεψάλα: Jabieh.) A Gershonite Levite, one of the Bene-Eliaphan, who assisted in the restoration of the house of Jehovah under king Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxiii. 13).

6. (Ἰεφάλα, [Vat. Ειφαλά] Alex. Ιεφάλα) One of the chiefs (Ἰεπαλῶν) of the Levites in the time of Josiah, and an assistant in the rites at his great Passover (2 Chr. xxviii. 9).

7. (Jebel as above, but in Keri and A. V. Jeiel: Ἰεψάλα, [Vat. Εωςα] Alex. Ειψάλα) One of the Bene-Aduinum who formed part of the caravan of Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ez. viii. 13). In Esdras the name is Jeuel.

8. (Ἰαφελά, Alex. Ιεψάλα) A layman, of the Bene Necho, who had taken a foreign wife and had relinquished her (Ez. x. 43). In Esdras it is omitted from the Greek and A. V., though the Vulgate has Ιεψαλα.

JEKAB'ZEEEL (יְקָבְצֵיא) [god who assembles, brings, collects]: Vat. [Alex. FA.1 onlt; FA.3 Comp.] קבציא; Cibzuel), a fuller form of the name of KERZIEEL, the most remote city of Judah on the southern frontier. This form occurs only in the list of the places reoccupied after the Captivity (Neh. xii. 25).

JEK'AMAM (יְקָם) [who assembles the people]: [Vat. Ιεκαμάν; Alex. [in xxiv. 23.] Ἰκαμάνος; Jecamman, Jecamman], a Levite in the time of King David: fourth of the sons of Hebron, the son of Kohath (1 Chr. xxiii. 19, xxiv. 23).

JEKAMIAH (יְקָמְיָה) [Jehovah collects, or assembles]: Ἰκαμάια; [Vat. μείρι; Alex. Ἰκαμάια; Icamias], son of Shallum, in the line of Ahik, about contemporary with king Ahas.
was led, as well by the unsettled character of the age as by his own family circumstances, to adopt a kind of life unrestrained, adventurous, and insecure as that of a Scottish border-chieftain in the middle ages. It was not unlike the life which David afterwards led at Ziklag, with this exception, that Jephthah's subjects and friends owned the headmen in whose land he lived. His fame as a bold and successful captain was carried back to his native Gilead; and when the time was ripe for throwing off the yoke of Ammon, the Gileadite elders sought in vain for any leader, who in an equal degree with the base-born outcast could command the confidence of his countrymen. Jephthah consented to become their captain, on the condition solemnly ratified before the Lord in Mizpeh—that in the event of his success against Ammon he should still remain as their acknowledged head. Messages, urging their respective claims to occupy the trans-Jordanic region, were exchanged between the Amnonitish king and Jephthah. Then the Spirit of the Lord (i.e. "force of mind for great undertakings, and bodily strength.") came upon Jephthah. The Ammonites were routed with great slaughter. Twenty cities, from Aroer on the Arnon to Meecham and to Abel Keramim, were taken from them. But as the conqueror returned to Mizpeh there came out to meet him a procession of dances with dances and timbrels, and among them—the first person from his own house—his daughter and only child. "Ahah! my daughter, thou hast brought me very low," was the greeting of the heart-stricken father. But the high-minded maiden is ready for any personal suffering in the hour of her father's triumph. Only she asks for a respite of two months to withdraw to her native mountains, and in their recesses to weep with her virgin-friends over the early disappearance of her life. When that time was ended she returned to her father; and "he did unto her as she desired." But Jephthah had not long leisure, even if he were to spare himself for the indulgence of domestic grief. The proud tribe of Ephraim challenged his right to go to war, as he had done without their concurrence, against Ammon; and they proceeded to vindicate the absurd claim by invading Jephthah in Gilead. They did but add to his triumph which they envied. He first defeated them, then intercepted the fugitives at the ford of Jordan, and there, having insultingly identified them as Ephraimites by a peculiar expression, xi. 34, faithfully translated in the margin of the A. V., has been interpreted as signifying that Jephthah had step-children.

That the daughter of Jephthah was really offered up to God in sacrifice, slain by the hand of her
but and then burned— is a horrible conclusion; but one which it seems impossible to avoid. This was unanimously supposed to be unequivocally stated by Josephus, Ant. v. 7, § 10, and by perhaps all the early Christian Fathers, as Origen, in Joannem, tom. vi. cap. 36; Chrysostom, Hom. ad pop. Antioch. xiv. 3, Opp. ii. 115: Theodoret, Quest. in Jud. xx.; Jerome, Ep. ad Jud. 118, Opp. i. 791, &c.; Augustine, Quest. in Jud. viii. § 46, Opp. iii. 1, p. 610.

For the first eleven centuries of the Christian era this was the current, perhaps the universal opinion of Jews and Christians. Yet none of them extenuates the act of Jephthah. Josephus calls it neither lawful nor pleasing to God. Jewish writers say that he ought to have referred it to the high-priest; but either he failed to do so, or the high-priest culpably omitted to prevent the rash act. Origen strictly confines his praise to the heroism of Jephthah's daughter.

Another interpretation was suggested by Joseph Kimchi. He supposed that, instead of being sacrificed, she was shut up in a house which her father built for the purpose, and that she was there visited by the daughters of Israel four days in each year so long as she lived. This interpretation has been adopted by many eminent men, as by Levi ben Gerson and Bechay among the Jews, and by Dusias, Grotius, Estius, de Dieu, Bishop Hall, Waterland, Dr. Hales, and others. More names of the same period, and of not less authority, might however be added on the other side. Lightfoot once thought (Ewshhin, § 16) that Jephthah did not slay her daughter; but upon more mature reflection he came to the opposite conclusion (Horuminy, etc.; Judg. xi., Works, i. 51).

Each of these two opinions is supported by arguments grounded on the original text and on the customs of the Jews. (1.) In Judg. xi. 31, the word translated in the A. V. " whatsoever " knows no distinction of gender, and may as correctly be translated " whosoever;" and in favor of the latter version it is urged that Jephthah could not have expected to be met by an ox or other animal fit for sacrifice, coming forth from the door of his house; and that it was obviously his intention to signalize his thanksgiving for victory by devoting some human creature (the text, or a substitute for the statute, Lev. xxvii. 23, 29) (given with another purpose, on which see Jahn, Archæologia, § 234, or Ewald, Alterthümer, 89), to the taking of a life which was not forit to the law. (2.) To J. Kimchi's proposal to translate "and I will offer," verse 31, " or I will offer," it has been replied that this sense of the conjunction is rare, that it is not intended in two vocal words in parallel phraseology, Gen. xxviii. 21, 22, and I Sam. i. 11, and that it does not give two alternatives between which there is no opposition. (3.) The word rendered in A. V. " to lament," or " to talk with," verse 40, is translated by later scholars, as in Judg. v. 11, " to celebrate." (4.) It has been said that if Jephthah put his daughter to death, according to verse 39, it is unmeaning to add that she " knew no man;" but on the other hand it is urged that this circumstant is in the text, perhaps the universal opinion of the rashness of Jephthah and the heroism of his daughter. (5.) It has been argued that human sacrifices were opposed to the principles of the Jewish law, and therefore a Jew could not have intended to make a thank-offering of that sort; but it is replied that a Gileadite born in a lawless age, living as a freebooter in the midst of rude and idolatrous people who practiced such sacrifices, was not likely to be unusually acquainted with or to pay unusual respect to the pure and humane laws of Israel. (6.) Lastly, it has been argued that a life of religious celibacy is without injunction or example to favor it in the O. T.

Some persons, mindful of the enrollment of Jephthah among the heroes of faith in Heb. xi. 32, as well as of the expression "the Spirit of the Lord came upon him," Judg. xi. 29, have therefore scrupled to believe that he could be guilty of such a sin as the murder of his child. But it must be remembered also that deep sins of several other faithful men are recorded in Scripture, sometimes without comment; and as Jephthah had time afterwards, so he may have had grace to repent of his vow and his fulfillment of it. At least we know that he felt remorse, which is often the forerunner of retribution and the harbinger of repentance.

Doubtless theological opinions have sometimes had the effect of leading men to prefer one view of Jephthah's vow to the other. Selden mentions that Genebrard was told by a Jew that Kimchi's interpretation was devised in order to prevent Christians quoting the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter as a type of the sacrifice of the Son of God. And Christians, who desire or fear an example alleged in favor of celibate vows or of the fullblility of inspired men, may become partial judges of the question.

The subject is discussed at length in Augustine, l. c. Opp. iii. 1, p. 610; a Treatise by L. Capellus inserted in Crit. Sacr. on Judg. xi. 21; Hall's Contemplations on O. T., bk. x.; Selden, De jure natural et gentium, iv. § 11; Lightfoot, Sermon on Judg. xi. 30, in Works, ii. 1215; Pfeiffer, De voto Jepthah, Opp. 391; Dr. Hales' Analysis of Chronology, ii. 258; and in Rosenmüller's Scholia.

W. T. B.

* It may be well to remind the reader that Kimchi's suggestion (mentioned above) appears as a marginal reading of the A. V.: It " shall surely be the Lord's, or I will offer it up for a burnt-offering."

This disjunctive construction makes the vow of Jephthah not absolute, but conditional: it leaves him at liberty to pursue one course or another, according to the nature of the offering which he might be called to make, on ascertaining who or what should come forth to meet him from his house. But this solution does violence to the Hebrew sentence. Prof. Cassel, in his elaborate article on this subject (Hertzog's Real-Encycl. vi. 490-478), maintains that Jephthah, when he made his vow, was not thinking of the possibility of a human sacrifice, or of an animal sacrifice of any sort, but that he employed the term " burnt-offering " in a spiritual sense; that is, using the expressive word to denote completeness of consecration, he meant that he would devote to God's special and perpetual service the first person of his household whom he should meet.

The event showed that among all the contingencies he had no thought that this person would be his own child; but so it proved, and he proved her to himself in a manner that was impossible of any other, and the sadness of Jephthah's remorse and the heroism of his daughter. The first clause of the vow, it is argued, defines the second: a literal burnt-offering cannot be meant, but one which consists in being the Lord's. It must be admitted that no exact parallel can be found to justify this peculiar meaning of the word
(��). This author presents the same view in his *Richter und Rath*, pp. 106-114. Keil and Delitzsch discuss the question (Bibl. Commentary on the O. T., iv. 386-395), and decide, in like manner, against the idea of a literal sacrifice.

Wordsworth (Holy Bible, with Notes, ii. p. 128) makes up his review of the different explanations with the remark, that the predominance of argument and authority favors the opinion that Jephthah did actually offer his daughter, not against her will, but with her consent, a burnt-offering to the Lord. . . . But we may not pause here. There is a beautiful light shed upon the gloom of this dark history, reflected from the youthful form of the maiden of Gilead, Jephthah's daughter. . . . She is not like the Iphigenia of the Greek story. She offers her own life as a willing sacrifice; and in her love for her father's name, and in calm resolve that all should know she is a willing sacrifice, and with tender and delicate consideration for her father, and in order that no one may charge him with having sacrificed her against her own free will, she craves respect and liberty for two months, that she may range freely on the mountains, apart from the world, and prepare herself for another life of suffering, and for another life. In full foresight of death, she comes down from her mountain liberty at the appointed time to offer her virgin soul for the fulfillment of her father's vow. Her name was held in honor in Israel. The daughters of Israel went yearly to lament her—or rather to celebrate her—“for four days.”

Finally, let it be said, this is one of those acts which the Scripture history simply relates, but leaves the judgment of them to the reader. We cannot, without being unjust to the morality of the Bible, insist too much on this distinction. In itself considered, it is immaterial to the correctness or incorrectness of our interpretation of Jephthah's vow, whether this interpretation exalts or lowers our estimate of his character. The commendation of his faith (Heb. xi. 32) does not extend to all his actions. The same allowance is due to him for frailty and aberrations that we make in behalf of others associated with him in the same catalogue of examples of heroic faith.

II.

JEPHUN'NE (יפונא; Jephone), Echon, xiv. 7. [JEPHUNNEH].

JEPHUN'NEH (יפונא; [perh. for whom a way is prepared]; Jephone). 1. (יפונא). Father of Caleb the scribe, who is usually designated as "Caleb the son of Jephunneh." He appears to have belonged to an Edomitish tribe called Kenzites from Kenez their founder; but his father or other ancestors are not named. [Caleb, 2; KENAZ]. (See Num. xiii. 6, &c.; xxxii. 12, &c.; Josh. xiv. 14, &c.; 1 Chr. iv. 15.)

2. (יפונא in both MSS. [rather, Rom. Alex.; Vat. 1cor.]—A descendant of Asher, eldest of the three sons of Jether (1 Chr vii. 38). A. C. H.

JERAH (ירח). [new moon]: [in Gen.] ירח [Alex. 1999, Comp. ירח; in 1 Chr., Rom. Vat. Alex. omit; Afr. 1999, Comp. ירח; Jere], the fourth in order of the sons of Johanan (Gen. x. 26: 1 Chr. i. 29) and the progenitor of a tribe of southern Arabia. He has not been satisfactorily identified with the name of any Arabian place or tribe, though a fortress (and probably an old town, like the numerous fortified places in the Yemen of the old Himyrrite kingdom) named Yerakh (ירח) is mentioned as belonging to the district of the Nijjaj (Mervizid, s. v. Yerakh), which is in Mahrah, at the extremity of the Yemen (Kamoua, in article KAMOUA; cf. ARABIA). The similarity of name, however, and the other indications, we are not disposed to lay much stress on.

A very different identification has been proposed by Bochart (Phalieg, ii. 19). He translates Jerah = "the moon" into Arabic, and finds the descendants of Jerah in the Allai, a people dwelling near the Red Sea (Agatharch. ap. Hid. Sic. iii. 45), on the strength of a passage in Herodotus (iii. 8), in which he says of the Arabs, "Bacchus they call in their language Otrud; and Uamnu, Allat." He further suggests that these Allai are the Benee-Hild of more modern times, Hili; being near the sun, it shows a narrow rim of light." Gesenius does not object to this theory, which he quotes; but says that the opinion of Michaelis (Spicileg. ii. 60) is more probable: the latter scholar finding Jerah in the "coast of the moon" (correctly, "low land of the moon," أرض القمر, "the mountain of the moon") in each case the moon being "kamar," not "bihil." The former is "a place between Zatari and Esb-Sihir" (Kamoua); the latter in the same part, but more inland: both being, as Gesenius remarks, near to Hadramiut, next to which, in the order of the names, is Jerah in the record in Genesis; and the same argument may be added in favor of our own possible identification with the fortress of Yerakh, named at the commencement of this article. Whatever may be said in support of translating Jerah, as both Bochart and Michaelis have done, the former's theory involves some grave difficulties, which must be stated.

The statement of Herodotus above quoted (cf. i. 131, "the Arabsian call Venus Alitfa"), that Allat signifies Uramia, cannot be accepted without further evidence than we at present possess. Allat was almost doubtless the same as the object of worship called by the Arabs "El-Latt," and any new information respecting the latter is therefore important. It would require too much space in this work to state the various opinions of the Arabs respecting El-Latt, its etymology, etc., as collected in the great MS. Lexicon entitled the "Mohkam," a work little known in Europe; from which (articles لط and لو) we give the following particulars. "El-Latt" is [generally] said to be originally "El-Lath," the name of an object of worship, so called by the appellation of a man who used to moisten mead of parched barley (sawke) with clarified butter or the like, at the place thereof; for the pilgrims: "El-Latt" signifying "the person who performs that operation." The object of worship itself is said to have been a mass of rock upon which he moistened the mead; and which was more properly
JERAMIEEL

mish "the Rock of El-Latt"; after the death of the man above mentioned this rock was worshipped. But some say that "El-Latt" is originally "El-Nakhleh." (El Nakhleh), meaning [not "the Goddess," but] "the Serpent." To this we may add from El-Beydawee (Kur 'an, lii. 19 and 20), El-Latt was an idol of Thakeef, at El-Tuff, or of Kureysh, at Nakhleh; and was so called from 'I'lafeef, because they used to go round about it: or it was called "El-Latt," because it was the image of a man who used to moisten mead of parched barley with clarified butter, and to feed the pilgrims. Our own opinion is that it may be a contraction of "El-Hihat" ("the Serpent," or perhaps "the Goddess"), pronounced according to the dialect of Hinjer, with "t" instead of "h" in the case of a pause. (See the Sihah, MS., art. "Thakeef.") It is said in the Lexicon entitled the Thohidkeel (MS., art. "El-Latt"). El-Kis-i-ee used to pronounce it, in the case of a pause, "El-Liih:" and that those who worshipped it compared its name with that of "El-Hihat.

Pooecke has some remarks on the subject of El-Latt, which the reader may consult (Spec. Hist. Arab., p. 90); and also Sir G. Wilkinson, in his notes to Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, ii. 402, footnote, and Essay i. to bk. iii.): he seems to be wrong, however, in saying that the Arabic "a'awel," "first," "correctly, "a'awali" is "related to "el-Latt, or Allah, etc.; and that Alitta and Myllita are Semitic names derived from "skekel, wodau, 'to bear children." (Essay i. 537). The comparison of Alitta and Myllita is also extremely doubtful; and probably Herodotus assimilated the former name to the latter.

It is necessary to observe, in endeavoring to elucidate the ancient religion of the Ismaeeli Arabes, that fetishism was largely developed among them: and that their idols were generally absurdly rude and primitive. Beyond that relic of primeval revelation which is found in most beliefs — a recognition of one universal and supreme God — the practices of fetishism obtained more or less throughout Arabia: on the north giving place to the faith of the patriarchs: on the south merging into the cosmic worship of the Hinjerites.

That the Alitaei were worshippers of Allat is an assumption unsupported by facts: but, whatever may be said in its favor, the people in question are not the Benue-Hilid, who take their name from a kinsman of Mohameed, in the fifth generation before him, of the well-known stock of Keys. (Cannin, Esdr. (ed. T. X A.; Abel-I-taha, Hist. ant., ed. Fleischer, p. 194.) E. S. P.

JERAMIEEL ('Isrā'emāl) [object of God's mercy]: 'Isrāemāl: [Vat. 'Isrā'emāl, 'Isrēmēl, -ēl, Ra'atā, Al'ras'māl, 'Isrēmēl, -ēl:] Jeremeelel.

1. First-born son of Henzon, the son of Pharez, the son of Judah (1 Chr. ii. 9, 25-27, 39, 42). His descendants are given at length in the same chap. (Azariah, 5: Zarah). They inhabited the southern border of Judah (1 Sam. xvi. 10, comp. 8; xxx. 29).

2. [Vat. Alex. 'Isrāmēl] A Merarite Levite; the representative, at the time of the organization of the Divine service by king David, of the family of Kish, the son of Mahli (1 Chr. xxiv. 29; comp. xxvii. 21).

3. [Iṣeremāl, Alex. -ēl, FA. -ēla: Jeremiael.] Son of Hammelech, or, as the LXX. render it, "the king," who was employed by Jehoshakim to make Jeremiah and Baruch prisoners, after he had burnt the roll of Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer. xxxvi. 26).

JERÁHEELITÉS, THE (Ele-Latt) [patronym. from the above]: Iṣeremāli, b 'Iṣeremēl: [Vat. in xxx. 29, Iṣeremēl: Iṣeremēli: Jeremiahel]. The tribe descended from the first of the foregoing persons (1 Sam. xxvii. 10). Their cities are also named amongst those to which David sent presents from his Anakileite booty (xxx. 29), although to Achish he had represented that he had attacked them.

JERÉCHUS (Iṣreghōs) [or i-čsēt; Vat. Iṣre- 

evōs]: Jericus, I Esdr. v. 22. [Jericho.]

JERED (Iṣregh) [descent, going down]: Iṣregh: Jered. 1. One of the patriarchs before the flood, son of Mahaleel and father of Enoch (1 Chr. i. 2).

In Genesis the name is given as JARED.

2. [Jere'ch.] One of the descendants of Judah signalled as the "father — i.e. the founder — of Geor" (1 Chr. iv. 18). He was one of the sons of Ezrah by his wife Ha-Jeshubiah, i.e. the Jewess. The Jews, however, give an allegorical interpretation to the passage, and treat this and other names therein as titles of Moses — Jered, because he caused the manna to descend. Here — as noticed under Jabez — the pan, though obvious in Biblical Hebrew, where Jered (the root of Jordan) means "to descend," is concealed in the rabbinical paraphrase, which has שְׁלֹשׁ, a word with the same meaning, but without any relation to Jered, either for eye or ear.

JERÉMAI [3 sy], ('Iṣregh) [dwellers on heights]: Iṣregh: Jeresia; [Vat. Iṣre- 

eṣia, FA. —ēsia: Jeremai], a layman; one of the Bene-

Hesham, who was compelled by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 36). In the lists of Ezrast it is omitted.

JEREMIAH ('Iṣregh), as the more usual form, or Iṣregh, ch. xxxvi.-xxxviii.: Iṣregha: Jeremias, Vulg.: Hieremia, Hieron. et al.). The name has been variously explained: by Jerome and Simonis (Onomast., p. 535), as "the exalted of the Lord;" by Gesenius (t. c.), as "appointed of the Lord;" by Carpoza (Intro. ad Tob. V. T. p. 3 c, fol.) following by Hengstenberg (Christologia des A. B. vol. i., as "the Lord throws" — the latter seeing in the name a prophetic reference to the book described in i. 10; [by Dietrich, "whom Jehovah founds," i.e. establishes.]

1. Life. — It will be convenient to arrange what is known as to the life and work of this prophet in sections corresponding to its chief periods. The materials for such an account are to be found almost exclusively in the book which bears his name. Whatever interest may attach to Jewish or Christian traditions connected with his name, they have no claim to be regarded as historical, and we are left to form what picture we can of the man and of his times from the narratives and prophecies which he himself has left. Fortunately, these have
some down to us, though in some disorder, with
usual fullness; and there is no one in the "goodly
fellowship of the prophets" of whom, in his work,
feelings, sufferings, we have so distinct a knowledge.
He is for us the great example of the prophetic life,
the representative of the prophetic order. It is not
x be wondered at that he should have seemed to
the Christian feeling of the Early Church a type of
Man in whom that life received its highest com-
pletion (Hieron. Comm. in Jerem. xxii. 3); Origen,
Hom. in Jerem. i. and viii.; Aug. de Prae. Dei, c.
xxvii.), or that recent writers should have identi-
fied him with the "Servant of the Lord" in the
later chapters of Isaiah (Bansen, Gott in der Gus
chte, i. 425-447; Engelbach, art. "Jerem." in Herzen's Real-Enzyklop.).

(1.) Under Josiah, n. c. 638-686. — In the 39th
year of the reign of Josiah, the prophet speaks
of himself as still "a child" (2 K. i. 6). We cannot
rely indeed on this word as a chronological datum.
It may have been used simply as the ex-
pression of conscious weakness, and as a word of
age it extends from infant infancy (Ex. ii. 6; 1 Sam.
iv. 11) to entire manhood (2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 K. li. 7).
We may at least infer, however, as we can trace his
life in full activity for upwards of forty years from this period, that at the commence-
ment of that reign he could not have passed out of
actual childhood. He is described as "the son of
Hilkiah of the priests that were in Anathoth" (1. 1).
Were we able, with some earlier (0.lem. Al. Strom.
I. p. 142; Jerome, Opor. tom. iv § 16, 11) and
some later writers (Gellhorn, Celsius, Maldonatus,
von Boden, Umbreit), to identify this Hilkiah with
the high-priest who bore so large a share in Josiah's
work of reformation, it would be interesting to
think of the king and the prophet, so nearly of the
same age (2 Chr. xxxiv. 1), as growing up together
under the same training, subject to the same in-
fluences. Against this hypothesis, however, there
have been urged the facts (Carpos. Keil, Ewald,
and others) — (1.) that the name is too common
to be a ground of identification; (2.) that the man-
ner in which this Hilkiah is mentioned is inco-
sistent with the notion of his having been the
High-priest of Israel; (3.) that neither Jeremiah
himself, nor his opponents, allude to this parentage;
(4.) that the priests who lived at Anathoth were
of the House of Uthman (1 K. ii. 26; 1 Chr. xxiv.
3), while the high-priests from Zadok downwards
were of the line of Eleazar (Carpos. Introd. in lib.
V. T. Jerem.). The occurrence of the same name
may be looked on, however, in this as in many
other instances in the O. T., as a probable indi-
cation of affinity or friendship; and this, together
with the coincidences — (1.) that the uncle of Jerem-
iah (xxxvi. 7) bears the same name as the husband
of Hilkiah; (2.) that the high-priests from Zadok downwards
in Anathoth as a son of Shaphan, the great sup-
porter of Hilkiah and Huldah in their work (2 Chr.
xxiv. 20) was also, throughout, the great protector
of the prophet (Jer. xxvi. 24), may help to throw
some light on the education by which he was pre-
pared for that work to which he was taught to have
been "sacrificed from his mother's womb." The
strange Rabbinic tradition (Carpos. i. c.), that
right of the personal most conspicuous among the reli-
gious history of this period (Jeremiah, Baruch,
Nechoh, Maseiah, Hilkiah, Hanameel, Huldah, Shaphan) were all descended from the harlot Rahab,
day possibly have been a distortion of the fact that
they were connected, in some way or other, as
members of a family. If this were so, we can form
a tolerably distinct notion of the influences that
were at work on Jeremiah's youth. The boy would
hear among the priests of his native town, not three
miles distant from Jerusalem [Anathoth], of the
obediences and cruelties of Manasseh and his son
Amon. He would be trained in the traditional
practices and ordinances of the Law. He would
become acquainted with the names and writings
of other prophets, such as Mica and Isaiah.
As
he grew up towards manhood, he would hear also
of the work which the king and his counsellors were
carrying on, and of the teaching of the woman,
who alone, or nearly so, in the midst of that reli-
gious revival, was looked upon as speaking from
direct prophetic inspiration. In all likelihood, as
we have seen, he came into actual contact with
them. Possibly, too, to this period of his life we
may trace the commencement of that friendship
with the family of Neriah which was afterwards so
fruitful in results. The two brothers Baruch and
Nechoh both appear as the disciples of the prophet
(xxxvi. 4, li. 59); both were the sons of Neriah,
the first born of Josiah (Jerem. vii. 21; xxxiv. 7.
xxiv. 8) was governor of Jerusalem, acting with
Hilkiah and Shaphan in the religious reforms of
Josiah. As the result of all these influences we
find in him all the conspicuous features of the
devout ascetic character: intense consciousness
of his own weakness, great susceptibility to vary-
ing emotions, a spirit easily bowed down. But there
were also, we may believe (assuming only that the
prophetic character is the development, purified
and exalted, of the natural, not its contradiction),
the strong national feelings of an Israelite, the
desire to see his nation becoming in reality what
it had been called to be, anxious doubts whether
this was possible, for a people that had sunk so low
(cf. Maurice, Propheils and Kings of the O. T.,
Sem. xxii.-xxiv.; Ewald, Propheils. ii. p. 6-8).
Left to himself, he might have borne his part
among the reforming priests of Josiah's reign, free
from their formalism and hypocrisy. But the
word of Jehovah came to him" (1. 2); and by that
divine voice the secret of his future life was revealed
to him, at the very time when the work of reformation
was going on with fresh vigor (2 Chr. xxxiv. 3),
when he himself was beginning to have the thoughts
and feelings of a man. He was to lay aside all
self-distraction, all natural fear and trembling (1. 7, 8),
and to accept his calling as a prophet of Jehovah
"set over the nations and over the kingdoms,
to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and
to throw down, to build and to plant" (i. 10). A
life-long martyrdom was set before him, a struggle
against kings and priests and people (i. 18). When
was this wonderful mission developed into action? We
may have a clue there, and the life of the man who received it? For a time, it
would seem, he held aloft from the work which was
going on throughout the nation. His name is
nowhere mentioned in the history of the memorable
eighteenth year of Josiah. Though five years had
passed since he had entered on the work of a
prophet, it is from Hilkiah, not from him, that the
son of Maseiah (c. c.); and conse-quence of the Book of the Law, however (we need
not now inquire whether it was the Pentateuch as
— A Carpos. (i. c.) fixes twenty as the probable age
of Jeremiah at the time of his call.
a whole, or a lost portion of it, or a compilation altogether new), could not fail to exercise an influence on a mind like Jeremiah's: his later writings show abundant traces of it (cf. infra); and the result apparently was, that he could not share the hopes which others cherished. To them the reformation seemed more thorough than that accomplished by Hezekiah. They might think that fasts, and sacrifices, and the punishment of idolaters, might avert the penalties of which they heard in the book so strangely found (Deut. xxvii., xxviii., xxxii.), and might lead for a time to peace, of godliness and security (vii. 4). He saw that the reformation was but a surface one. Israel had gone into captivity, and Judah was worse than Israel (iii. 11). It was as hard for him as it had been for Isaiah, to find among the princes and people who worshipped in the Temple, one just, truth-seeking man (v. 1. 28). His own work, as a priest and prophet, led him to discern the falsehood and lust of rule which were at work under the form of zeal (v. 31). The spoken or written prophecies of his contemporaries, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Urijah, Huldah, may have served to deepen his convictions, that the sentence of condignation was already passed, and that there was no escape from it. The strange visions which had followed upon his call (i. 11-16) taught him that Jehovah would " hasten " the performance of His word; and if the Sycionid intruders of the later years of Josiah's reign seemed in part to correspond to the " destruction coming from the North " (Ewald, Propheta in loc.), they could hardly be looked upon as exaggerating the words that spoke of it. Hence, though we have hardly any mention of special incidents in the life of Jeremiah during the eighteen years between his call and Josiah's death, the main features of his life come distinctly enough before us. He had even then his experience of the bitterness of the lot to which God had called him. The duties of the priest, even if he continued to discharge them, were merged in those of the new and special office. Strange as it was for a priest to remain unmarried, his lot was to be one of solitude (xvi. 2). It was not for him to enter into the house of feasting, or even into that of mourning (xv. 5, 8). From time to time he appeared, clad probably in the " rough garment " of a prophet (Zech. xiii. 4), in Anathoth and Jerusalem. He was heard warning and protesting, " rising early and speaking " (xxv. 3), and as the result of this there came " reproach and derision daily " (xx. 8). He was betrayed by his own kindred (xii. 6), persecuted with murderous hate by his own townsmen (xiv. 21), mocked with the taunting question, Where is the word of Jehovah? (xvii. 13). And there were inner spiritual trials as well as these outward ones. He too, like the writers of Job and Ps. cxiii., was haunted by perplexities rising out of the disorders of the world (xii. 1, 2); on him there came the bitter feeling, that he was " a man of contention to the whole earth " (xxv. 10); the doubt whether his whole work was not a delusion and lie (xxvi. 19); the tempting of all times to fall back into silence, until the fire again burnt within him, and he was weary of forbearing (xx. 9). Whether the passages that have been referred to belong, all of them, to this period or a later one, they represent that which was inseparable from the prophet's life at all times, and which, in a character like Jeremiah's, was developed in its strongest form. Towards the close of the reign, however, he appears to have taken some part in the great national questions then at issue. The overthrow of the Assyrian monarchy to which Manasseh had become tributary led the old Egyptian party among the princes of Judah to revive their plans, and to urge an alliance with Pharaoh-Necho, as did Ezekiel (xvii. 18). Jeremiah, following in the footsteps of Isaiah (Is. xxx. 1-7), warned them that it would lead only to confusion (ii. 18, 36). The policy of Josiah was determined, probably, by this counsel. He chose to attach himself to the new Chaldean kingdom, and lost his life in the vain attempt to stop the progress of the Egyptian king. We may think of this as one of the first great sorrows of Jeremiah's life. His lamentations for the king (2 Chr. xxxv. 25) may have been those of personal friendship. They were certainly those of a man who, with nothing before him but the prospect of confusion and wrong, looks back upon a reign of righteousness and truth (xxii. 16). 

(2.) Under Jehoahaz (= Shalman), n. c. 608. — The short reign of this prince — chosen by the people on hearing of Josiah's death, and after three months deposed by Pharaoh-Necho — gave little scope for direct prophetic action. The fact of his deposition, however, shows that he had been set up against Egypt, and therefore as representing the policy of which Jeremiah had been the advocate; and this may account for the tenderness and pity with which he speaks of him in his Egyptian exile (xxii. 11, 12).

(3.) Under Jehoiakim, n. c. 607-597. — In the weakness and disorder which characterized this reign, the work of Jeremiah became daily more prominent. The king had come to the throne as the vassal of Egypt, and for a time the Egyptian party was dominant in Jerusalem. It numbered among its members many of the princes of Judah, many priests and prophets, the Pashurs and the Hananihas. Others, however, remained faithful to the policy of Josiah, and held that the only way of safety lay in accepting the supremacy of the Chaldeans. Jeremiah appeared as the chief representative of this party. He had learnt to discern the signs of the times; the evils of the nation were not to be cured by any half-measures of reform, or by foreign alliances. The king of Babylon was God's servant (xx. 9, xxviii. 6), doing his work and was for a time to prevail over all resistance. Hard as it was for one who sympathized so deeply with all the sufferings of his country, this was the conviction to which he had to bring himself. He had to expose himself to the suspicion of treachery by declaring it. Men claiming to be prophets had their " word of Jehovah " to set against his (xiv. 14, xxiii. 17), and all that he could do was to submit his heart to God, and let the result come. None of the most striking scenes in this conflict are brought before us with great vividness. Soon after the accession of Jehoiakim, on one of the sol -

a This is clearly the natural inference from the words, and patristic writers take the fact for granted.
b The hypothesis which ascertains these lamentations to Jeremiah of Libnah, Josiah's father-in-law, is hardly worth refuting.
The feast-days — when the courts of the Temple were filled with worshippers from all the cities of Judah, the prophet appeared in a garment the message that Jerusalem should become a curse, that the Temple should share the fate of the tabernacle of Shiloh (xxvi. 6). Then it was that the great struggle of his life began: priests and prophets and people joined in the demand for his death (xxvi. 8). The princes of Judah, among whom were still many of the counsellors of Josiah, or their sons, endeavoured to protect him (xxvi. 18). His friends, including the president of the Meroshaites, who in the reign of Hezekiah had uttered a like prophecy with impurity, and so for a time he escaped. The fate of one who was stirred up to prophesy in the same strain showed, however, what he might expect from the weak and cruel king. If Jeremiah was not at once hunted to death, like Uriah (xxvi. 23), it was only because his friend Ahikam was powerful enough to protect him. The fourth year of Jehoiakim was yet more memorable. The battle of Carchemish overthrew the hopes of the Egyptian party (xvi. 2), and the armies of Nebuchadnezzar drove those who had no defended cities to take refuge in Jerusalem (xxvii. 11). As one of the consequences of this, we have the interesting episode of the Hechabites. The mind of the prophet, acetic in his habits, shrinking to the simple life of a Chaldaean prophet, perceiving that a natural enough drawn towards the tribe which was at once conspicuous for its abstinencc from wine and its traditional hatred of idolatry (2 K. x. 15). The occurrence of the name of Jeremiah among them, and their ready reception into the Temple, may point, perhaps, to a previous intimacy with him and his brother priests. Now they and their mode of life had a new significance for him. They, with their reverence for the precepts of the founders of their tribe, were as a living protest against the disobedience of the men of Judah to a higher law (xxviii. 18). In this year too came another solemn message to the king: prophecies which had been uttered, here and there at intervals, were now to be gathered together, written in a book, and read as a whole in the hearing of the people. Baruch, already known as the prophet's disciple and scribe; and in the following year, when a solemn fast-day called the whole people together in the Temple (xxxvi. 1-10), Jeremiah — hindered himself, we know not how — sent him to proclaim them. The result was as it had been before: the princes of Judah cowarded at the escape of the prophet and his scribe (xxxvi. 19). The king vented his impotent rage upon the scroll which Jeremiah had written. Jeremiah and Baruch, in their retirement, wrote it with many added prophecies; among them, probably, the special prediction that the king should die by the sword, and he cast out unburied and dishonoured (xxii. 30). In ch. xlv., which belongs to this period, we have a glimpse into the relations which existed between the master and the scholar, and into what at that time were the contents of his mind. The prophet and more eager, had expected a change for the better. To play a prominent part in the impending crisis, to be the hero of a national revival, to gain the favor of the conqueror whose coming he announced — this, or something like this, had been the vision that had come before him, and when this passed away he sank into despair at the seeming fruitlessness of his efforts. Jeremiah had passed through that phase of trial and could sympathize with it and knew how to meet it. To the mind of his disciple, as once to his own, the future was revealed in all its dreariness. He foretold the great things "for himself in the midst of his country and ruin: his life, and that only, was to be given him "for a prey." As the danger drew nearer, there was given to the Prophet a clearer insight into the purposes of God for his people. He might have thought before, as others did, that the chastisement would be but for a short time, that repentance would lead to strength, and that the yoke of the Chaldaean conqueror would be lifted off; but he knew that it would last for seventy years (xxv. 12), till he and all that generation had passed away. Nor was it on Judah only that the king of Babylon was to execute the judgments of Jehovah: all nations that were within the prophet's ken would be to drink as fully as she did of "the wine-cup of his fury" (xxv. 15-38). In the absence of special dates for other events in the reign of Jehoiakim, we may bring together into one picture some of the most striking features of this period of Jeremiah's life. As the danger from the Chaldaeans became more threatening, the persecution against him grew hotter, his own thoughts were more bitter and desponding (xviii.). The people sought his life: his voice rose up in the prayer that God would deliver and avenge him. Common facts became significant to him; the wonderful circumstances of the work of better aiming at the production of a perfect form, rejecting the vessels which did not attain to it, became a parable of God's dealings with Israel and with the world (xvii. 1-6: comp. Maurice, Prophecies and Kings, i. 6). That thought he soon reproduced in act as well as word. Standing in the valley of Ben-Hinnom, he broke the earthen vessel he carried in his hands, and prophesied to the people that the whole city should be defiled with the dead, as that valley had been, within their memory, by Josiah (xix. 10-13). The boldness of the speech and act drew upon him immediate punishment. The priest Pashur smote and put him "in the stocks" (xx. 2); and then there came upon him, as in all seasons of suffering, the sense of failure and weakness. The work of God's messengers seemed to him to terminate in nothing; he who had been called God's servant and the future of the nation, found himself to have been but a delusion, as the Lord had said (xx. 9). He used for himself the cry of wailing that had belonged to the extremest agony of Job (xx. 14-18). The years that followed brought no change for the better. Famine and drought were added to the miseries of the people (xix. 1), but false prophets still deceived them with assurances of plenty; and Jeremiah was looked on with dislike, as "a prophet of evil," and "every one cursed" him (xx. 10). He was set, however, "as a fenced hinman wall" (xx. 20), and went on with his work, reproving king and nobles and people; as for other sins, so also especially for their desecration of the Sabbath (xxii. 13-25), for their blind reverence for the Temple, and yet blinder trust in it, even while they were worshipping the Queen of Heaven in the city streets of Jerusalem (xxii. 14, 18). Now too, as before, his work extended to other nations: they were not to exult in the downfall of Judah, but to share it. All were to be swallowed up in the empire of the Chaldaeans (xxiii.-xxiv.). If there had been nothing beyond this, no hope for Israel or this world but that of a universal monarchy resting on brute strength, the work of Jeremiah would have been overwhelming; but through this darkness there gleamed the dawning of a glorious Hope. When
The seventy years were over, there was to be a restoration as wonderful as that from Egypt had been (xxxiii. 7). In the far off future there was the vision of a renewed kingdom; of a "righteous branch" of the house of David, "executing judgment and justice," of Israel and Judah dwelling safely, once more united, under "the Lord our Righteousness" (xxvii. 5, 6).

It is doubtful how far we can deal with the strange narrative of ch. xiii., as a fact in Jeremiah's life. "Prophecies (Prophecy not A. B, in loc.) rejects the reading "Euphrates" altogether; Hitzig, following Bochart, conjectures Euphrates. Most other modern commentators look on the narrative as merely symbolical. Assuming, however (with Calmet and Henderson, and the consensus of patristic expositors), that there, as in xix. 1, 10, xxvii. 2; Is. xx. 2, the symbols, however strange they might seem, were not and not, it is open to us to conjecture that in this visit to the land of the Chaldeans may have originated his acquaintance with the princes and commanders who afterwards befriended him. The special commands given in his favor by Nebuchadnezzar (xxxix. 11) seem at any rate to imply some previous knowledge.

(4.) Under Jehoiachin (=Jeremiah), n. c. 597.

— The danger which Jeremiah had so long foretold now threatened his life. Probably his successor, was carried into exile, and with them all that constituted the worth and strength of the nation,—princes, warriors, artists (2 K. xxiv.). Among them too were some of the false prophets who had encouraged the people with the hope of a speedy deliverance, and could not yet abandon their blind confidence. Of the work of the prophet in this short reign we have but the fragmentary record of xxvi. 24—30. We may infer, however, from the language of his later prophecies, that he looked with sympathy and sorrow on the fate of the exiles in Babylon: and that the fulfillment of all that he had been told to utter made him stronger than ever in his resistance to all schemes of independence and revolt.

(5.) Under Zedekiah, n. c. 597-586. — In this prince (probably, as having been appointed by Nebuchadnezzar, he failed to find the same obstinate resistance to the prophet's counsels as in Jehoiakin. He respects him, fears him, seeks his counsel; but he is a mere shadow of a king, powerless even against his own counselors, and in his reign, accordingly, the sufferings of Jeremiah were sharper than they had been before. The struggle with the false prophets went on: the more desperate the condition of their country, the more daring were their predictions of deliverance. Between such men, living in the present, and the true prophet, walking by faith in the unseen future of a righteous kingdom (xxiii. 5, 6), there could not but be an interminable enmity. He saw too plainly that nothing but the most worthless remnant of the nation had been left in Judah (xxiv. 5-8), and denounced the falsehood of those who came with lying messages of peace. First Jehoiakin, then the exiles (conveyed in a letter which, of all portions of the O. T., comes nearest in form and character to the Epistles of the N. T.) was, that they should submit to their lot, prepare for a long captivity, and wait quietly for the ultimate restoration. In this hope he found comfort for himself which made his sleep "sweet" unto him, even in the midst of all his sorrows and strife (xxx. 20). Even at Babylon, however, there were false prophets opposing him, speaking of him as a "madman" (xxiv. 26), urging the priests of Jerusalem to more active persecution. The trial soon followed. The king at first seemed willing to be guided by him, and sent to ask for his intercession (xxvii. 3), but the apparent revival of the power of Egypt under Apries (Ptolemy-Hophra), created false hopes, and drew him and the princes of the neighboring nations into projects of revolt. The earnestness with which Jeremiah had foretold the ultimate overthrow of Babylon, in a letter sent to the exiles in that city by his disciple, Baruch's brother Semiah (assuming the genuineness of I. and ii.), made him all the more certain that the time of that overthrow had not yet arrived, and that it was not to come from the hand of Egypt. He appears in the streets of the city with bonds and yokes upon his neck (xxvii. 2), announcing that they were meant for Judah and its allies. The false prophet Hananiah — who broke the offensive symbol (xxxviii. 10), and predicted the destruction of the Chaldeans within two years (xxviii. 3) — learnt that "a yoke of iron" was upon the neck of all the nations, and died himself while it was still pressing heavily on Judah (xxviii. 16, 17). The approach of an Egyptian army, however, and the consequent departure of the Chaldeans, made the position of Jeremiah full of danger; and he went to his home a prisoner, and the judicial procession of Jehoiachin, his escape from a city in which he seemed, he could no longer do good, and to take refuge in his own town of Anathoth or its neighborhood (xxviii. 12). The discovery of this plan led, not unnaturally perhaps, to the charge of desertion: it was thought that he too was "falling away to the Chaldeans," as others were doing (xxviii. 29); and, in spite of his denial, he was thrown into a dungeon (xxviii. 13). The interposition of the king, who still respected and consulted him, led to some mitigation of the rigor of his confinement (xxviii. 21); but, as this did not hinder him from speaking to the people, the princes of Judah—sent on an alliance with Egypt, and calculating on the king's being unable to resist them (xxviii. 5)—threw him into the prison-pit, to die there. From this horrible fate he was again delivered by the friendship of the Ethiopian eunuch, Ebed-Meles, who found the king's "evil in this city in which he had been kept previously, where we find (xxx. 16) he had the companionship of Baruch. In the impotence of his perplexity, Zedekiah once again secretly consulted him (xxxviii. 14), but only to hear the certainty of failure if he continued to resist the authority of the Chaldeans. The same counsel was repeated more openly when the king sent Pashur (not the same person mentioned) and Zephaniah—before friendly, it appears, to Jeremiah, or at least neutral (xxix. 20)—to ask for his advice. Fruitless as it was, we may yet trace, in the softened language of xxiv. 5, one consequence of the king's kindness: though exile was inevitable, he was yet to "die in peace." The return of the Chaldean army filled both king and people with dismay (xxvii. 1); and the risk now was, that they would pass from their presumptuous confidence to the opposite extreme and sink down in despair, with no faith in God and no hope for the future. The prophet was taught how to meet that danger also. In his prison, while the Chaldeans were ravaging the country, he bought, with all requisite formalities, the field at Anathoth, which his kinsman Hanamel wished to get rid of (xxvi. 6-9). His faith in the promises of God did not fail him.
With a confidence in his country's future, which has been compared (Nagyebisch, L. c.) to that of the Roman who bought at its full value the very ground on which the forces of Hannibal were encamped (Liv. xxxvi. 11), he believed not only that "houses and fields and vineyards should again be possessed in the land" (xxxii. 15), but that the voice of gladness should still be heard there (xxxiii. 11), that, under the "Lord our Righteousness," the house of David and the priests the Levites should never be without representatives (xxxiii. 15-18). At last the blow came. The solemn renewal of the national covenant (xxxiv. 10), the offer of freedom to all who had been brought into slavery, were of no avail. The selfishness of the nobles was stronger even than their fears, and the prophet, who had before rebuked them for their desecration of the Sabbath, now had to protest against their disregard of the sabbatic year (xxxiv. 14). The city was taken, the temple burnt. The king and his princes shared the fate of Jehoiachin. The prophet gave utterance to his sorrow in the Lamentations.

(6.) After the capture of Jerusalem, B. C. 586-7. The Chaldean party in Judah had now the prospect of better things. Nebuchadnezzar did not fail to reward those who, in the midst of hardships of all kinds, had served him so faithfully. We find accordingly a special charge given to Nebuzaradan (xxxiv. 11) to protect the person of Jeremiah, and, after being carried as far as Ramah with the crown of captives (xl. 1), he was set free, and Gedaliah, the son of his steadfast friend Ahikam, made governor over the cities of Judah. The feeling of the Chaldeans towards him was shown yet more strongly in the offer made him by Nebuzaradan (xl. 4,5). It was left to him to decide whether he would go to Babylon, with the prospect of living there under the patronage of the king, or remain in his own land with Gedaliah and the remnant over whom he ruled. Whatever may have been his motive—sympathy with the sufferings of the people, attachment to his native land, or the desire to help his friend—the prophet chose the latter, and the Chaldean commander "gave him a reward," and set him free. For a short time there was an interval of peace (xl. 9-12), soon broken, however, by the murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael and his associates. We are left to conjecture in what way the prophet escaped from a massacre which was apparently intended to include all the adherents of Gedaliah. The fullness with which the history of the massacre is narrated in chap. xii. makes it however probable that he was among the prisoners whom Ishmael was carrying off to the Ammonites, and who were released by the arrival of Johanan. One of Jeremiah's friends was thus cut off, but Baruch still remained with him, and his life, though under constant danger, was spared, and his work continued. We are not informed how long the command on the death of Gedaliah, turned to him for counsel. "The governor appointed by the Chaldeans had been assassinated. Would not their vengeance fall on the whole people? Was there any safety but in escaping to Egypt while they could?" They came accordingly to Jeremiah with a foregone conclusion. With the risk of perils and the probability of that happening which had been foreseen, he consented to go with Baruch the old charge of treachery (xiii. 3). The people followed their own counsel, and—lest the two whom they suspected should betray or contract it—took them also by force to Egypt. There, in the city of Tahpanhes, we have the last clear glimpses of the prophet's life. His words are sharper and stronger than ever. He does not shrink, even there, from speaking of the Chaldean king once more as the "servant of Jehovah" (xiii. 10). He declares that they should see the throne of the conqueror set up in the very place which they had chosen as the securest refuge. He utters a final protest against the ideas of which the death of Gedaliah and their fathers had been guilty, and which they were even then renewing. After this all is uncertain. If we could assume that li. 31 was written by Jeremiah himself, it would show that he reached an extreme old age, but this is so doubtful that we are left to other sources. On the one hand, there is the Christian tradition, resting doubtless on some earlier belief (Tertull., adv.omon. c. 8; Pseudo-Epiphan. Opp. lib. 239; Hieron., adv. Jovin. ii. 37, that the long tragedy of his life ended in actual martyrdom, and that the Jews at Tahpanhes, irritated by his rebukes, at last stoned him to death. Most commentators on the N. T. find an allusion to this in Heb. xvi. 37. An Alexandrian tradition reported that his bones had been brought to that city by Alexander the Great, who took the city of Tahpanhes, as Nebuchadnezzar had done the city of Jerusalem, 156, ed. Diodor, quoted by Carpzov and Nagyebisch). In the beginning of the last century travellers were told, though no one knew the precise spot, that he had been buried at Gilead (Lucas, Travels in the Levant, p. 28). On the other side, there is the Jewish statement that, on the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, he, with Baruch, made his escape to Babylon (Seder Olam Rabba, c. 26); Genadriel, Chronol. Heb. 1608) or Judah (R. Solomon Jarchi, on Jer. xiv. 14), and died in peace. Josephus is altogether silent as to his fate, but states generally that the Jews who took refuge in Egypt were finally carried to Babylon as captives (Ant. x. 9). It is not impossible, however, that both the Jewish tradition and the silence of Josephus originated in the desire to gloss over a great crime, and that the elder of Nebuzaradan (xl. 4) suggested the conjecture that afterwards grew into an assertion. As it is, the darkness and doubt that brood over the last days of the prophet's life are more significant than either of the issues which presented themselves to men's imaginations as the winding-up of his career. He did not need a death by violence to make him a true martyr. To die, with none to record the time or manner of his death, was the right end for one who had spoken all along, not to win the praise of men, but because the word of the Lord was in him a "burning fire" (xx. 9). May we not even conjecture that this silence was due to the prophet himself? If we believe (cf. infra) that Baruch, who was with Jeremiah in Egypt, survived him, and had any share in bringing out and editing his prophecies, it is hard to account for the omission of a fact of so much interest, except on the hypothesis that his lips were sealed by the injunctions of the master who thus taught him, by example as well as by precept, that he was not to seek "great things" for himself.

Other traditions connected with the name of Jeremiah are obscure, though they throw no light on his history, are interesting, as showing the impression left by his work and life on the minds of later generations. As the Captivity dragged on, the prophecy of the Seventy Years, which had at first been so full of terror, came to be a ground of hope.
JEREMIAH

I. Character and Style. — It will have been seen from this narrative that there fell to the lot of Jeremiah sharper suffering than any previous prophet had experienced. It was not merely that the misery which others had seen afar off was actually pressing on him and on his country, nor that he had to endure a life of persecution, while they had intervals of repose, in which they were honored and their counsel sought. In addition to all this, causes of outward circumstances, there was that of individual character, influenced by them, reacting on them. In every page of his prophecies we recognize the temperament which, while it does not lead the man who has it to shrink from doing God’s work, however painful, makes the pain of doing it infinitely more acute, and gives to the whole character the terrors of a deeper and more lasting melancholy. He is preeminently “the man that hath seen afflictions” (Lam. iii. 1). There is no sorrow like unto his sorrow (Lam. i. 12). He witnesses the departure, one by one, of all his hopes of national reformation and deliverance. He has to appear, Cassandra-like, as a prophet of evil, dashes to the ground the false hopes with which the people are buoying themselves up. Other prophets, like Elias, Elisha, Isaiah, had taught the people to resistance. He (like Phocion in the parallel crisis of Athenian history) has been brought to the conclusion, bitter as it is, that the only safety for his countrymen lies in their accepting that against which they are contending as the worst of evils; and this brings on him the charge of treachery and desertion. If it were not for his trust in the God of Israel, for his hope of a better future to be brought out of all this chaos and darkness, his heart would fail within him. But that vision is clear and bright, and it gives to him, almost as fully as to Isaiah, the character of a prophet of the Gospel. He is not merely an Israelite looking forward to a national restoration. In the midst of all the woe which he utters against neighboring nations he has hopes and promises for them also (xlvii. 47, xlix. 6, 30). In that stormy sunset of prophecy, he beholds, in spirit, the dawn of a brighter and eternal day. He sees that, if there is any hope of salvation for his people, it cannot be by a return to the old system and the old ordinances, divine though they once had been (xxxi. 31). There must be a New Covenant. That word, destined to be so full of power for all after-ages, appears first in his prophecies. The relations between him and the people as a member of the Christian church, and appeared in the notion that he had never really died, but would return one day from Paradise as one of the “two witnesses” of the Apocalypse (Victorinus, Comm. in Apoc. xi. 13). Egyptian legends assumed yet wilder and more fantastic forms. He it was who foretold to the priests of Egypt that their idols should one day fall to the ground in the presence of the virgin king (Epictetus, Tē Tript. Opp. p. 290). Playing the part of a St. Patrick, he had delivered one district on the shores of the Nile from crocodiles and asps, and even in the 4th century of the Christian era the dust of that region was looked on as a specific against their bites (ibid.). According to another tradition, he had returned from Egypt to Jerusalem, and lived there for 300 years (D’Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. p. 499). The O.T. narrative of his sufferings was dressed out with the incidents of a Christian martyrdom (Eupolemus, Polyhist. in Euseb. Prep. Evang. ix. 39).

II. Character and Style. — It will have been seen from this narrative that there fell to the lot of Jeremiah sharper suffering than any previous prophet had experienced. It was not merely that the misery which others had seen afar off was actually pressing on him and on his country, nor that he had to endure a life of persecution, while they had intervals of repose, in which they were honored and their counsel sought. In addition to all this, causes of outward circumstances, there was that of individual character, influenced by them, reacting on them. In every page of his prophecies we recognize the temperament which, while it does not lead the man who has it to shrink from doing God’s work, however painful, makes the pain of doing it infinitely more acute, and gives to the whole character the terrors of a deeper and more lasting melancholy. He is preeminently “the man that hath seen afflictions” (Lam. iii. 1). There is no sorrow like unto his sorrow (Lam. i. 12). He witnesses the departure, one by one, of all his hopes of national reformation and deliverance. He has to appear, Cassandra-like, as a prophet of evil, dashes to the ground the false hopes with which the people are buoying themselves up. Other prophets, like Elias, Elisha, Isaiah, had taught the people to resistance. He (like Phocion in the parallel crisis of Athenian history) has been brought to the conclusion, bitter as it is, that the only safety for his countrymen lies in their accepting that against which they are contending as the worst of evils; and this brings on him the charge of treachery and desertion. If it were not for his trust in the God of Israel, for his hope of a better future to be brought out of all this chaos and darkness, his heart would fail within him. But that vision is clear and bright, and it gives to him, almost as fully as to Isaiah, the character of a prophet of the Gospel. He is not merely an Israelite looking forward to a national restoration. In the midst of all the woe which he utters against neighboring nations he has hopes and promises for them also (xlvii. 47, xlix. 6, 30). In that stormy sunset of prophecy, he beholds, in spirit, the dawn of a brighter and eternal day. He sees that, if there is any hope of salvation for his people, it cannot be by a return to the old system and the old ordinances, divine though they once had been (xxxi. 31). There must be a New Covenant. That word, destined to be so full of power for all after-ages, appears first in his prophecies. The relations between him and the people as a member of the Christian church, and appeared in the notion that he had never really died, but would return one day from Paradise as one of the “two witnesses” of the Apocalypse (Victorinus, Comm. in Apoc. xi. 13). Egyptian legends assumed yet wilder and more fantastic forms. He it was who foretold to the priests of Egypt that their idols should one day fall to the ground in the presence of the virgin king (Epictetus, Tē Tript. Opp. p. 290). Playing the part of a St. Patrick, he had delivered one district on the shores of the Nile from crocodiles and asps, and even in the 4th century of the Christian era the dust of that region was looked on as a specific against their bites (ibid.). According to another tradition, he had returned from Egypt to Jerusalem, and lived there for 300 years (D’Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. p. 499). The O.T. narrative of his sufferings was dressed out with the incidents of a Christian martyrdom (Eupolemus, Polyhist. in Euseb. Prep. Evang. ix. 39).
way the outward form of his writings answers to his life, we find some striking characteristics that help us to understand both. As might be expected in one who lived in the last days of the kingdom, and had therefore the works of the earlier prophets to look back upon, we find in him reminiscences and reproductions of what they had written, which indicate the way in which his own spirit had been educated (comp. Is. xi. 19, 20, with x. 9—Ps. xxviii. 7, with whom speaks out of the fulness of his heart, to reproduce himself—to repeat in nearly the same words the great truths on which his own heart rested, and to which he was seeking to lead others (comp. marginal references possin, and list in Keil, Einl. § 74). Throughout, too, there are the tokens of his individual temperament: a greater prominence of the subjective, elegiac element than in other prophets, a less sustained energy, a less orderly and completed rhythm (De Wette, Einl. § 217; Ewald, Propheten, ii. 1—11). A careful examination of the several parts of his prophecy has led to the conviction that we may trace an increase of these characteristics corresponding to the accumulating trials of his life (Ewald, l. c.). The earlier writings are calmer, softer, more uniform in tone: the later show marks of age and weariness and sorrow, and are more strongly imbued with the language of individual suffering. Living at a time when the purity of the older Hebrew was giving way under continual contact with other kindred dialects, his language came under the influence which was acting on all the writers of his time, abounds in Aramaic forms, loses sight of the finer grammatical distinctions of the earlier Hebrew, includes many words not to be found in its vocabulary (Ehrenreich, Einl. in des A. T. iii. 121). It is in part distinctive of the man as well as of the time, that single words should have appeared full of a strange significance (i. 11), that whole predictions should have been embodied in names coined for the purpose (xiv. 6, xx. 3), and that the real analogies which presented themselves should have been drawn not from the region of the great and terrible, but from the mean and familiar incidents (xiii. 1—11, xviii. 1—10). Still more startling is his use of a kind of cipher (the Atbash; comp. Hitzig and Ewald on xxv. 26), con-

The system of secret writing which bears this name forms part of the Kabalah of the later Jews. The plan adopted is that of using the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in an inverted order, so that 

the fact that Jer. vi. 4 suggested the imagery of the opening Gates of the Inferno is not without importance, as bearing on this parallelism.

The system of secret writing which bears this name forms part of the Kabalah of the later Jews. The plan adopted is that of using the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in an inverted order, so that 

"image of the opening Gates of the Inferno is not without importance, as bearing on this parallelism."
The context of the name Jeremiah with any other portion of the O. T. is to pass from the field of history into that of conjecture; but the fact that Hitzig (Comm. *über die Psalmen*), followed in part by Rödiger (Ersch und Grüber, *Encycl. art. Jerem.*), assigns not less than thirty psalms (cc. vi., vii., xxi.-xxii., lii.-lv., lxxix.-lxxxi.) to his authorship is, at least, so far instructive that it indicates what were the hymns, belonging to that or an earlier period, with which his own spirit had most affinity, and to which he and other like sufferers might have turned as the fit expression of their feelings.

III. Arrangement. — The absence of any chronological order in the present structure of the collection of Jeremiah's prophecies is obvious at the first glance; and this has led some writers (Blayney, *Pref. to Jeremiah*) to the belief that, as the book now stands, there is nothing but the wildest confusion — "a preposterous jumbling together" of prophecies of different dates. Attempts to reconstruct the book on a chronological basis have been made by almost all commentators on it since the revival of criticism (Simonis, Vitringa, Cornelius à Lapide, among the earliest; cf. De Wette, *Einl. § 220*); and the result of the labors of the more recent critics has been to modify the somewhat hasty judgment of the English divine. Whatever points of difference there may be in the hypotheses of Movers, Hitzig, Ewald, Bunsen, Nagelschmidt, and others, they agree in admitting traces of an order in the midst of the seeming irregularity, and endeavor to account, more or less satisfactorily, for the apparent anomalies. The conclusion of the three last-named is that we have the book substantially in the same state in which it left the hands of the prophet, or his disciple Baruch. Confining ourselves, for the present, to the Hebrew order (reproduced in the A. V.) we have two great divisions:

1. Ch. i.-xv. Prophecies delivered at various times, directed mainly to Judah, or connected with Jeremiah's personal history.
2. Ch. xvi.-lii. Prophecies connected with later nations.

Ch. lii., taken largely, though not entirely, from 2 K. xxv., may be taken either as a supplement to the prophecy, or (with Grotius and Lowth) as an introduction to the Lamentations.

Looking more closely into each of these divisions, we have the following sections. The narrative of xxxvi. 32 serves to explain the growth of the book in its present shape, and accounts for some, at least, of its anomalies. Up to the 4th year of Jehoiakim, it would appear, no prophecies had been committed to writing; or, if written, they had not been collected and preserved. Then the more memorable among the messages which the word of the Lord had from time to time brought to him were written down at the dictation of the prophet himself. When that roll was destroyed, a second was written out, and other prophecies or narratives added as they came. We may believe that this MS. was the groundwork of our present text; but it is easy to understand how, in transcribing such a document, or collection of documents, the desire to introduce what seemed to the transcriber a better order might lead to many modifications. As it is, we recognize — adopting Bunsen's classification (*Gott in der Geschichte*, i. 113), as being the most natural, and agreeing substantially with Ewald's — the following groups of prophecies, the sections in each being indicated by the recurrence of the formula, "The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah," in fuller or abbreviated forms.

1. Ch. i.-xvi. Containing probably the substance of the book of xxxvi. 32, and including prophecies from the 13th year of Josiah to the 4th of Jehoiakim: i. 3, however, indicates a later revision, and the whole of ch. i. may possibly have been added at the end of this period. The prophecy of xxxvi. 2 was probably written, since its first beginning. Ch. xvi. belongs to a later period, but has probably found its place here as connected, by the recurrence of the name Pashur, with ch. xx.

2. Ch. xvii.-xxv. Shorter prophecies, delivered at different times against the kings of Judah and the false prophets. Xxxv. 13, 14 evidently marks the conclusion of a series of prophecies; and that which follows, xxxv. 15-38, the germ of the fuller predictions in xvi.-xxii., has been placed here as a kind of completion to the prophecy of the Seventy Years and the subsequent fall of Babylon.

3. Ch. xxvi.-xxxvii. The two great prophecies of the fall of Jerusalem, and the history connected with them. Ch. xxxvi. belongs to the earlier, ch. xxxvii. and xxxviii. to the later period of the prophet's work. Jehoiakim in xxvii. 1 is evidently (comp. ver. 3) the year for Zech. xxxiv.


5. Ch. xlv.-xlvi. The history of the last two years before the capture of Jerusalem, and of Jeremiah's work in them and in the period that followed. Ch. xxxvi. and xxxvii. are remarkable as interrupting the chronological order, which otherwise would have been followed here more closely.
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than in any other part. The position of ch. xlv.,
unconnected with anything before or after it, may
be accounted for on the hypothesis that Harnack
desired to place on record so memorable a passage
in his own life, and inserted it where the direct
narrative of his master's life ended. The same
explanation applies in part to ch. xxxvi., which was
evidently at one time the conclusion of one of the
divisions.

6. Ch. xvi.-li. The prophecies against foreign
ations, ending with the great prediction against
Babylon.

7. The supplementary narrative of ch. lii.

IV. Text. The translation of the LXX. presents
many remarkable variations, not only in details
indicating that the translator found or substituted
readings differing widely from those now extant in
Hebrew codices (Keil, Einführung, § 76), but in the
order of the several parts. Whether we suppose
him to have had a different recension of the text,
or to have endeavored to introduce an order accord-
ing to his own notions into the seeming confusion
of the Hebrew, the result is, that in no other book of
the O. T. is there so great a diversity of arrange-
ment. It is noticeable, as illustrating the classifi-
cation given above, that the two agree as far as
xxxv. 13. From that point all is different, and the
following tables indicate the extent of the diver-
gence. It will be seen that here there was the
attempt to collect the prophecies according to their
subject-matter. The thought of a consistently
chronological arrangement did not present itself in
such case more than the other.

LXX.

Hebrew.


xxvi. = xlii.

xxvii.-xxviii. = l.-ii.

xxiii. 1-7 = xlvii. 1-7.

7-22 = xliii. 7-22.

xxx. 1-5 = xliii. 1-6.

6-11 = 26-33.

12-16 = 23-27.

xxvii. = xliii.

xxviii. = xlv.

xxviii.-li. = xlv.-xliv.

li. = liii.

The difference in the arrangement of the two
texts was noticed by the critical writers of the
Pref. in Jerem.). For fuller details tending to a
conclusion unfavorable to the trustworthy of the
Greek translation, see Keil, Einleitung (l. e.), and
the authors there referred to.

Supposed Interpolations. — The genuineness
of some portions of this book has been called in ques-
tion, partly on the hypothesis that the version of
the LXX. presents a purer text, partly on internal
and a priori grounds. The following tables indicate
the chief passages affected by each class of
objections:

1. As omitted in the LXX.

(1) x, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

(2) xxvii. 7.

(3) xxviii. 16-21 [not omitted, but with many varia-
tions].

(4) xxxiii. 14-21.

(5) xxxix. 4-13.

2. On other grounds.

(1) x, l.-li. As being altogether the work of a later
writer, probably the so-called Pseudo-Jeremiah.
The fragment of ver. 11 is urged as confirming
this view.

(2) xxv. 11-14.

(3) xxvii. 7.

(4) xxxiii. 14-26.

(5) xxxix. 1, 2, 4-15.

(6) xxviii.-xxix. As showing, in the shortened form
of the prophet's name (Jerem. i. 1), and the
addition of the epithet "Jeremias the prophet,"
the revision of a later writer.

(7) xxxvii.-xxvi.

As pertaining of the character of the later
prophecies of Isaiah.

(8) xxvi. As betraying in language and statements
the interpolations either of the later prophecies
of Isaiah or of a still later writer.

(9) li. As being a continuation of events, inserted
probably by the writer of ls. xxiv., and foreign
in language and thought to the general charac-
ter of Jeremiah's prophecies.

(10) liii. As being a supplementary addition to the
book, compiled from 2 K. xxv. and other
sources.

In these, as in other questions connected with
the Hebrew text of the O. T., the impugners of the
authenticity of the above passages are for the most
part — De Wette, Movers, Hitzig, Ewald, Kielbel,
Hengstenberg, Kiiper, and Umbreit, are among the
chief defenders. (Comp. Keil, Einleitung, § 76; and,
for a special defense of li. and liii., the monograph of
Nagelsbach, Jeremia und Babyloyn.)

V. Literature. — Origen, Hom. in Jerem.;
Theodore, Schol. in Jerem., Opp. ii. p. 143;
Hieron. Comm. in Jerem., cc. l-xxiii.;
Commentaries by Herzandipius (1530); Calvin (1563);
Henderson (1614); Sanctius (1618); Venema (1765);
Michaelis (1793); Blayney [Jerem, and Loui, New
Translation, with Notes, Oxf. ] (1784 [3rd ed. Lond.
1836])] I Adler [Jerem, Teubni, acciugnoge des
notes, 2 pt. Strass.] (1825-30); Umbreit [Prakt.
Comm. Hamil.] (1842); Henderson [Jerem, and
Laws, translated, with a Commentary, Lond. 1851];
Leipz.] (1856-58).

The following treatises may also be consulted:
Schurrer, C. C., Observationes ad vaticin. Jerem.,
1793 [-94]; repr. in the Comment. Theo.
by Velthausen, Kunzol and Ruperti, vol. ii.-v.];
Gaeb, Erkliirung schweren Stellen in d. Weiszg. Jerem.,
1824; Heusler, Bennekk, Ðber Stellen in Jerem. Weiszg.,
Alex., 1794 [-1824]; Kiiper, Jerem, Liberorum
Sacrorum Integra pars et vind. 1827; Movers, De
intrusco vaticination. Jerem, imde et
origine, 1827; Wedelchais, De Jerem, versione
Alex., 1847; Hengstenberg, Christologie des A. T.
(Section on Jerem). E. H. P.

* The prophecies are often spoken of in the Bible
as announcing orally their predictions and messages,
but very seldom as writing them out either before
or after their promulgation. In this respect we
have more distinct notices concerning the habit of
Jeremiah, than of any other prophet. We learn
from Jer. xxxvi. 21, that in the fourth year of
Jehoiachin he received a command from God to
collect all that he had spoken "against Israel and
against Judah, and against all the nations from
the days of Josiah," and to write down the same
in a book. In accordance with this direction he
dedicated to his master his announcements all his
prophecies up to that time. This collection was burnt
by Judas itakim on account of the threatening
which it contained against himself; but Jeremiah
immediately prepared another in which he not only
The and predictions together von Jahrooch (Dan. 1394, Proph. the Halfte, Of Libr. den siebenzig commentary of Jeremiah. of the prophecy of Daniel was the ground of Daniel’s earnest, effectual prayer for the end of the exile and the restoration of Israel (Dan. ix. 2 ff.). It is noteworthy that the first quotation from Jeremiah as we open the Gospel history (Matt. ii. 17, 18) brings back to us the voice of lamentation and sorrow to which we were accustomed in the Old Testament.


Of the later Introductions to the Old Testament hose of Keil (pp. 249-294, 2te Aufl.), Bleek (pp. 169-501) and Davidson (iii. 87-120) contain important sections. The art. on Jeremiah in Ersch and Gruber’s Allgemein. Encyclopädie (Seite. ii. Bd. xv.) is by Rödiger; that in Herzog’s Real-Encyk. (vi. 478-483), by Nigelsbach; and that in Zeller’s Bild. Wörterb. (i. 666 ff.), of a popular character, by Wunderlich. Stanley’s sketch of Jeremiah (Jerish Church, ii. 570-622) describes him as reality the great personage of his epoch, not merely in his religious sphere, but in the state. For his poetical characteristics, see Lathw’s Lectures on Hebrew Poetry, pp. 177, 178 (Stone’s ed.), Meier, Gesch. d. prophet. Nat.- lit. der Hebräer (1856), pp. 395 ff. and Isaac Taylor’s Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, pp. 272 (N. Y. 1862). For Milman’s estimate of his importance and of his literary merits, see his History of the Jews, i. 439-448 (Amcr. ed.). His unrivalled elegies, says this eminent critic, combine the truth of history with the deepest pathos of poetry. He justifies the encomium by a translation of some of the passages, all remarkable for originality of thought and tenderness of expression, in which the Hebrew patriot laments the sad fate of Jerusalem on its being captured and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar.

On the general import of his prophecies the reader may consult F. R. Hasse’s Geschichte des A. Bandes, pp. 145-157; Köster’s Die Propheten, pp. 112-113, and Hengstenberg’s Christologie, especially in relation to the Messianic portions, ii. 381-473 (Edinb. 1856). It is to Jeremiah, says Stanley (ii. 580), “even more than to Isaiah, that the writers of the Apostolic age (Hebr. viii. 8, 13, x. 16, 17) look back, when they wish to describe the Dispensation of the Spirit. His predictions of the Anointed King are fewer and less distinct than those of the preceding prophets. But he is the prophet beyond all others of the New Testament, the New Covenant, which first appears in his writings.... And the knowledge of this new truth shall no longer be confined to any single order or caste, but all shall know the Lord, from the least unto the greatest” (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34).”

[Jeremiah]

Seven other persons bearing the same name as the prophet are mentioned in the O. T.


2. 3. [Ierpwaj, Alex.-wmis, F.A.-wmis, Vat.-wmis; Ierpwaj, Vat.-wmis, Alex.-wmis, F.A.-Ierpwaj; 4. Ierpwaj, Vat.-wmis, Alex.-wmis]. Three warriors — two of the tribe of Gad — in David’s army, 1 Chr. xii. 4, 10, 13.

5. [Ierpwaj; Vat. Ierpwaj]. One of the “mighty men of valor” of the trans-Jordanic half tribe of Manasseh, 1 Chr. v. 24.

6. [F.A.-Ierpwaj; Alex. Ierpwaj, exc. xii. 34, Ierpwaj; Vat. Ierpwaj, Ierpwaj; F.A. Ierpwaj, Ierpwaj]. A priest of high rank, head of the second or third of the 21 courses which are apparently enumerated in Neh. x. 2-8. He is mentioned again, i.e. the course which was called after him is, in Neh. xii. 11; and we are told at v. 12 that the personal name of the head of this course in the days of Joakim was Hanamah. This course, or its chief, took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 34).

7. [Rom. Vat. Ierpwaj]. The father of Jaza’iah the Rechabite, Jer. xxxv. 3.

* Jeremia, Lamentations of.

Jeremiæ ('Ierpwaj: [Alex. in Eoccus. Ierpwaj:] Jeremiæ, Hieremiæ]. 1. The Greek form of the name of Jeremiah the prophet, used in the A. V. of Eoccus. xliii. 6; 2 Mac. xv. 11; Matt. xvi. 14. "Jeremiæ; Jeremiæ."
JEDEMOTH ([headmaster]: 1'ap'., etc.) Jerimoth, Jerimoth.

1. ([Ap'., etc.]: [Vat. I'ap'., etc.]: Jerimoth.) A Benjamite chief, son of the house of Beraiah of Ephraim, according to an obscure genealogy of the age of Hezekiah (1 Chr. viii. 14; comp. 12 and 18). His family dwelt at Jerusalem, as distinguished from the other division of the tribe, located at Gilbon (ver. 28).

2. [Vat. I'ap'., etc.]: Jerimoth.] A Merarite Levite, son of Mushi (1 Chr. xxiii. 23); elsewhere called Jerimoth.

3. ([I'ap'., etc.]: Vat. Erp'., etc.]: Jerimoth.) Son of Hamon; head of the 13th course of musicians in the Divine service (1 Chr. xxv. 22). In ver. 4 the name is Jerimoth.

4. [I'ap'., etc.]: Vat. Ierimoth; Ier. Ierimoth. One of the sons of Haman, and -

5. ([Ap'., etc.]: Vat. Amah; A. Ap'., etc.]: Alex. Comp. I'ap'., etc.]: Jerimoth.) one of the sons of Zattu, who had taken strange wives; but put them away, and offered each a ram for a trespass offering, at the persuasion of Ezra (Ezr. x. 26, 27). In Esdras the names are respectively Ieremoth and Jerimoth.

6. The name which appears in the same list as "and Ramoth" (ver. 20) — following the correction of the Keri — is in the original text (Tehill) Jeremoth, in which form also it stands in 1 Esdr. ix. 30, Ieremoth, A. V. Ieremoth. A. C. H.

JEREMY (I'eremias: [Alex. in 2 Macc. ii. 7, I'eremias: Ieremias, Ieremias], the prophet Jeremiah. 1 Esdr. i. 28, 32, 47, 57, ii. 1; 2 Esdr. ii. 18; 2 Macc. ii. 1, 5, 7; Matt. xii. 17, xxvii. 9. [Jeremias: Jeremias.]) These abbreviated forms were much in favor about the time that the A. V. was translated. Elsewhere we find Esai for Isaiah; and in the Homiletics such abbreviations as Zachary, Toby, etc., are frequent.

* JEREMY. EPISTLE OF. (BARUCH, THE BOOK OF, vii. 50)

JERIACH (תֹּרְא, i. e. Teri-ya'ahu [founded by Jehovah]: Ierai: Exdai: [Vat. 1500, Ierai: Alex. Ierai: Ierai: Jerai:]) a Kohathite Levite, chief of the great house of Hebron when David organised the Levites (1 Chr. xxiii. 19, xxiv. 23; in the latter passage the name of Hebron has been omitted both in the Hebrew and LXX.).

The same man is mentioned again, though with a slight difference in his name, as Jeriah.

JERIBAI [3 sls.] (תֹּרְא, [pers. whm Je- rovah defends]: Ieraih: [Vat. Ieraih]: Alex. Ieraih: Ieraih], one of the Bene-Eliannah [sons of E.], named among the heroes of David's guard in the supplemental list of 1 Chr. (xi. 46).

JERICHO (תֹּרְא; Jericho, Num. xxii. 1; also תֹּרְא, Jericho, Josh. ii. 1, 2, 3; and יָרֶח, Jericho, 1 K. xvi. 34; יָרֶח, Jericho, place of fragrance, from תֹּרְא, rach, "to breathe," תֹּרְא, "to smell;" older commenta-

a In which case it would probably be a remnant of the old Canaanite worship of the heavenly bodies, which has left its traces in such names as Chemel, Jericho, etc.) Jericho is first mentioned as the city to which the two spies were sent by Joshua from Shittim: they were lodged in the house of Rahab the harlot upon the wall, and departed, having first promised to save her and all that were found in her house from destruction (ch. i. 21). In the annihilation of the city that ensued, this promise was silently observed. Her house was recognized by the scarlet line bound in the window from which the spies were let down, and she and her relatives were taken out of it, and "lodged without the camp;" but it is nowhere said or implied that her house escaped the general conflagration. That she "dwelt in Beth-shemesh, and others (see IDOLATRY, p. 1131 b) which may have been the head-quarters of the worship indicated in the names they bear. • also from תֹּרְא, rach, "to be broad," as in a wide plain; יָרֶח; [Vat. Ye'er, etc.]: [Exr. iii. 34, 1500: Alex. Ye'er, etc.]: in 1 Chr. vi. 78, Ezr. iii. 34, and (with F.) in Neh. iii. 2, vii. 36; F. A. in 1 Chr. xix. 5. יָרֶח; Sin. in Eccl. xxv. 14, 1 Mac. vii. 11, 14, Ye'er, and so Tisch. in the N. T., etc. Heb. xi. 30 (7th ed.); Strabo and Josephus; יָרֶח; [Jericho], a city of high antiquity, and in these days of considerable importance, situated in a plain traversed by the Jordan, and exactly over against where that river was crossed by the Israelites under Joshua (Josh. iii. 16). Such was either its vicinity, or the extent of its territory, that Gilgal, which formed their primary encampment, stood in its east border (iv. 19). That it had a king is a very secondary consideration, for almost every small town had one (ii. 19-24); in fact monarchy was the only form of government known to those primitive times — the government of the people of God presenting a marked exception to prevailing usage. But Jericho was further inclosed by walls — a fenced city — its walls were so considerable that at least one person (Rahab) had a house upon them (ii. 15), and its gates were shut, "as throughout the East still, when it was dark" (v. 6). Again, the spoil that was found in it betokened its influence — Ai, Makedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, and even Hazor, evidently contained nothing worth mentioning in comparison — besides sheep, oxen, and asses, we hear of vessels of brass and iron. These possibly may have been the first-fruits of those brass foundries "in the plain of Jordan" of which Solomon afterwards so largely availed himself (2 Chr. iv. 17). Silver and gold was found in such abundance that one man (Achan) could appropriate stealthily 200 shekels (100 oz. avoid. see Lewis, Hib. Rep. vi. 57) of the former, and "a wedge of gold of 50 shekels (25 oz.) weight; "a goodly Babylonish garment," purloined in the same dishonesty, may be adduced as evidence of a then existing commerce between Jericho and the far East (Josh. vi. 24, vii. 21). In fact its situation alone — in so noble a plain and contiguous to so prolific a river — would bespeak its importance in a country where these natural advantages have been always so highly prized, and in an age when people depended so much more upon the indigenous resources of nature than they are compelled to do now. But for the curse of Joshua (vi. 28) doubtless Jericho might have proved a more formidable counter-claim to the city of David than even Samaria.

Jericho is first mentioned as the city to which the two spies were sent by Joshua from Shittim: they were lodged in the house of Rahab the harlot upon the wall, and departed, having first promised to save her and all that were found in her house from destruction (ch. i. 21). In the annihilation of the city that ensued, this promise was silently observed. Her house was recognized by the scarlet line bound in the window from which the spies were let down, and she and her relatives were taken out of it, and "lodged without the camp;" but it is nowhere said or implied that her house escaped the general conflagration. That she "dwelt in Beth-shemesh, and others (see IDOLATRY, p. 1131 b) which may have been the head-quarters of the worship indicated in the names they bear.
Jericho

Israel" for the future; that she married Salmon son of Naasson, "prince of the children of Judah," and had by him, Poriah, the husband of Ruth and progenitor of David and of our Lord; and lastly, that she was the first and only gentile name that appears in the list of the faithful of the O. T. given by St. Paul (Josh. vi. 25; 1 Chr. ii. 10; Matt. i. 5; Heb. xi. 31), all these facts surely indicate that she did not continue to inhabit the accredited site; and, if so, and in absence of all direct evidence to the contrary, "Jericho" has been inferred that her house was left standing.

Such as it had been left by Joshua, such it was bestowed by him upon the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xvii. 21), and from this time a long interval elapses before Jericho appears again upon the scene. It is only incidentally mentioned in the life of David in connection with his embassy to the Ammonite king (2 Sam. x. 5). And the solemn manner in which its second foundation under Hel; the Bethelite is of the direction recorded — upon whom the curse of Joshua is said to have descended in full force (1 K. xvi. 34) — would certainly seem to imply that up to that time its site had been uninhabited. It is true that mention is made of "a city of palm-trees" (Judg. i. 16, and iii. 13) in existence apparently at the time when spoken of; and that Jericho is twice once before its first overthrow, and once, surely its second foundation — designated by that name (see Deut. xxxiv. 3, and 2 Chr. xxvii. 15). But it would be difficult to prove the identity of the city mentioned in the book of Judges, and as in the territory of Judah, with Jericho. However, once actually rebuilt, Jericho rose again slowly into consequence. In its immediate vicinity the sons of the prophets sought retirement from the world; had he built the spire of the waters," and over and against it, beyond Jordan, Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 K. ii. 1-22). In its plains Zedekiah fell into the hands of the Chaldeans (2 K. xxv. 5; Jer. xxxix. 5). By what may be called a retrospective account of it, we may infer that Hiel's restoration had not utterly failed; for in the return under Zerubbabel the "children of Jericho," 544 in number, are comprised (Ezra. ii. 44). Neb. iii. 2). We now enter upon its more modern phase. The Jericho of the days of Josephus was distant 150 stadia from Jerusalem, and 50 from the Jordan. It lay in a plain, overlain by a barren mountain whose roots ran northwards towards Sechartopolis, and southwards in the direction of Sodom and the Dead Sea. These formed the western boundaries of the plain. Eastwards, its barriers were the mountains of Moab, which ran parallel to the former. In the midst of the plain the great plain as it was called — flowed the Jordan, and at the top and bottom of it were two lakes: Tiberias, proverbial for its sweetness, and Ashtaroth, bitter as a brine. Away from the Jordan it was parched and unhealthy during summer; but during winter, even when it snowed at Jerusalem, the inhabitants here wore linen garments. Hard by Jericho — bursting forth close to the site of the old city, which Joshua took on his entrance into Canaan was a most exuberant fountain, whose waters, before noted for their contrary properties, had received, proceeds Josephus, through Edna's prayers, their then wonderfully salutary and prolific efficacy. Within its range — 70 stadia (Strabo says 100) by 20 — the fertility of the soil was unsurpassed; plenty of various names and properties, some that produced honey scarce inferior to that of the neighborhood — opolexandum, the choicest of indigenous fruits — cypris (Ar. "el-henna") and myrobalancum ("Zukkhum") threw there beautifully, and thickly dabbled about in pleasure-grounds (B. j. iv. 8, § 3). Wisdom herself did not disdain comparison with "the rose of Jericho" (Ezech. xxi. 8). Well might Strabo (Geogr. v. 2, § 41) say: "Miller could hardly doubt that its revenues were considerable. By the Romans Jericho was first visited under Pompey: he encamped there for a single night; and subsequently destroyed two forts, Thrax and Taurus, that commanded its approaches (Strabo, &c. § 40). Gabinus, in his resettlement of Judea, made it one of the five seats of assembly (Joseph. B. J. i. 5, § 5). With Herod the Great it rose to still greater prominence; it had been found full of treasure of all kinds, as in the time of Joshua, so by his Roman allies who sacked it (ibid. i. 15, § 6); and its revenues were eagerly sought, and rented by the wily tyrant from Cœpatra, to whom Antony had assigned them (Ant. xv. 4, § 2). Not long afterwards he built a fort there, which he called "Cy- prus" (Ant. xv. 4; i. 4). A tower, which he called in honor of his bride "Phasæus," and a number of new palaces — superior in construction to those which had existed there previously — which he named after his friends. He even founded a new town, higher up the plain, which he called, like the tower, Tharsis (B. J. i. 21, § 8). If he did not make Jericho his habitual residence, he at least retired thither to die — and to be interred, if he could have got his plan carried out — and it was in the amphitheatre of Jericho that the news of his death was announced to the assembled soldiers and people by Salome (B. J. i. 38, § 8). Soon afterwards the palace was burnt, and the town plundered by one Simon, a revolutionary that had been slave to Herod (Ant. xvii. 10, § 6); but Archelaus rebuilt the former sumptuously — founded a new town in the plain, that bore his own name — made it a measure for all, diverted water from a village called Neera, to irrigate the plain which he had planted with palms (Ant. xvii. 13, § 1). Thus Jericho was once more a "city of palms" when our Lord visited it: such as Herod the Great and Archelaus had left it, such he saw it. As the city that had so exceptionally contributed to his own ancestry — as the city which had been the first to fall — amidst so much ceremony before "the captain of the Lord's host," and his servant Joshua — we may well suppose that his eyes surveyed it with unwonted interest. It is supposed to have been on the rocky heights overrating it (hence called by tradition the Quar- tana), that he was assailed by the Tempter; and over against it, according to tradition likewise, He had been previously baptized in the Jordan. Here it is in honor of the blind (two, or perhaps three, St. Matth. xx. 30; St. Mark x. 46; this is in jorico Jericho. St. Luke says "as He was come nigh unto Jericho," etc., xviii. 35). Here the descendant of Rahab did not disdain the hospitality of Zaqueus the publican — an office which was likely to be lucrative enough in so rich a city. Finally, between Jerusalem and Jericho was laid the scene of His story of the good Samaritan, which, if it is not to be regarded as a real
occurrence throughout, at least derives interest from the fact, that robbers have ever been the terror of that precipitous road; and so formidable had they proved only just before the Christian era, that Pontius Pilate was induced to undertake the destruction of their strongholds (Strabo, as before, vii. 2, § 40; comp. Joseph. Ant. xx. 6, § 1 ff.). Dagon, or Docus (1 Mac. xvi. 15; comp. ix. 50), where Potenay assassinated his father-in-law, Simon the Macabeus, may have been one of these.

Posterior to the Gospels the chronicle of Jericho may be briefly told. Vespasian found it one of the strongest of all the Judean cities (Jñ. iii. 20). C. of the city deserted by its inhabitants in a great measure when he encamped there (ibid. iv. 8, § 2). He left a garrison on his departure— not necessarily the 10th legion, which is only stated to have marched through Jericho—which was still there when Titus advanced upon Jerusalem. Is it asked how Jericho was destroyed? Evidently by Vespasian; for Josephus, rightly understood, is not so silent as Dr. Robinson (ibid. iii. 50, 51 ed.) would have us think. C. of the city pillaged and burnt, in R. J. iv. 9, § 1, was clearly Jericho with its adjacent villages, and not Gerasa, as may be seen at once by comparing the language there with that of c. § 5, 2, and the agent was Vespasian. Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onom. sanct. s. v.) say that it was destroyed when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans. They further add that it was afterwards rebuilt—they do not say by whom—and still existed in their day; nor had the ruins of the two preceding cities been obliterated. Could Hadrian possibly have planted a colony there when he passed through Judea and founded Elia? (Bion, Cass. Hist. i. xix. 11, ed. Sturz.; more at large. Chor. Ptol.) p. 234. ed. Du Fresne.) The discovery which Origen made there of a version of the O. T. (the 5th in his Hexapla), together with sundry MSS. of Greek and Hebrew, suggests that it could not have been wholly without inhabitants (Euseb. E. H. vi. 16; S. Epiphani. Lib. de Pudicit. et Mæsur. cæræ met.) or again, as is perhaps more probable, did a Christian settlement arise there under Hadrian, when baptisms in the Jordan began to be the rage? That Jericho became an episcopal see about that time under Jerusalem appears from more than one unanswerable fact (Joseph. 1 Bar. 7. 1, 10, § 1, 2, and the Parap. appended to it; comp. William of Tyre, Hist. lib. xxiii., ed. H.). Its bishops subscribed to various councils in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries (ibid. and Le Quien's Oriens Christian., iii. 654). Justinian, we are told, restored a hospice there, and likewise a church dedicated to the Virgin (Procop. De Edif. v. 9). As early as A. D. 357, when the Herouadice planted Wesselinus, there existed a hospice here, which was pointed out, during the manner of those days, as the house of Rahab. This was useless when Arculfus saw it; and not only so, but the third city was likewise in ruins (Adam. de Locis S. ap. Migne, Patrolog. C. lxxvii. 793). Had Jericho been visited by an earthquake, as Antoninus reports (ap. Ugoi. Theor. vii. p. xcviii., and note to c. 9); and as Syria certainly was, in the 11th year of Justinian, A. D. 553? If so, we can well understand the restorations already referred to; and when Antoninus adds that the house of Rahab had now become a hospice and oratory, we might almost pronounce that this was the very hospice which had been restored by that emperor. Again, it may be observed, did Christian Jericho receive no injury from the Persian Romiunz, the ferocious general of Chosroes II. A.D. 614? (Bar-Hébraï. Chron. 29 Lat. v. ed. Kirsch.) It would rather seem that there were more religious edifices in the 7th than in the 6th century round about it. According to Arculfus one church marked the site of Gibgal; another the spot where our Lord was supposed to have deposited his garments previously to his baptism; a third within the precincts of a vast monastery dedicated to St. John, situated upon some rising ground overlooking the Jordan. (See as before.) Jericho meanwhile had disappeared as a theatre of human life. Monasteries sprang up round it on all sides, but could not modify away in their turn. The anchorite caves in the rocky flanks of the Quentanes are the most striking memorial that remains of early or medieval enthusiasm. Arculfus speaks of a diminutive race—Canaanites he calls them—that inhabited the plain in great numbers in his day. They have retained possession of those fairy meadow-lands and pleasant groves which have made the spot so dear to our literary translaters. In some centuries round the "square tower or castle" first mentioned by Willebrand (ap. Leon. Alhaz Sulamis. p. 151) in A. D. 1211, when it was inhabited by the Saracens, whose work it may be supposed to have been, though it has since been dignified by the name of the house of Zaelness. Their village is by Brocards (ap. Cinn. Thes. iv. 16), in A. D. 1230, styled "a vile place;" by Sir J. Manwells, in A. D. 1232, "a little village;" and by Henry Maundrell, in A. D. 1697, "a poor nasty village;" in which verdict all modern travellers that have ever visited it has must concur. (See Early Trav. in Pal. by Wright, pp. 177 and 451.) They are looked upon by the Arabs as a desolate race: and are probably nothing more or less than veritable gypsies, who are still to be met with in the neighborhood of the Frank mountain near Jerusalem, and on the heights round the village and convent of St. John in the desert, and are still called "Soomanitae" by the native Christians—one of the names applied to them when they first attracted notice in Europe in the 15th century (i. e. from feigning themselves "penitents") and under censure of the Pope. See Huy- land's Histor. Survey of the Gypsies, p. 18; also The Poem by Dr. Southwell. 3d S. iv. 204.) Jericho does not seem to have been ever restored as a town by the Crusaders: but its plains had not ceased to be prolific, and were extensively cultivated and laid out in vineyards and gardens by the monks (Ptolema. ap. Leon. Alhaz. Sulamis. c. 20, p. 31). They seem to have been included in the domains of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and as such were bestowed by Arnulf upon his niece as a dowry (Wm. of Tyre. Hist. xi. 15). Twenty-five years afterwards we find Melisendeis, wife of king Fulco, assigning them to the convent of Bethany, which she had founded A. D. 1137.

The site of ancient (the first) Jericho is with reason placed by Dr. Robinson (ibid. Rev. 1. 552-568) in the immediate neighborhood of the four towns of Elath, and the second city of the N. T. and of Josephus) at the opening of the Wady Kelt (Cherith), half an hour from the fountain. These are precisely the sites that one would infer from Josephus. On the other hand we are much more inclined to refer the ruined aqueducts round Jericho to the irrigations of Archelaus (see above) than to any hypothetical "culture or preparation of sugar by the Saracens." Jacob of Vitri
JERICHOSays but generally, that the plains of the Jordan produced cane yielding sugar in abundance,— from Lebanon to the Dead Sea,— and when he speaks of the mode in which sugar was obtained from them, he is rather describing what was done in Syria than anywhere near Jericho (Hist. Hierosol. c. 93). Besides, it may fairly be questioned whether the same sugar-yielding reeds or canes there spoken of are not still as plentiful as ever they were within range of the Jordan (see Lynch’s Narrative, events of April 16, also p. 260-67). Almost every reed in these regions distills a sugary juice, and almost every herb breathes fragrance. Palms have indeed disappeared (there was a solitary one remaining not long since) from the neighborhood of the “city of palms”; yet there were groves of them in the days of Acrabius, and palm-branches could still be cut there when Fulcherius traversed the Jordan, A. D. 1100 (ap. Gest. Dei per Francos, vol. I. part I, p. 402). The fig-mulberry or “tree-fig” of Zaccheus—which all modern travellers confound with our Acer pseudahelenum, or common sycamore (see Dict. d’Hist. Nat. tom. xiii. p. 218, and Cruden’s Concord. s. v.)—mentioned by the Bordeaux pilgrim and by Antoninus, no longer exists. The agophilo fumum has become extinct both in Egypt—whither Cleopatra is said to have transplanted it—and in its favorite vale, Jericho. The mycolium um (Zadkum of the Arabs) alone survives, and from its nut oil is still extracted. Honey may be still found here and there, in the nest of the wild bee. Fig-trees, maize, and cucumbers, may be said to comprise all that is now cultivated in the plain; but wild flowers of brightest and most varied hue besprinkle the rich herbage on all sides.

Lastly, the bright yellow apples of Sodom are still to be met with round Jericho; though Josephus (B. J. iv. 84) and others (Havercamp, ad Tertull. Apol. c. 40, and Jacob of Vitry, as above) make their locality rather the shores of the Dead Sea: and some modern travellers assert that they are found out of Palestine no less (Bild. Res. i. 322 ff.). In fact there are two different plants that, correctly or incorrectly, have obtained that name, both bearing bright yellow fruit like apples, but with no more substance than fungus-balls. The former or larger sort seems confined in Palestine to the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, while the latter or smaller sort abounds near Jericho.

E. S. F.

JERIEL (גериיל) [founded by God]: Jericho; [Vat. Ρεγία;] Jeriel, a man of Issachar, one of the six heads of the house of Tola at the time of the census in the time of David (1 Chr. vii. 2).

JERIJAH (גרייה) [founded by Jehovah]: Ophias; [Vat. τον Δείας;] Alex. τον Διας; Jerias, 1 Chr. xxvi. 31. [The same name as Jeriah, with a slight difference in the form of the name.] The difference consists in the omission of the final u, the Plain of Jericho, as we found two aged trees in the little ravine [near the channel of Wadi Ketif], in Illustration of the Gospel narrative!” (Land of Israel, p. 229, and also p. 314, 24 ed.). He also found a few of these trees “among the ruins by the wayside at ancient Jericho” (Natural History of the Bible, p. 369, Lond 1867). [ZACHIEU]
not in the insertion of the [1], which our translators should have added in the former case.

JERIMOTH (גֵּרִימוֹת) [heights]: 1. Jerimad, 1 Jermad, Jeremad). 1. [I jerkd: Vat. Araphim.] Son or descendant of Deh, according to 1 Chr. vii. 7, and founder of a Benjamite house, which existed in the time of David (ver. 2). He is perhaps the same as—

2. (Araphim: [Vat. Araphim: Alex. Araph; Vat. Araph; Jerimath, who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chr. xii. 5). [BELA.]

3. (גְּרִימוֹת, i.e. Jeremoth: [I Jeremath: Vat. Araphim: Alex. Jeremad.) A son of Becher (1 Chr. vii. 8), and head of another Benjamite house. [BECHER.]

4. [I jerkd: Vat. Araphim.] Son of Mushi, the son of Merari, and head of one of the families of the Merarites which were counted in the census of the Levites taken by David (1 Chr. xxiv. 30). [See JEREMOTH, 2.]

5. [I jerkd: Vat. Jeremath: Alex. Jeremath.) Son of Harim, head of the 15th ward of musicians (1 Chr. xxv. 4, 22). In the latter he is called JEREMOTH. [HUMAN.]

6. [I jerkd: Alex. Jeremad: Vat. Araphim.] Son of Azriel, "ruler" (גֵּרִימוֹת) of the tribe of Naphtali in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxi. 19). The same persons, called rulers, are in ver. 22 called "princes" (גֵּרִימוֹת) of the tribes of Israel.

7. (I jerkd: Vat. Jeremath: Alex. Araphim.) Son of king David, whose daughter Mahalath was one of the wives of Rehoboam, her cousin Abiail being the other (2 Chr. xi. 18). As Jeremoth is not named in the list of children by David's wives in 1 Chr. iii. or iv. 4-7, it is fair to infer that he was the son of a concubine, and this in fact is the Jewish tradition (Jerome, Questions, ad loc.). It is however questionable whether Rehoboam would have married the grand-child of a concubine even of the great David. The passage 2 Chr. xi. 18 is not quite clear, since the word "daughter" is a correction of the Keri: the original text had [7.] i.e. "son."

8. [I jerkd: Vat. Jeremath.] A Levite in the reign of Hezekiah, one of the overseers of offerings and dedicated things placed in the chambers of the Temple, who was under Chenaniah and Shemai the Levites, by command of Hezekiah, and Azariah the high-priest (2 Chr. xxxi. 13). A. C. H.

JERIOTH (גֵּרִימֶה) [curtains]: Jered: [Vat. Exad: Jered]. According to our A. V. and the LXX, one of the elder Caleb's wives (1 Chr. ii. 18), but according to the Vulgate he was his daughter by his first wife Azubah. The Hebrew text seems evidently corrupt, and will not make sense: but the probability is that Jerioth was a daughter of Caleb the son of Hezon. (In this case we ought to read [גֵּרִימֶה] הָנַה נִתְח תּוֹלָה]. The Latin version of Santes Pagininius, which makes Azubah and Jerish both daughters of Caleb, and the note of Vatadulis, which makes Ishosh (A. V. "wife") a proper name and a third daughter, are clearly wrong, as it appears from ver. 19 that Azubah was Caleb's wife. A. C. H.

JEROBOAM (גֵּרִימוֹב) = Yarabam: 1 Jeroboam). The name signifies "whose people is many," and thus has nearly the same meaning with Rehoboam, "enlarger of the people." Both names appear for the first time in the reign of Solomon, and were probably suggested by the increase of the Jewish people at that time.

1. The first king of the divided kingdom of Israel. The ancient authorities for his reign and his wars were "the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (1 K. xiv. 19), and "the visions of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat" (2 Chr. ix. 29). The extant account of his life is given in two versions, so different from each other, and yet each so ancient, as to make it difficult to choose between them. The one usually followed is that contained in the Hebrew text, and in one portion of the LXX. The other is given in a separate account inserted by the LXX. at 1 K. xi. 43, and xii. 24. This last contains such evident marks of authenticity in some of its details, and is so much more full than the other, that it will be most conveniently taken as the basis of the biography of this remarkable man, as the nearest approach which, in the contradictory state of the text, we can now make to the truth.

1. He was the son of an Ephraimite of the name of Nebat; his father had died whilst he was young; but his mother, who had been a person of loose character (LXX.), lived in her widowhood, trusting apparently to her son for support. Her name is variously given as Zeruiah (Heb.), or Sarai (LXX.), and the place of their abode on the mountains of Ephraim is given either as Zereda, or (LXX.) as Sarai: in the latter case, indicating that there was some connection between the wife of Nebat and her residence. At the time when Solomon was constructing the fortifications of Millo underneath the citadel of Zion, his sagacious eye discovered the strength and activity of a youth of Ephraimite name, who was employed on the works, and he raised him to the rank of superintendent (גֵּרִימֶה A. V. "ruler") over the taxes and labors exacted from the tribe of Ephraim (1 K. xi. 28). This was Jeroboam. He made the most of his position. He completed the fortifications, and was long afterwards known as the man who had "enclosed the city of David" (1 K. xii. 24, LXX.). He then aspired to royal state. Like Absalom before him, in like circumstances, though now on a grander scale, in proportion to the enlargement of the royal establishment itself, he kept 300 chariots and horses (1. LXX.), and at last was perceived by Solomon to be aiming at the monarchy.

These ambitious designs were probably fostered by the sight of the growing disaffection of the great tribe over which he presided, as well as by the alienation of the prophetic order from the house of Solomon. According to the version of the story in the Hebrew text (Jos. Ant. viii. 7, § 7), this alienation was made evident to Jeroboam very early in his career. He was leaving Jerusalem, and he encountered, on one of the black-paved roads which

... who was the first to insult David in his flight and the "first of all the house of Joseph" to congratulate him on his return.
JEROBOAM

He went out of the city, Abijah, "the prophet" of the ancient sanctuary of Shiloh. Abijah drew him aside from the road into the field (LXX.), and, as soon as they found themselves alone, the prophet, who was dressed in a new outer garment, stripped it off, and tore it into 12 shreds; of 10 of which he gave to Jeroboam, with the assurance that on condition of his obedience to His laws, God would establish for him a kingdom and dynasty equal to that of David (1 K. xii. 21-40).

The attempts of Solomon to cut short Jeroboam's designs occasioned his flight into Egypt. There he remained during the rest of Solomon's reign — in the court of Shishak (LXX.), who is here first named in the sacred narrative. On Solomon's death, he demanded Shishak's permission to return. The Egyptian king seems, in his reluctance, to have offered any gift which Jeroboam chose, as a reason for his remaining, and the consequence was the marriage with Ame, the elder sister of the Egyptian queen, Tahpenes (LXX. Thekemina), and of another princess (LXX.) who married the Edomite chief, Hadad. A year elapsed, and a son, Abijah (or Abijam), was born. Then Jeroboam again requested permission to depart, which was granted: and he returned with his wife and child to his native place, Sarira, or Zereda, which he fortified, and the consequence became a centre for his fellow tribesmen (1 K. xi. 43, xii. 24, LXX.).

Still there was no open act of insurrection, and it was in this period of suspense (according to the LXX.) that a pathetic incident darkened his domestic history. His infant son fell sick. The anxious father sent his wife to inquire of God concerning him. Jerusalem would have been the obvious place to visit for this purpose. But no doubt political reasons forbade. The ancient sanctuary of Shiloh was nearer at hand: and it so happened that a prophet was now residing there, of the highest repute. It was Abijah — the same who, according to the common version of the story, had already been in communication with Jeroboam, but who, according to the authority we are now following, appears for the first time on this occasion. He was 60 years of age — but was prematurely old, and his eyesight had already failed him. He was living, as it would seem, in poverty, with a boy who waited on him, and with his own little children. For him and for them, the wife of Jeroboam brought such gifts as were thought likely to be acceptable; ten loaves, and two rolls for the children (LXX.), a bunch of raisins (LXX.), and a jar of honey. She had disguised herself, to avoid recognition; and perhaps these humble gifts were part of the plan. But the blind prophet, at her first approach, knew who was coming; and bade his boy go out to meet her, and invite her to his house without delay. There he warned her of the uselessness of her gifts. There was a doom on the house of Jeroboam, not to be averted; those who grew up in it and died in the city would become the prey of the hungry dogs; they who died in the country would be devoured by the vultures. This child alone would die before the calamities of the house arrived: "They shall mourn for the child, Woe, O Lord, for in him there is found a good word regarding the Lord," — or according to the other version, "all Israel shall mourn for him, and bury him; for he only of Jeroboam shall come to the grave, because in him there is found some good thing toward Jehovah, the God of Israel, in the house of Jeroboam." (1 K. xiv. 13, LXX. xiii.).

The mother returned. As she reentered the town of Sarira (Heb. Tirah, 1 K. xiv. 17), the child died. The loud wail of her attendant damsels greeted her on the threshold (LXX.). The child was buried, as Abijah had foretold, with all the state of the child of a royal house. "All Israel mourned for him" (1 K. xiv. 18). This incident, if it really occurred at this time, seems to have been the turning point in Jeroboam's career. It drove him from his ancestral home, and it gathered the sympathies of the tribe of Ephraim round him. He left Sarira and came to Shechem. The Hebrew text describes that he was sent for. The LXX. speaks of it as his own act. However that may be, he was thus at the head of the northern tribes, when Rehoboam, after he had been on the throne for somewhat more than a year, came up to be inaugurated in that ancient capital. Then (if we may take the account already given of Abijah's interview as something separate from this), for the second time, and in a like manner, the Divine intimation of his future greatness is conveyed to him. The prophet Shevatah, the Enuhite (1 K. xii. 16; 2 K. xiv. 9) addressed to him the same veiled parable, in the ten shreds of a new unwashed garment (LXX.). Then took place the conference with Rehoboam (Jeroboam appearing in it, in the Hebrew text, but not in the LXX.), and the final revolt; which ended (expressly in the Hebrew text, in the LXX. by implication) in the elevation of Jeroboam to the throne of the northern kingdom. Shevatah remained on the spot and deterred Rehoboam from an attack. Jeroboam entered at once on the duties of his new situation, and fortified Shechem as his capital on the west, and Penuel (close by the old trans-Jordanic capital of Mahanaim) on the east.

II. Up to this point there had been nothing to disturb the anticipations of the Prophetic Order and of the mass of Israel as to the glory of Jeroboam's future. But from this point, error crept, not unnaturally, into his policy, which undermined his dynasty and tarnished his name as the first king of Israel. The political disruption of the kingdom was complete; but its religious unity was as yet unimpaired. He feared that the yearly pilgrimages to Jerusalem would undo all the work which he effected, and he took the bold step of rending it asunder. Two sanctuaries of venerable antiquity existed already — one at the south, the other at the northern extremity of his dominions. These he elevated into seats of the national worship, which should rival the newly established Temple at Jerusalem. As Abderrahman, caliph of Spain arrested the movement of his subjects to Mecca, by the erection of the holy place of the Zecca at Cordova, so Jeroboam trusted to the erection of his shrines at Dan and Bethel. But he was not satisfied without another deviation from the Mosaic idea of the national unity. His long stay in Egypt had familiarized him with the outward forms under which the Divinity was there represented: and now, for the first time since the Exodus, was an Egyptian element introduced into the national worship of

a This omission is however borne out by the Hebrew text, 1 K. xii. 20, "when all Israel heard that J. was come again."

b The cry of revolt, 1 K. xii. 19, is the same as that in 2 Sam. xx. 1.
Palestine. A golden figure of Meneius, the sacred calf of Helipolis, was set up at each sanctuary, with the address, "Behold thy God" (Ephesians—comp. Neb. ix. 18) which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." The sanctuary at Dāx, as the most remote from Jerusalem, was established first (1 K. xii. 30) with priests from the distant tribes, whom he conserved instead of the Levites (xii. 31, xiii. 33). The more important one, as nearer the capital and in the heart of the kingdom, was at Bethel. The worship and the sanctuary continued till the end of the northern kingdom. The priests were supplied by a peculiar form of consecration—any one from the non-Levitical tribes could procure the office on sacrificing a young bullock and seven rams (1 K. xiii. 33; 2 Chr. xiii. 9). For the dedication of this he copied the precedent of Solomon in choosing the feast of Tabernacles as the occasion; but postponing it for a month, probably in order to meet the vintage of the most northern parts. On the fifteenth day of this month (the 8th), he went up in state to offer incense on the altar which was before the calf. It was at this solemn and critical moment that a prophet from Judah suddenly appeared, whom Josephus with great probability identifies with伊do the Seeer (the calls him Lebon, Ant. viii. 8, § 51; and see Jerome, Qu. Heb., on 2 Chr. x. 4), who denounced the altar, and foretold its desolation by Josiah, and violent overthrow. It is not clear from the account, whether it is intended that the overthrow took place then, or in the earthquake described by Amos (i. 1). Another sign is described as taking place instantly. The king stretching out his hand to arrest the prophet, felt it wither and paralyzed, and only at the prophet's prayer saw it restored, and acknowledged his divine mission. Josephus adds, but probably only in conjecture from the sacred narrative, that the prophet who seduced Idlo on his return, did so in order to prevent his obtaining too much influence over Jeroboam, and endeavored to explain away the miracles to the king, by representing that the altar fell because it was new, and that his hand was paralyzed from the fatigue of sacrificing. A further alliance is mentioned in this incident in the narrative of Josephus (Ant. viii. 15, § 4), where Zeckeliah is represented as contrasting the potency of Idol in withering the hand of Jeroboam with the powerlessness of Memiah to wither the hand of Zeckeliah. The visit of Ano to Abiiah, which the common Hebrew text places after this event, and with darker intimations in Abiiah's warning only suitable to a later period, has already been described.

Jeroboam was at constant war with the house of Judah, but the only act distinctly recorded is a battle with Abiiah, son of Rechoboam; in which, in spite of a skillful ambush made by Jeroboam, and of much superior force, he was defeated, and for the time lost three important cities, Bethel, Jeshaunah, and Ephraim. The calamity was severely felt; he was paralyzing the blow, and soon after died, in the 22d year of his reign (2 Chr. xiii. 20), and was buried in his ancestral sepulchre (1 K. xiv. 20). His son Nadah, or (LXX.) Nela (named after the grandfather), succeeded, and in him the dynasty was closed. The name of Jeroboam hang remained under a cloud as the king who "had caused Israel to sin." At the time of the Reformation it was a common practice of Roman Catholic writings to institute comparisons of the kings of Israel, and for his separation from the sanctuary of Judah, and that of Henry VIII. from the see of Rome.

2. JEROBOAM II., the son of Joash, the 4th of the dynasty of Jehu. The most prosperous of the kings of Israel. The contemporary accounts of his reign are, (1.) in the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (2 K. xiv. 24), which are lost, but of which the substance is given in 2 K. xiv. 23-25. (2.) In the contemporary prophets Hosea and Amos, and (perhaps) in the fragments found in Is. xv., xvi. It had been foretold in the reign of Jeconiah that a great deliverer should come, to rescue Israel from the Syrian yoke (comp. 2 K. xiii. 4, xiv. 26, 27), and this had been expanded into a distinct prediction of Jonah, that there should be a restoration of the wildest domination of Solomon (iv. 25). This "savior" and "restorer" was Jeroboam. He not only repelled the Syrian invaders, but took their capital city Damascus (2 K. xiv. 28; Am. i. 3-5), and recovered the whole of the ancient dominion from Hanath to the Pecul Sea (xiv. 25; Am. vi. 14). Ammon and Moab were reconquered (Am. i. 13, ii. 1-3); the trans-Jordanic tribes were restored to their territory (2 K. xiii. 5; 1 Chr. v. 17-22).

But it was merely an outward restoration. The sanctuary at Bethel was kept up in royal state (Am. vii. 14), but drunkenness, licentiousness, and oppression, prevailed in the country (Am. ii. 6-8, iv. i. 6; Hos. iv. 12-14, 1, 2), and idolatry was united with the worship of Jehovah (Hos. iv. 13, xiii. 6).

Amos prophesied the destruction of Jeroboam and his house by the sword (Am. vii. 9, 17), and Amaziah, the high priest of Bethel, complained to the king (Am. vii. 10-13). The effect does not appear. Hosea (Hos. i. 1) also denounced the crimes of the nation. The prediction of Amos was not fulfilled as regarded the king himself. He was buried with his ancestors in state (2 K. xiv. 29).

Ewah (Grec. iii. 51, note) supposes that Jero- boam was the subject of Ps. xiv. A. P. S.

JEROHAM (Jer. i. 1) (from Arabic, "Jehovah is my strength"), 1. (Iopioaiia, both MSS. [rather, Rom. Alex.] at 1 Chr. vi. 27; but Alex. Iopioa at ver. 31; [in 1 Sam., Iepioa, comp. Alex. Iopioa; in 1 Chr. vii. 27, 28, 29, 30. Iepioa; Iopioa; Abd. Iepioa(A.)]) Father of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, of the house of Kohath. His father is called Elaah at 1 Chr. vi. 27, Eliah at ver. 31, and Eliahu at 1 Sam. i. 1. Jeroham must have been about the same age as Ela.

A. C. H.

2. (Iopioa, [Vat. Iepioa,] Alex. Iopioa.) A Benjamite, and the founder of a family of Bene Jeroham (1 Chr. viii. 27). They were among the leaders of that part of the tribe which lived in Jerusalem, and which is here distinguished from the part which inhabited Gibeah. Probably the same person is intended in—

3. (Iopioa, [Vat. Iepioa,] Comp. Alex. Iepioa. Iepioa.) Father (or progenitor) of Bheciah, one of the leading Benjamites of Jerusalem (1 Chr. ix. 8; comp. 3 and 9).

4. (Iepioa, Alex. Iepioa, [Comp. Abd. Iepioa,] is here alluded to, or when it took place, we have no present view to.
It is not a little remarkable that Josephus omitted all mention both of the change of name and of the event it commemorates. [GIDEON.]

W. A. W.

JERUSALM

n Neh., tom. Alex. 17ro0, Vat. FA.1 omit.) A descendant of Aaron, of the house of Immer, the elder of the sixteenth course of priests; son of Pashur and father of Adiaiah (1 Chr. ix. 12). He appears to have been mentioned again in Neh. xii. 12 (a record curiously and puzzlingly parallel to that of I Chr. ix., though with some striking differences), though as here he is stated to belong to the house of Mahliiah, who was leader of the fifth course (and comp. Neh. xi. 14).

5. (17ro0, [Vat. FA. Pau, Alex. 17ro0,].) Jeroham of Gedor (לֹוֹדֵד אֶחָה), some of whose "sons" joined David when he was taking refuge from Saul at Ziklag (1 Chr. xii. 7). The list purports to be of Benjamins (see verse 2, where the word "even" is interpolated, and the last five words belong to verse 3). But then how can the presence of Kohites (verse 6), the descendants of Korah the Levite, be accounted for?

6. (17ro0, [Vat. Ald.] Alex. 17ro0.) A Danite, whose son or descendant Azarel was head of his tribe in the time of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 22).

7. (17ro0.) Father of Azariah, one of the "captains of hundreds" in the time of Athaliah; one of those to whom Jehoiada the priest confided his scheme for the restoration of Joash (2 Chr. xiii. ii. 9).

G.

JERUBBAAL (ֹּרְבֵאֶל [with whom Exod contents]: 17ro0b, [Vat. in Judg. vi. 32, Arab: vii. 1, 17ro0; viii. 29, 17ro0b; i Sam. xlii. 11, 17ro0a]) Alex. 117ro0אָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָאַבָאָa: Judg. vi. 32, 17ro0b in vii. 1: Jerubbaal), the surname of Gideon which he acquired in consequence of destroying the altar of Baal, when his father confided him to the vengeance of the Abiezrites. The A. V. of Judg. vi. 32, which has "therefore on that day he called him Jerubbaal," implying that the surname was given by Joash, should rather be, in accordance with a well-known Hebrew idiom, "one called him," i.e. he was called by the men of his city. The LXX. in the same passage have ἐκάλαξεν αὐτῷ, "he called it," i.e. the Abiezrites in the preceding verse, but in all other passages they recognize Jerubbaal as the name of Gideon, the reading should probably be αὐτόν. In Judg. viii. 25 the Vulg. strictly follows the Heb., Jeroham Gedon. The Alex. version omits the name altogether from Judg. ix. 57. Besides the passages quoted, it is found in Judg. vii. 1, viii. 29, ix. 1, 5, 16, 19, 24, 28, and 1 Sam. xiii. 11. In a fragment of Porphyry, quoted by Eusebius (Proc. Ex. i. 9, § 21), Gideon appears as Hieromuelas (17ro0b, the priest of the God '17ro0, or Jehovah, from whom the Phoenician chronicler, Sanchoniathon of Byblos, received his initiation with regard to the affairs of the Jews.

* Ex. iv. 11, 12; xx. 22-29.

Other names borne by Jerusalem are as follows:—

A. Those, the "lion of God," or according to another interpretation, the "hearth of God" (Is. xxix. 1, 2; comp. Es. xiii. 15). For the former significance compare Matt. xxiv. 2 (Stier, S. P. § 171)."I am the Θεός τῆς Ιουδαίας, "the holy city," Matt. i. 5 and xxii. 53 only. Both these passages would seem to refer to Zion—the sacred portion of the place, in which the Temple was situated. It also occurs, ἐκῇ, 1 P. iv. 13, ἐκ τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τύχος, "in the holy house," the sanctuary. The former is that in ordinary use at present. The latter is found in Arabic chronicles. The name al-Sherif, "the venerable," or οἶκος, is also quoted by Schultens in his Index Geogr. in Vit. Saladin. 2. The corrupt form of Acrebelen is found in Erieli (Jaubert, i. 345), possibly quoting a Christian writer.

The question of the identity of 17ro0 with Jerusalem will be examined under that head.
bined, lest displeasure should be felt by either of the two Saints at the exclusive use of one (Berech. Rob. in Otio, Lex. Rob. x. v., also Lightfoot). Others, quoted by Reindel (p. 833), would make it mean "fear of Salem," or "sight of peace." The suggestion of Reindel himself, adopted by Simonis (Onom. p. 467), and Ewald (Gesch. iii. 156, note) is אֵלֶּ֣הֶל אֶֽיֶרֶנֵיָּה (Eyeris, p. 2), is named by the two last great scholars only to condemn it. Others again, looking to the name of the Canaanite tribe who possessed the place at the time of the conquest, would propose Jebusus-Reindel (p. 834), or even Jehus-Solomon, as the name conferred on the city by that monarch when he began his reign of tranquility.

Another controversy relates to the termination of the name — Jeruselhim — the Hebrew dual; which, by Simonis and Ewald, is unasstesiatingly referred to the double formation of the city, while reasons are shown against it by Reindel and Gesenius. It is certain that on the two occasions where the latter portion of the name appears to be given for the whole (Gen. iv. 18; Ps. lxvi. 2) it is Shalem, and not Shalhim; also that the five places where the vocal points of the Masorets are supported by the letters of the original text are of a late date, when the idea of the double city, and its reflection in the name, would have become familiar to the Jews. In this conflict of authorities the suggestion will perhaps occur to a bystander that the original formation of the name may have been anterior to the entrance of the Israelites on Canaan, and that Jeruselhim may be the attempt to give an intelligible Hebrew form to the original ancient name, just as centuries afterwards, when Hebrews in their turn gave way to Greeks, attempts were made to twist Jeruselhim itself into a shape which should be intelligible to Greek ears. a "the holy Solyma" (Joseph. B. J. vi. 10), "Ierou Σαλομώνεια" b in the "holy place of Solomon" (Tappanom, in Enseh. Jr. E. ix. 34), or, on the other hand, the curious fancy quoted by Josephus (ib. i. 34, 35) from Lysimachus — Ἱεροσόλυμα (speakers of temples) — are perhaps not more violent adaptations, or more wide of the real meaning of Jerusalem, than that was of the original name of the city.

The subject of Jerusalem naturally divides itself into three heads: —

I. The place itself: its origin, position, and physical characteristics.

II. The annals of the city.

III. The topography of the town; the relative

a Such mystical interpretations are those of Origen, τον ἑκάστη χρόνον άνθρωπ (from γήγη and γῆ), in the eἰγορία, where half the name is interpreted as Greek, and half as Hebrew, curious as they are, cannot be examined here. (See the catalogues preserved by Jerome.)

b Other instances of similar Greek forms given to Hebrew names are Ἱεροβόλα and Ἱεροσόλυμα.

c Philo carries this a step further, and, hearing in the only the sanctity of the place, he discards the Semitic member of the name, and calls it Ἱεροσόλυμα.

d Theologies of its various parts; the sites of the Holy Places ancient and modern, etc.

I. THE PLACE ITSELF.

The arguments — if arguments they can be called — for and against the identity of the "Salem" of Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18) with Jerusalem — the "Salem" of a late Psalmist (Ps. lxvi. 2) — are almost equally balanced. In favor of it are the unhesitating statement of Josephus (Ant. i. 10; vii. 3, 2; B. J. vi. 104) and Eusebius (Onom. τοῦ Πολιορκημένου), the recurrence of the name Salem in the Psalm just quoted, where it undoubtedly means Jerusalem, and the general consent in the identification. On the other hand is the no less positive statement of Jerome, grounded on more reason than he often vouchers for his statements (Ep. ad Eusebiun, § 7), that "Salem was not Jerusalem, as Josephus and all Christians (mastri omnes) believe it to be, but a town near Syphopolis, which to this day is called Salem, where the magnificent ruins of the palace of Melchizedek are still seen, and of which mention is made in a subsequent passage of Genesis. — Jacob came to Salem, a city of Shechem. (Gen. xxxii. 18.), Elsewhere (Onomasticon, "Salem"). Eusebius and he identify it with Shechem itself. This question will be discussed under the head of SAELEM.

Here it is sufficient to say (1) that Jerusalem suits the circumstances of the narrative rather better than any place further north, or more in the heart of the country. It would be quite as much in Abram's road from the sources of Jordan to his home under the oaks of Hebron, and it would be more suitable for the visit of the king of Sodom. In fact we know that, in later times at least, the usual route from Damascas avoided the central highlands of the country and the neighborhood of Shechem, where Seme is now shown. (See Pompey's route in Joseph. Ant. xiv. 3, § 4; 4, § 1. (2) It is perhaps some confirmation of the identity, at any rate it is a remarkable coincidence, that the king of Jerusalem in the time of Joshua should bear the title Adoni-zedek — almost precisely the same as that of Melchizedek.

The question of the identity of Jerusalem with "Calatys, a large city of Syria," — almost as large as Sardis," which is mentioned by Herodotus (ii. 150, iii. 5) as having been taken by Pharaoh-Necho, need not be investigated in this place. It is interesting, and, it decided in the affirmative, so far important as confirming the Scripture narrative; but does not in any way add to our knowledge of the history of the city. The reader will find it fully examined in Rawlinson's Hierod. ii. 246; Blakeley's Hierod. — It was on bk. iii. ch. 5 (both against the identification); and in Kenrick's Egypt, ii. 406; and Dict. of Gr. and Rsm. Geogr. ii. 17 (both for it).

It is exactly the complement of πόλις Σαλομόν (Pausanias, viii. 16).

a In this passage he even goes so far as to say that Melchizedek was "the first priest of God," built there the first Temple, and changed the name of the city from Salmus to Hierusalem. c A contraction analogous to others with which we are familiar in our own poetry; 1 cor. Edin., or Elime for Edom. d For Edinburgh. e Winer is wrong in stating (Rahab. ii. 79) that Jerome bases this statement on a mischievous tradition. The tradition that he quotes, in § 5 of the same Ep is as to the identity of Melchizedek with Shem.
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Not only do we more than refer to the traditions — it traditions they are, and not mere individual speculations — of Tacitus (Hist. v. 2) and Plutarch (Isis et Osir. c. 31) of the foundation of the city by a certain Hierosolymus, a son of the Typhon (see Winer's note, i. 545). All the certain information to be gathered as to the early history of Jerusalem, must be gathered from the books of the Jewish historians alone.

It is during the conquest of the country that Jerusalem first appears in definite form on the scene in which it was destined to occupy so prominent a position. The earliest notice is probably that in Josh. xv. 8 and xviii. 16, 28, describing the landmarks of the boundaries of Judah and Benjamin. Here it is styled "the Jebusite," (A. V. Jebusa), after the name of its occupiers, just as is the case with other places in these lists. (Jerus.) Next, we find the form JERUSALEM (Judg. xix. 10, 11) — "Jebus, which is Jerusalem . . . the city of the Jebusites;" and lastly, in documents which profess to be of the same age as the foregoing — we have Jerusalem (Josh. x. 1, &c., xii. 19; Judg. i. 7, &c.). To this we have a parallel in Hebron, the other great city of Southern Palestine, which bears the alternative title of Kirjath-jearim, in these very same documents.

It is one of the obvious peculiarities of Jerusalem — but to which Professor Stanley appears to have been the first to call attention — that it did not become the capital till a comparatively late date in the career of the nation. Bethel, Shechem, Hebron, had their beginnings in the earliest periods of national life — but Jerusalem was not only not a chief city, it was not even possessed by the Israelites till they had gone through one complete stage of their life in Palestine, and the second — the monarchy — had been fairly entered on. (See Stanley, S. p. 103.)

The explanation of this is no doubt in some measure to be found in the fact that the seats of the government and the religion of the nation were originally fixed farther north — first at Shechem and Nabal; then at Gibeah, Saul, and Gibbor; but it is also no doubt partly due to the natural strength of Jerusalem. The heroes of Joshua's army who traced the boundary-line which was to separate the possessions of Judah and Benjamin, when, after passing the spring of En-rogel, they went along the "vale of the son of Hinnom," and looked up to the "southern shoulder of the Jebusite" (Josh. xv. 7, § 1), must have felt that to scale its heights so great and so steep would have fully tasked even their tried prowess. We shall see, when we glance through the annals of the city, that it did effectually resist the tribes of Judah and Simeon not many years later. But when, after the death of Ishboseth, David became king of a united and powerful people, it was necessary for him to leave the remote Hebron and approach nearer to the bulk of his dominions. At the same time it was imposs-

a This appears from an examination of the two corresponding documents, Josh. xvii. 7, 8, and xviii. 15, 17. The line was drawn from En-shemesh — probably Ain Habat, known also as En-gedi — to En-harod, either to the west or the Fountain of the Virgin; thence it went by the ravine of Hinnom and the southern shoulder of the Jebusite — the steep slope of the modern Zion; climbed the heights on the west of the ravine, and stretched off to the spring at Nephtoah, probably Lybnah. The other view, which is made the subject of my ingenious "calcul-

sible to desert the great tribe to which he belonged, and over whom he had been reigning for seven years. Out of this difficulty Jerusalem was the natural escape, and accordingly at Jerusalem David fixed the seat of his throne and the future sanctuary of his nation.

The boundary between Judah and Benjamin the north boundary of the former and the south boundary of the latter, was at the foot of the hill on which the city stands, so that the city itself was actually in Benjamin, while by crossing the narrow ravine of Hinnom you set foot on the territory of Judah. That it was not far enough to the north to command the continued allegiance of the tribe of Ephraim, and the others which lay above him, is obvious from the fact of the separation which at last took place. It is enough for the vindication of David in having chosen it to remember that that separation did not take place during the reigns of himself or his son, and was at last precipitated by misgovernment combined with feeble short-sightedness. And if not actually in the centre of Palestine, it was yet virtually so. "It was on the ridge, the broadest and most strongly marked ridge, of the back-bone of the complicated hills which extend through the whole country from the Plain of Esdraelon to the Desert. Every wanderer, every conqueror, every traveller who has trod the central route of Palestine from N. to S. must have passed through the table-land of Jerusalem. It was the water-shed between the streams, or rather the torrent-beds, which find their way eastward to the Jordan, and those which pass westward to the Mediterraneum (Stanley, S. p. 176)."

This central position naturally impressed itself in the words of Ezekiel (ver. 5), "I have set Jerusalem in the midst of the nations and countries round about her," led in later ages to a definite belief that the city was actually in the centre of the earth — in the words of Jerome, "umbilicus terrae," the central axis or navel of the world. (See the quotations in Ireland, Palestine, pp. 52 and 838; Joseph, B. J. iii. 3, § 5; also Stanley, S. p. 146.)

At the same time it should be observed that, while thus central to the people of the country, it had the advantage of being remote from the great high road of the nations which so frequently passed by Palestine, and therefore enjoyed a certain immunity from disturbance. The only practicable route for a great army, with baggage, siege-trains, etc., moving between Egypt and Assyria was by the low plain which bordered the sea-coast from Tyre to Pelusium. From that plain, the central table-land on which Jerusalem stood was approached by valleys and passes generally too intricate and precipitous for the passage of large bodies. One road there was less rugged than the rest — that from Jaffa and Lydda up the pass of the Bethhorons to Gibalon, and thence, over the hills, to the north side of Jerusalem: and by this route, with few if any exceptions, armies seem to have ap-

b This is pressingly expressed in a rubriculated figure quoted by Othon (Lex. p. 290): "The world is like to an eye: the white of the eye is the ocean surrounding the earth; the blue of the world itself: the pupil is Jerusalem, and the lense in the pupil, the Temple."
proceeded the city. But, on the other hand, we shall find, in tracing the annals of Jerusalem, that large armies, nay, that sieges of the towns on the Mediterranean coast were conducted, lasting for years, without apparently affecting Jerusalem in the least. Jerusalem stands in latitude 31° 46' 35" North, and longitude 35° 18' 30" East of Greenwich. It is 32 miles distant from the sea, and 18 from the Jordan; 20 from Hebron, and 36 from Samaria.

Such is the result of the latest observations possessed by the Lords of the Admiralty, and officially communicated to the Consul of Jerusalem in 1852 (p. 153). To what part of the town the observations apply is not stated. Other results, only slightly differing, will be found in Van de Velde's Memoir, p. 64, and in Rob. i. 259.
"In several respects," says Professor Stanley, "its situation is singular among the cities of Palestine. Its elevation is remarkable; occasioned not from its being on the summit of one of the numerous hills of Judaea, like most of the towns and villages, but because it is on the edge of one of the highest table-lands of the country. Hebron indeed is higher still by some hundred feet, and from the south, accordingly (even from Bethlehem), the approach to Jerusalem is by a slight descent. But from any other side the ascent is perpetual; and to the traveller approaching the city from the E. or W. it must always have presented the appearance beyond any other capital of the then known world — we may say beyond any important city that has ever existed on the earth — of a mountain city; breathing, as compared with the sultry plains of Jordan, a mountain air; enthroned, as compared with Jericho, or Damascus, Gaza or Tyre, on a mountain fastness" (S. & P. p. 170, 171).

The elevation of Jerusalem is a subject of constant reference and exultation by the Jewish writers. Their fervid poetry abounds with allusions to its height,2 to the ascent thither of the tribes from all parts of the country. It was the habitation of Jehovah, from which "he looked upon all the inhabitants of the world" (Ps. xxxiii. 14); its kings were "higher than the kings of the earth" (1S. lxxix. 27). In the later Jewish literature of narrative and description, this poetry is reduced to prose, and in the most exaggerated form. Jerusalem was so high that the flames of Jannah were visible from it (2 Macc. xii. 9). From the tower of Paeplinius outside the walls, could be discerned on the one hand the Mediterranean Sea, on the other the country of Arabia (Joseph. B. J. v. 4, § 2). Hebron could be seen from the roofs of the Temple (Lightfoot, Chor. Cult. xlix.). The same thing can be traced in Josephus's account of the environs of the city, in which he has exaggerated what is in truth a remarkable ravine, to a depth so enormous that the head swam and the eyes failed in gazing into its recesses (Ant. xv. 11, § 53).

In exemplification of these remarks it may be said that the general elevation of the western ridge of the city, which forms its highest point, is about 2,500 feet above the level of the sea. The Mount of Olives rises slightly above this — 2,724 feet. Beyond the Mount of Olives, however, the descent is remarkable; Jericho — 13 miles off — being no less than 3,524 feet below, namely, 900 feet under the Mediterranean. On the north, Bethel, at a distance of 11 miles, is 419 feet below Jerusalem. On the west Ramleh — 25 miles — is 2,274 feet below. Only to the south, as already remarked, are the heights slightly superior — Bethlehem, 2,704; Hebron, 3,029. A table of the heights of the various parts of the city and environs is given further on.

The situation of the city in reference to the rest of Palestine, has been described by Dr. Robinson in a well-known passage, which is so complete and graphic a statement of the case, that we take the liberty of giving it entire.

Jerusalem lies near the summit of a broad mountain ridge. This ridge or mountainous tract extends, without intermission, from the plain of Esdraelon to a line drawn between the south end of the Dead Sea and the S. E. corner of the Mediterranean: or more properly, perhaps, it may be regarded as extending as far south as to Jebel 'Arūjī in the desert; where it sinks down at once to the level of the great western plateau. This tract, which is everywhere not less than from twenty to twenty-five geographical miles in breadth, is in fact high uneven table-land. It everywhere forms the precipitous western wall of the great valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea; while towards the west it sinks down by an offset into a range of lower hills, which lie between it and the great plain along the coast of the Mediterranean. The surface of this upper region is everywhere rocky, uneven, and mountainous; and is moreover cut up by deep valleys which run east or west on either side towards the Jordan or the Mediterranean. The line of division, or water-shed, among the waters of these valleys, — a term which here applies almost exclusively to the waters of the rainy season, — follows for the most part the height of land along the ridge; yet not so but that the heads of the valleys, which run off in different directions, often interlap for a considerable distance. Thus, for example, a valley which descends to the Jordan often has its head a mile or two westward of the commencement of other valleys which run to the western sea.

From the great plain of Esdraelon onwards towards the south, the mountainous country rises gradually, forming the tract anciently known as the mountains of Ephraim and Judah; until in the vicinity of Hebron it attains an elevation of nearly 9,000 Paris feet above the level of the Mediterranean Sea. Further north, on a line drawn from the north end of the Dead Sea towards the true west, the ridge has an elevation of only about 2,500 Paris feet; and here, close upon the water-shed, lies the city of Jerusalem.

Six or seven miles N. and N. W. of the city is spread out the open plain or basin round about el-Jib (Gibeon), extending also towards el-Birch (Hebron); the waters of which flow off at its S. E. port through the deep valley here called by the Arabs Wady Bilb Hamiu; but to which the monks and travellers have usually given the name of the Valley of Turpentine, or of the Terebinth, on the mistaken supposition that it is the ancient Valley of Elah. This great valley passes along in S. W. direction an hour or more west of Jerusalem; and that, if bored to its foundation, the wall would present an unbroken face of solid masonry of nearly 1,000 feet long, and for a large portion of the distance more than 150 feet in height; in other words, the height of the Crystal Palace, and the height of the triumphal arch. The wall, as it stands, with less than half that height, emerging from the ground, has always been regarded as a marvel. What must it have been when entirely exposed to view! No wonder that prophets and psalmists have rejected in the 'walls' and 'bolwarks' between the Temple, and that Ezekiel should have described it as modo arcei constructum;" See also Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature, p. 494 (January 1888). II.
finally opens out from the mountains into the western plain, at the distance of six or eight hours S. W. from the city, under the name of Wady es-Sâdîr. The traveller, on his way from Ramleh to Jerusalem, descends into and crosses this deep valley at the village of Kâbînîtch on its western side, an hour and a half from the latter city. On again reaching the high ground on its eastern side, he enters upon an open tract sloping gradually downwards towards the south and east; and sees before him, at the distance of a mile and a half, the walls and domes of the Holy City, and beyond them the higher ridge or summit of the Mount of Olives.

The traveller now descends gradually towards the city along a broad swell of ground, having at some distance on his left the shallow northern part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; and close at hand on his right the basin which forms the beginning of the Valley of Hinnom. Upon the broad and elevated promontory within the fork of these two valleys, lies the Holy City. All around are higher hills: on the east, the Mount of Olives; on the south, the Hill of Evil Counsel, so called, rising directly from the Vale of Hinnom; on the west, the ground rises gently, as above described, to the borders of the great Wady; while on the north, a bend of the ridge connected with the Mount of Olives bounds the prospect at the distance of more than a mile. Towards the S. W. the view is some what more open; for here lies the plain of Rechâ'ın

---

**Plan of Jerusalem.**

already described, commencing just at the southern brink of the Valley of Hinnom, and stretching off S. W., where it runs to the western sea. In the N. W., too, the eye reaches up along the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; and from many points can discern the mosque of Nebi Samueel, situated on a lofty ridge beyond the great Wady, at the distance of two hours." (Robinson's Bibl. Res. i. 258-260).

So much for the local and political relation of Jerusalem to the country in general. To convey an idea of its individual position, we may say roughly, and with reference to an accompanying Plan, that the city occupies the southern termination of a table-land, which is cut off from the country round it on its west, south, and east sides, by ravines more than usually deep and precipitous. These ravines leave the level of the table-land, the one on the west and the other on the northeast of the city, and fall rapidly until they form a junction below its southeast corner. The eastern one — the valley of the Kedron, commonly called the Valley of Jehoshaphat, runs nearly straight from north to south. But the western one — the Valley of Hinnom — runs south for a time and then takes a sudden bend to the east until it meets the Valley of Jehoshaphat, after which the two rush off as one to the Dead Sea. How sudden is their descent may be gathered from the fact, that the level of the point of junction — about a mile and a quarter from the starting-point of each — is more than 600 feet below that of the upper plateau from which they commenced their descent. Thus, while on the north there is no material difference between the general level of the country outside the walls and that of the highest parts of the city; on the other three sides, so steep is the fall of the ravines, so trench-like their character, and so close do they keep to the promontory, at whose feet they run, as to leave on the beholder almost the impression of the ditch at the foot of a fortress, rather than of valleys formed by nature.

The promontory thus encircled is itself divided by a longitudinal ravine running up it from south to north, rising gradually from the south like the external ones, till at last it arrives at the level of the upper plateau, and dividing the central mass into two unequal portions. Of these, two, that on the west — the "Upper City" of the Jews, — the Mount Zion of modern tradition — is the higher and more massive; that on the east — Mount Moriah, the "Akra" or "lower city" of Josephus, now occupied by the great Mohammedan sanctuary with its mosques and domes — is at once considerably lower and smaller, so that, to a spectator from the south, the city appears to slope gradually towards the east. This central valley, at about half-way up its length, throws out a subordinate on its left or west side, which apparently quitted it at about right angles, and made its way up to the general level of the ground at the present Jaffa or Bethlehem gate. We say apparently, because covered as the ground now is, it is difficult to ascertain the point exactly. (This is the reason to which the author alludes, in speaking of the straight valley north and south, or its southern half, with the branch just spoken of, as a Tyropeon valley of Josephus. The question will be examined in Section III. under the head of the Topography of the Ancient City.

One more valley must be noted. It was on the north of Moriah, and separated from it by a hill on which, in the time of Josephus, stood one of the few part of the city called Bezea, or the New-town. Part of this depression is still preserved in the large reservoir with two arches, usually called the Pool of Bethesda, near the St. Stephen's gate. It also will be more explicitly spoken of in the examination of the ancient topography.

This rough sketch of the terrain of Jerusalem will enable the reader to appreciate the two great advantages of its position. On the one hand, the ravines which entrench it on the west, south, and east — out of which, as has been said, the rocky slopes of the city rise almost like the walls of a fortress out of its ditches — must have rendered it impregnable on those quarters to the warfare of the old world. On the other hand, its junction with the more level ground on its north and northwest sides afforded an opportunity of expansion, of which we know advantage was taken, and which gave it remarkable superiority over other cities of Palestine, and especially of Judah, which, though secure on their hill-tops, were unable to expand them (Stanley, S. J. P. pp. 174, 175).

The heights of the principal points in and round the city, above the Mediterranean Sea, as given by Lt. Van de Velde in the Memoirs accompanying his Map, 1838, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. W. corner of the city</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Zion (Gourouia)</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Moriah (Harum el-Sherif)</td>
<td>2,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Kedron, near Bethlehem</td>
<td>2,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool of Siloam</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir-Agob, at the confluence of Hinnom and Kedron</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount of Olives, Church of Ascension on summit</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures it will be seen that the ridge on which the western half of the city is built is tolerably level from north to south; that the eastern hill is more than a hundred feet lower; and that from the latter the descent to the floor of the valley at its feet — the Bir-Agob — is a drop of nearly 450 feet.

The Mount of Olives overtops even the highest part of the city by rather more than 100 feet, and the Temple-hill by no less than 300. Its northern and southern outliers — the Viri Galilaei, Scopus, and Mount of Offense — bend round slightly towards the city, and give the effect of a standing round about Jerusalem. Especially would this be the case to a worshipper in the Temple. "It is true," says Professor Stanley, "that this image is not realized, as most persons familiar with European scenery would wish, and expect it to be realized. . . . Any one facing Jerusalem westward, northward, or southward will always see the city itself on an elevation higher than the hills in its immediate neighborhood, its towers and walls standing out against the sky, and not against any high background, such as which incloses the mountain towns and villages of our own Cumbrian or Westmoreland valleys. Yet again is the plain on which it stands inclosed by a continuous, though distant, circle of mountains like Athens or Innsbruck. The mountains in the neighborhood of Jerusalem are of unequal height, and only in two or three instances

b A table of levels, differing somewhat from those of Lt. Van de Velde, will be found in Barclay's City of the Great King, pp. 103, 104.
It thus appears that the highest point of elevation here is the two seas — 2,715 feet — occurring on Mount Sepphoris, just north of Jerusalem. A bright spot from the top of the cairn on Sepphoris is 2,724 feet. The level of the Mediterranean is crossed 33 miles beyond Khan Hulda; and the figures against the last two stations represent the depression below the level of the Mediterranean. The party reached the Dead Sea on the 12th of March, 1865. It is known that this sea is liable to be, on the average, six feet lower, a few weeks later in the season; and hence the lowest depression of the surface would be 1,298 feet. According to the soundings by Lient. Vignes of the French Navy, the maximum depth of the Dead Sea is 1,148 feet, making the depression of the bottom 2,446 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. "The sounding in the Mediterranean, midway between Malta and Candia, by Capt. Sprunt, gave a depth of 13,920 feet, or a depression of the bottom five times greater than that of the bottom of the Dead Sea." (Observance Survey of Jerusalem, pp. 26-27, Lond. 1865.) It should be stated that a line of levels was also carried from Jerusalem to Solomon’s Pools. The level at the Jaffa gate on the west side of the city was found to be 2,528 feet below the Mediterranean; near the Mar Elias, 2,616; at Rachel’s tomb, 2,478; at the Castle near Solomon’s Pools, 2,424; near the upper Pool, 2,616, and the lower Pool, 2,513. (Survey, p. 88.)

Roule.—There appears to have been but two main approaches to the city. 1. From the Jordan Valley by Jericho and the Mount of Olives. This was the route commonly taken from the north and east of the country — as from Galilee by our Lord (Luke xvi. 11, xviii. 35, xix. 1, 29, 43, &c.), from Damascus by Pompey (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 3, § 4: 1, § 1), to Malhamim by David (2 Sam. xv. 17, xvi.). It was also the route from places in the central districts of the country, as Samaria (2 Chr. xxviii. 15). The latter part of the approach, over the Mount of Olives, as generally followed at the present day, is identical with what it was, at least in one memorable instance, in the time of Christ. A path there is over the crown of the hill, but the common route is that 2,500 yards more to the south, along the shoulder of the principal summit (see S. F. P. p. 193). In the later times of Jerusalem, this road crossed the valley of the Kedron by a bridge or viaduct on a double series of arches, and entered the Temple by the gate of Susanna. (See the quotations from the Talmud in Otto, Lex. Rob. 265; and Barclay, pp. 102, 292.) The insecure state of the Jordan Valley has thrown this route very much into disuse, and has diverted the traffic from the north to a road along the central ridge of the country. 2. From the great maritime plain of Philistia and Sharon. This road led by the two Beth-herons up to the high ground at Gibeah, whence it turned south, and came to Jerusalem by Ramah and Gibeah, and over the ridge north of the city. This is still the route by which the heavy traffic is carried, though a few important to the same view as not least just than beautiful: "From almost every point, there is visible that long purple wall, rising out of its unmathematical depths, to us even more interesting than to the old Jewsites or inhabitants. They knew the tribes whom they were living over; but the inhabitants of modern Jerusalem, of whom comparatively few have ever visited the other side of the Jordan, it is the end of the world, — and to them
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At districts of nora). This was the route by which large bodies, such as armies, always approached the city, whether from Gaza on the south, or from Cesarea and Tophelmen on the north. The communication with the mountainous districts of the south is less distinct. Even Hebron, after the establishment of the monarchy at Jerusalem, was hardly of importance enough to maintain any considerable amount of communication, and only in the wars of the Maccabees do we hear of any military operations in that region.

The roads out of Jerusalem were a special subject of Solomon's care. He paved them with black stone — probably the basalt of the trans-Jordanic districts. (Joseph. Ant. viii. 7, § 4).

Gates. — The situation of the various gates of the city is examined in Section III. It may, however, be desirable to supply here a complete list of those which are named in the Bible and Josephus, with the references to their occurrences: —

1. Gate of Ephraim. 2 Chr. xxv. 23; Neh. xii. 16, xii. 39. This is probably the same as the —

2. Gate of Benjamin. Jer. xx. 2, xxvii. 13; Zech. xiv. 10. If so, it was 400 cubits distant from the —

3. Corner Gate. 2 Chr. xxv. 23, xxvii. 9; Jer. xxxi. 12; Zech. xiv. 10.

4. Gate of Joshua, governor of the city. 2 K. xxiii. 8.

5. Gate between the two walls. 2 K. xxv. 4; Jer. xxxix. 4.

6. Horse Gate. Neh. iii. 28; 2 Chr. xxxii. 15; Jer. xxxi. 40.

7. Ravine Gate (i.e. opening on ravine of Hinnom). 2 Chr. xxvi. 9; Neh. ii. 13, 15, iii. 12.

8. Fish Gate. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 14; Neh. iii. 31; Zeph. i. 9.


10. Sheep Gate. Neh. iii. 32, xii. 39.

11. East Gate. Neh. iii. 29.


13. Fountain Gate (Siloam?). Neh. xii. 37.


17. Gate Harith (perhaps the Sun; A V. East Gate). Jer. xix. 2.


To these should be added the following gates of the Temple:

Gate Sur. 2 K. xi. 6. Called also —

Gate of Foundation. 2 Chr. xxiii. 5.

Gate of the Guard, or behind the guard. 2 K. xi. 6, 19. Called the —

High Gate. 2 Chr. xxiii. 20, xxvii. 3; 2 K. xv. 35.

Gate Shallheeleth. 1 Chr. xxvi. 16.

Burial-Grounds. — The main cemetery of the city seems from an early date to have been where § is still — on the steep slopes of the valley of the Kidron. Here it was that the fragments of the idol abominations, destroyed by Josiah, were cast on the "graves of the children of the people" (2 K. xxii. 6), and the valley was always the receptacle for impurities of all kinds. There Manasseh's idol was burnt by Ass (1 K. xv. 13); there, according to Josephus, Athaliah was executed; and there the "filthiness" accumulated in the sanctuary, by the false-worship of Ahaz, was discharged (2 Chr. xxvii. 6, 16). But in addition to this, and although there is only a slight allusion in the Bible to the fact (Jer. vii. 32), many of the tombs now existing on the immediate environs of the city, must be as old as Biblical times — and if so, show that this was also used as a cemetery. The monument of Ananias the high-priest (Joseph B. J. v. 12, § 2) would seem to have been in this direction.

The tombs of the kings were in the city of David that is, Mount Zion, which, as will be shown in the concluding section [III.] of this article, was an eminence on the northern part of Mount Moriah. [See opposite view in § 14. Amer. ed.] The royal sepulchres were probably chambers containing separate recesses for the successive kings. [Tombs.] Of some of the kings it is recorded that, not being thought worthy of a resting-place there, they were buried in separate or private tombs in Mount Zion (2 Chr. xxix. 23, xxvii. 25; 2 K. xv. 7). Ahaz was not admitted to Zion at all, but was buried in Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxvii. 27). Other spots also were used for burial. Somewhere to the north of the Temple, and not far from the wall, was the monument of king Alexander (Joseph. B. J. v. 7, § 3). Near the northwest corner of the city was the monument of John the high-priest (Joseph. v. 6, § 2, 4); and to the northeast the "monument of the Fuller" (Joseph. B. J. v. 4, § 2). On the north, too, were the monuments of Herod (v. 3, § 2) and of queen Helena (v. 2, § 3, § 3), the former close to the "Serpent's Pool." Wood; Gardens. — We have very little evidence as to the amount of wood and of cultivation that existed in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. The king's gardens of David and Solomon seem to have been in the bottom formed by the confluence of the Kidron and Hinnom (Joseph. Ant. vii. 15; Joseph. B. J. v. iv. 12, § 4, ix. 10, § 4). The Mount of Olives, as its name and those of various places upon it seem to imply, was a fruitful spot. "At its foot was situated the Garden of Gethsemane. At the time of the final siege, the space north of the wall of Agrippa was covered with gardens, groves, and plantations of fruit-trees, inclosed by hedges and walls; and to level these was one of Titus's first operations (B. J. v. 3, § 2). We know that the gate Gennath (i.e. "of gardens") opened on this side of the city (B. J. v. 4, § 2). The Valley of Hinnom was in Jerome's time "a pleasant and woody spot, full of delightful gardens watered from the fountain of Siloah." (Comm. in Jer. vii. 30). In the Talmud mention is made of a certain rose garden outside the city, which was of great fame but no clue is given to its situation (Otho, Lex. us, these mountains almost have the effect of a distant view of the sea; the houses constantly changing, or that precipitous rock coming out clear in the morning or evening shade — there, the form dimly shadowed out by surrounding valleys of what may possibly be Plegad; here the point of Rock, the capital of Ish and fortress of the Crusaders — and then at times all wrapped in deep haze — the mountains overhanging the valley of the shadow of death, and all the more striking from their contrast with the gray or green colors of the hills and streets and walls through which you catch the glimpse of them." (S & S p. 199; Amer. ed.) H.
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Rob. 265. [GARDEN.] The sieges of Jerusalem were too frequent during its later history to admit of any considerable growth of wood near it, even if the thin soil, which covers the rocky substratum, would allow of it. And the scarcity of earth again necessitated the cutting down of all the trees that could be found for the banks and mounds, with which the ancient sieges were conducted. This is expressly said in the accounts of the sieges of Pompey and Titus. In the latter case the country was swept of its timber for a distance of eight or nine miles from the city (B. J. vi. 8, § 1, a.c.).

Ceremonies just mentioned on the north of the city were watered if it is difficult to understand, since at present no water exists in that direction. At the time of the siege (Joseph. B. J. v. 3, § 2) there was a reservoir in that neighborhood called the Serpent's Pool; but it has not been discovered in modern times. The subject of the waters is more particularly discussed in the third section, and reasons are shown for believing that at one time there existed, north of the town, the outflow of which was stopped—possibly by Hezekiah, and the water fed underground to reservoirs in the city and below the Temple. From these reservoirs the overflow escaped to the so-called Fount of the Virgin, and thence to Siloam, and possibly to the Hir-Aphob, or "Well of Nehemiah." This source would seem to have been, and to be still the only spring in the city—but it was always provided with private and public cisterns. Some of the latter still remain. Outside the walls the two on the west side (Birket Manilla, and Birket es-Sultan), generally known as the upper and lower reservoirs of Gibon, the small "pool of Siloam," with the larger B. el-Haram close adjoining, and the B. Hammam Sidi Marga, close to the St. Stephen's Gate. Inside are the so-called Pool of Hezekiah (B. el-Rabat), near the Jaffa gate, which receives the surplus water of the Birket Manilla; and the B. Isbell on the opposite side of the city, close to the St. Stephen's Gate, commonly known as the Pool of Bethesda. These two reservoirs are probably the Pools of Amasyalab and Struthius of Josephus, respectively. Dr. Bar- chav has discovered another reservoir below the Ma'talim in the latter part of the city—the Tyropean valley—west of the Haram, supplied by the aqueduct from Bethlehem and "Solomon's Pools." It is impossible within the limits of the present article to enter more at length into the subject of the waters. The reader is referred to the chapters on the subject in Barchav's City of the Great King (x. and xviii.), and Williams' Holy City: also to the articles RAMON; SOLOMON; POOL.

Streets, Houses, etc.—Of the nature of these in the ancient city we have only the most scattered notices. The "East Street" (2 Chr. xxix. 4): the "street of the city"—i.e. the city of David (xxxi. 6): the "street facing the water gate" (Neh. viii. 1, 3)—or, according to the parallel account in 1 Esdr. ix. 38, the "bread place (appia peplos) of the Temple towards the east;" the "street of the handmaids of the king" (Est. vi. 8): the "first gate of the gate of Ephraim" (Neh. viii. 16): and the "open place of the first gate towards the east" must have been not "streets" in our sense of the word, so much as the open spaces found in eastern towns round the inside of the gates. This is evident, not only from the word used, Recelbd, which has the force of breadth or room, but also from the nature of the occurrences related in each case. The same phrases are intended in Zech. viii. 5: Streets, properly so called (Chaldez), there are (Jer. v. 1): but the name of only one, "the Bakers' Street." (Jer. xxxvii. 21), is preserved to us. This is conjectured, from the names, to have been near the Tower of Ovens (Neh. xii. 38; "furnaces" is incorrect). A notice of streets of this kind in the 3d century a. d. is preserved by Ariston (see p. 1292).

At the time of the destruction by Titus the low part of the city was filled with narrow lanes, containing the bazaars of the town, and when the breach was made in the second wall it was at the spot where the cloth, brass, and wool bazaars abutted on the wall.

To the houses we have even less clue, but there is no reason to suppose that in either houses or streets the ancient Jerusalem differed very materially from the present city. No description of the houses exhibit that air of meandering dilapidation which is now so prominent there—that sordid look which gives its houses the appearance of "having been burnt down many centuries ago." (Richardson, in S. of P. p. 183), and which, as it is characteristic of so many eastern towns, must be ascribed to Turkish neglect. In another respect too, the modern city must present a different aspect from the ancient—the hill masonry of color which, at least during a part of the year, pervades the slopes of the hills and ravines outside the walls. Not only is this the case on the west, where the city does not relieve the view, but also on the south. A dull, leaden ashue hove overspreads all. No doubt this is due, wholly or in part, to the enormous quantities of debris of stone and mortar which have been shut over the precipices after the numerous demolitions of the city. The whole of the slopes south of the Haram area (the ancient Ophel), and the modern Zion, and the west side of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, especially near the St. Stephen's Gate, are covered with these debris, lying as soft and loose as the day they were poured over, and presenting the appearance of gigantic mounds of rubbish.

Thus at least the ancient city stood in favorable contrast with the modern, but in many others the resemblance must have been strong. The nature of the site compels the walls in many places to retain their old positions. The southern part of the summit of the Upper City and the slopes of Ophel are now bare, where previous to the final siege they were covered with houses, and the North Wall has retired very much south of where it then stood; but on the whole the area of the West and East, and the western corner of the North Wall, are what they always were. And the look of the walls and gates, especially the Jaffa Gate, with the "Citadel" adjoining, and the Daviuncus Gate, is probably hardly changed from what it was. True, the minarets, domes, and spires, which give such a variety to the modern town, must have been absent; but their places would have been the Western and Eastern, at the northwest part of the wall; by the upper stories and turrets of Herod's palace, the palace of the Antonians, and the other public buildings; while the lofty fortress of Antonia, towering far above every building within the city, and itself

a The writer was there in September, and the account above described left an ineffaceable impression on him.

b "Conspicuous fastigio turris Antonia." (Tac. Ann. v. 11).
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surrounded by the keep on its southeast corner, must have formed a feature in the view not altogether unlike (though more prominent than) the "Citadel" of the modern town. The flat roofs and the absence of windows, which give an eastern city so startling an appearance to a western traveller, must have existed then as now.

But the greatest resemblance must have been on the southeast side, towards the Mount of Olives. Though there can be no doubt (see below, Section III. p. 131) that the hierarchy is now much larger than it was, yet the precinct of the Haram es-Sherif, with its domes and sacred buildings, some of them clinging to the very spot formerly occupied by the Temple, must preserve what we may call the personal identity of this quarter of the city, but little changed in its general features from what it was when the Temple stood there. Nay, more: in the substructions of the enclosure - those massive and venerable walls, which once to see is never to forget - is the very masonry itself. Its lower courses undisturbed, which was laid there by Herod the Great, and by Agrippa, possibly even by still older builders.

Environs of the City. — The various spots in the neighborhood of the city will be described at length under their own names, and to them the reader is accordingly referred. See Environs of Jerusalem; Kidron; Olives, Mount of, etc., etc.

II. The Annals of the City.

In considering the annals of the city of Jerusalem, nothing strikes one so forcibly as the number and severity of the sieges which it underwent. We catch our earliest glimpse of it in the brief notice of the 1st chapter of Judges, which describes how the "children of Judah smote it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire:" and almost the latest mention of it in the New Testament is contained in the solemn warnings in which Christ foretold how Jerusalem should be "compassed with armies" (Luke xxii. 20), and the abomination of desolation be seen standing in the Holy Place (Matt. xxiv. 15). In the fifteen centuries which elapsed between those two points the city was besieged no fewer than seventeen times; twice it was razed to the ground; and on two other occasions its walls were levelled. In this respect it stands without a parallel in any city ancient or modern. The fact is one of great significance. The number of the sieges testifies to the importance of the town as a key to the whole country, and as the depository of the accumulated treasures of the Temple, no less forcibly than do the severity of the contests and their protracted length to the difficulties of the position, and the obstinate enthusiasm of the Jewish people. At the same time the details of these operations, scanty as they are, throw considerable light on the difficult topography of the place; and on the whole they are in every way so characteristic, that it has seemed needful to use them as far as possible as a frame-work for the following rapid sketch of the history of the city.

The first siege appears to have taken place almost immediately after the death of Joshua (cir. 1400 B.C.). Judah and Simeon had been ordered by the divine oracle at Shiloh or Shechem to commence the task of actual possession of the portions distributed by Joshua. As they travelled in the region south of these they encountered a large force of Canaanites at Bezek. They dispersed, took prisoner Adoni-bezek, a ferocious petty chieftain, who was the terror of the country, and swept on their southward road. Jerusalem was soon reached. a It was evidently too important, and also too near the actual limits of Judah, to be passed by. "They fought against it and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire" (Judg. i. 8). To this brief notice Josephus (Ant. v. 2, § 2) makes a material addition. He tells us that the siege lasted some time (aiov χάτθων;) that the part which was taken at last, and in which the slaughter was made, was the lower city; but that the upper city was so strong, "by reason of its walls and also of the nature of the place," that they relinquished the attempt and moved off to Hebron (Ant. v. 2, § 23). These few valuable words of the 1st Jewish historian reveal one of those topographical peculiarities of the place - the possession of an upper as well as a lower city - which differentiated it so remarkably from the other towns of Palestine which enabled it to survive so many sieges and partial destructions, and which in the former section we have endeavored to explain. It is not to be wondered at that these changes, which must have been impressed with peculiar force on the mind of Josephus during the destruction of Jerusalem, of which he had only lately been a witness, should have recurred to him when writing the account of the earlier sieges. b

As long as the upper city remained in the hands of the Jebusites they practically had possession of the whole as that a Jebusite city in fact it remained for a longer period after this. The Benjamites followed the men of Judah to Jerusalem, but with no better result - "They could not drive out the Jebusites, but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day." (Judg. i. 21). At the time of the sad story of the Levite (Judg. xix. — which the mention of Phinehas (xx. 28) fixes as early in the period of the Judges - Benjamin can hardly have had even so much footing as the passage just quoted would indicate; for the Levite refuses to enter it, not because it was hostile, but because it was "the city of a stranger, and not of Israel." And this lasted during the whole period of the Judges, the reign of Saul, and the reign of David at Hebron. c Owing to several

a According to Josephus, they did not attack Jerusalem till after they had taken many other towns - μετά των ᾧ κατέχοντο, ταυτότητι του. b See this noticed and contrasted with the situation of the villages in other parts by Prof. Stanley (S. & P. 161, 571, &c.).

c About half way through the period of the Judges (i.e. c. 8. 152) - occurred an invasion of the territory of the Hittites (Khatti) by Sethe I. king of Egypt, and the capture of the capital city, Keshesh, in the land of Amor. This would not have been noticed here, had not Keshesh been by some writers identified with Jerusalem (Geberon, Egypt, her Testimony, etc.)

d Also Williams in Dict. of Geogr. ii. 23, 24). The ground plans and identification are (1) the apparent affinity of the name (which they read Chadash) with the Greek κάθας, the modern Arabic et-Ruds, and the Syriac Kadatha; (2) the affinity of Amon with Amorites; (3) a likeness between the form and situation of the city, as shown in a rude sketch in the Egyptian records, and that of Jerusalem. But on closer examination these correspondences vanish. Egyptian scholars are now agreed that Jerusalem is much too far south to suit the requirements of the rest of the campaign, and that Keshesh survives in Nisra, a name discovered by Robinson a patron b ...
circumstances — the residence of the Ark at Shiloh — Saul's connection with Gibeah, and David's with Ziklag and Hebron — the disunion of Benjamin and Judah, symbolized by Saul's persecution of David — the tide of affairs was drawn northwards and southwards, and Jerusalem, with the places adjacent, was left in possession of the Jebusites. But as soon as a man was found to assume the rule over all Israel both north and south, so soon was it necessary that the seat of government should be moved from the remote Hebron nearer to the centre of the country, and the choice of David at once fell on the city of the Jebusites. David advanced to the siege at the head of the men-of-war of all the tribes who had come to Hebron — to turn the kingdom of Saul to him." They are stated as 290,000 men, choice warriors of the flower of Israel (1 Chr. xii. 23-39). No doubt they approached the city from the south. The ravine of the Kidron, the valley of Hinnom, the hills south and southeast of the town, the uplands on the west must have swarmed with these hardy warriors. As before, the lower city was immediately taken — and as before, the citadel held out (Joseph. Ant. vii. 3, § 1). The unhaunted Jebusites, lake and island on the Oronetes between Riblah and Homs, and still showing traces of extensive artificial works. Nor does the agreement between the representation in the records and the site of Jerusalem fail better. For the stream, which was supposed to represent the ravine of Jerusalem — the nearest point of the resemblance — contained at Ketesh water enough to drown several persons (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschift. 21, 8c.).

The passage which forms the latter clause of 2 Sam. v. 9 is generally taken to mean that the blind and the lame were excluded from the Temple. But believing in the impregnable of their fort as, manned the battlements "with lane and blind." a But they little understood the temper of the king, where is the proof that this was the fact? On one occasion at least we know that "the blind and the lame" came to Christ in the Temple, and he hailed them (Matt. xvi. 11). And indeed what had the Temple, which was not founded till long after this, to do with the matter? The explanation — which is in accordance with the accentuation of the Masorets, and for which the writer is indebted to the kindness of the Rev. J. J. S. Perowne — would seem to be that it was a proverb used in future with regard to any impregnable fortress — "The blind and the lame are there; let him enter the place if he can."
of those he commanded. David's anger was thoroughly roused by the insult (2 Sam. v. 13), and he at once proclaimed to his host that the first man who would scale the rocky side of the fortress and kill a Jebusite should be made chief captain of the host. A crowd of warriors, including Joseph, rushed forward to the attempt, but Josiah's superior agility gained him the day, and the citadel, the fastness of Zion, was taken (1 Chron. xiv. 10). It is the first time that that memorable name appears in the history.

David at once proceeded to secure himself in his new acquisition. He inclosed the whole of the city with a wall, and connected it with the citadel. In the latter he took up his own quarters, and the Zion of the Jebusites became "the city of David." 

Zeal. Zion. The rest of the town was left to the more immediate care of the new captain of the host.

The sensation caused by the fall of this impregnable fortress must have been enormous. It reached even to the distant Tyre, and before long an alliance was made between the two. Thus Jerusalem, the city of David, became from this time "a characteristic offering of artificers and materials to erect a palace for David in his new abode. The palace was built, and occupied by the fresh establishment of wives and concubines which David acquired. Two attempts were made the one by the Philistines alone (2 Sam. vii. 17-21: 1 Chr. xiv. 8-12), the other by the Philistines, with all Syria and Phoenicia (Joseph. Ant. vii. 4, § 1; 2 Sam. xvi. 22-23) — to attack David in his new situation, but they did not affect the city, and the actions were fought in the "Valley of Giants," apparently north of Jerusalem, near Gibeah or Gibeon. The arrival of the Ark, however, was an event of great importance. The old Tabernacle of Bezaleel and Aholiab being now pitched on the height of Gibeon, a new tent had been spread by David in the fortress for the reception of the Ark; and here, "in its place," it was deposited with the most impressive ceremonies, and Zion became at once the great sanctuary of the nation. It now perhaps acquired the name of Beth Ha-Har, the "house of the mount," of which we catch a glimpse in the LXX. addition to 2 Sam. xxv. 24. In this tent the Ark remained, except for short flight to the foot of the Mount of Olives with David (xxv. 1-20), until it was placed in its permanent resting-place in the Temple of Solomon.

In the fortress of Zion, too, was the sepulchre of David, which became also that of most of his successors.

The only works of ornament which we can ascribe to David are the "royal gardens," as they are called by Josephus, which appear to have been formed by him in the level space southeast of the city, and on the slope of the valleys of Kidron and Hinnom, screened from the sun during part of the day by the shoulders of the inclosing mountains, and irrigated by the well "Ain Aglib, which still appears to retain the name of Joab (Joseph. Ant. viii. 14, § 4; ix. 10, § 4). Until the time of Solomon we hear of no additions to the city. His three great works were the Temple, with its east wall and cloister (Joseph. B. J. v. 3, § 1), his own palace, and the Wall of Jerusalem. The two former will be best described elsewhere. [PALACE; SOLOMON; TEMPLE.] Of the last there is an interesting notice in Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, § 1: 6, § 1), from which it appears that David's wall was a mere rampart without towers, and only of moderate strength and height. One of the first acts of the new king was to make the walls larger probably extend them round some outlying parts of the city — and strengthen them (1 K. iii. 1, with the explanation of Josephus, vii. 2, § 1). But on the completion of the Temple he again turned his attention to the walls, and both increased their height, and constructed very large towers among them (ix. 15, and Joseph. Ant. vii. 6, § 1). Another work of his in Jerusalem was the repair or fortification of Millo, whatever that strange term may signify (1 K. ix. 15, 24). It was in the works at Millo and the city of David — it is uncertain whether the latter consisted of stopping breaches (as in A. V.) or filling up a ditch round the fortress (the Vulg. and others) — that Jeroboam first cause under the notice of Solomon (1 K. x. 18, 27). Millo was a palace for his Egyptian queen — of the situation of which all we know is that it was not in the city of David (1 K. vii. 8, ix. 24, with the addition in 2Chr. viii. 11). But there must have been much besides these to fill up the measure of "all that Solomon desired to build in Jerusalem." (2 Chr. viii. 6) — the vast Harem for his 700 wives and 300 concubines, and their establishment — the colleges for the priests of the various religions of these women — the stables for the 1,400 chariots and 12,000 riding horses. Outside the city, probably on the Mount of Olives, there remained, down to the latest times of the monarchy (2 K. xxii. 13), the fanes which had erected for the worship of foreign gods (1 K. xi. 7); and which have still left their name clinging to the "Mount of Olives."

His care of the roads leading to the city is the subject of a special panegyric from Josephus (Ant. vii. 7, § 4). They were, as before observed, paved with black stone, probably the hard basalt from the region of Argob, on the east of Jordan, where he had a special resident officer.

As long as Solomon lived, the visits of foreign powers to Jerusalem were those of courtesy and amity; but with his death this was changed. A city, in the midst of which all the vessels were of pure gold, where spices, precious stones, rare woods, curious animals, were accumulated in the greatest profusion; where silver was no more valued than the stones of the street, and considered too mean a material for the commonest of the royal purposes — such a city, governed by such a fitiment prince as Rehoboam, was too tempting a prey for the surrounding kings. He had been on the throne (1 K. xx. 40, 970 a. c.) before Shishak, king of Egypt, invaded Judah with an enormous host, took the fortified places and advanced to the capital. Jerusalem was crowded with the chief men of the realm who had taken refuge there (2 Chr. xii. 5), but Rehoboam did not attempt resistance. He opened his gates, apparently on a promise from Shishak that he would not pillage (Joseph. Ant. viii. 10, § 3). However, the promise was not kept, and the treasures of the Temple and palace were carried off, and special mention is made of the golden...
bucklers ( JsonConvertующийся), which were hung by Solomon in the house of the forest of Lebanon (1 K. xiv. 25; 1 Chr. xii. 9; comp. 1 K. x. 17).3 Jered in his pride was again threatened in the reign of Asa (grandson of Rehoboam), when Zerah the Cushite, or king of Ethiopia (Joseph. Ant. viii. 12, § 1), probably incited by the success of Shishak, invaded the country with an enormous horde of followers (2 Chr. xiv. 9). He came by the road through the low country of Philistia, where his chariots could find level ground. But Asa was more faithful and more powerful than Rehoboam had been. He did not remain to be blockaded in Jerusalem, but went forth and met the enemy at Mareshah, and repulsed him with great slaughter (cir. 1440). The consequence of this victory was a great reformation extending throughout the kingdom, but most demonstrative at Jerusalem. A vast assembly of the men of Judah and Benjamin, of Simeon, even of Ephraim and Manasses — now "strangers" (firebase) — was gathered at Jerusalem. Enormous sacrifices were offered; a prodigious enthusiasm seized the crowds of city, and amidst the clamor of trumpets and shouting, oaths of loyalty to Jehovah were exchanged, and threats of instant death denounced on all who should forsake his service. The temple of Jehovah in front of the palace of the Temple, which had fallen into decay, was rebuilt: the horrid idol of the queen-mother — the mysterious Asherah, doubtless an abomination of the Syrian worship of her grandmother — was torn down, ground to powder, and burnt in the ravine of the Kidron. At the same time the vessels of the Temple, which had been plundered by Shishak, were replaced from the spoil taken by Shaphan from the treasures, with Asa himself from the treasures (2 Chr. xiv. 8-19; 1 K. xxv. 12-15). This prosperity lasted for more than ten years, but at the end of that interval the Temple was once more despoiled, and the treasures so lately dedicated to Jehovah were sent by Asa, who had himself dedicated them, as bribes to Ben-hadad at Damascus, where they probably enriched the temple of Rimmon (2 Chr. xvi. 2, 3; 1 K. xix. 18). Asa was buried in that chariot by himself in the royal sepulchres in the citadel.

The reign of his son Jehoshaphat, though of great prosperity and splendor, is not remarkable as regards the city of Jerusalem. We hear of a "new court" to the Temple, but have no clue to its situation or its builder (2 Chr. xx. 5). An important addition to the government of the city was made by Jehoshaphat in the establishment of courts for the decision of causes both ecclesiastical and civil (2 Chr. xix. 8-11).

Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram was a prince of a different temper. He began his reign (cir. 887) by a massacre of his brethren, and of the chief men of the kingdom. Instigated, no doubt, by his wife

* According to Josephus he also carried off the arm which David had taken from the king of Zobah; but these were afterwards in the Temple, and did service at the proclamation of King Jehosh. [Ant. xiv. 102.]

* The Horse Gate is mentioned again in connection with Eloth by Jeremiah (xxxvi. 40). Possibly the name was perpetuated in the gate Susam (Nasa = horse) of the second Temple, the only gate on the east side of the outer wall (Lightfoot, Prop. of Temple, iii.).

From the expression in xiv. 25, "sons of Je-

Jerusalem, he re-introduced the profligate licentious worship of Ashtaroth and the high places (2 Chr. xx. 11), and built a temple for Baal (2 Chr. xxii. 1). Though Jehoram, Ant. ix. 7, § 4), was a man of great vigor and courage, he was overcome by an invasion of one of those huge hordes which were now almost periodical. The Philistines and Arameans attacked Jerusalem, broke into the palace, spoilt all its treasures, sucked the royal harem, killed or carried off the king's wives, and all his sons but one. This was the fourth siege. Two years after it the king died, universally detested, and his kingdom was divided. His son Jehoram was denied a resting-place in the sepulchres of the kings, but was buried without ceremony in a private tomb on Zion (2 Chr. xxi. 20).

The next events in Jerusalem were the massacre of the royal children by Joram's widow Athaliah, and the six years' reign of that queen. During her sway the worship of Baal was prevalent and that of Jehovah proportionately depressed. The Temple was only ordered to go without repair, but was even mutilated by the sons of Athaliah, and its treasures removed to the temple of Baal (2 Chr. xxiv. 7). But with the increasing years of Josiah, the spirit of the adherents of Jehovah returned, and the confederacy of Jehohada the priest with the chief men of Judah resulted in the restoration of the true line. The king was crowned and proclaimed in the Temple. Athaliah herself was hurried out to execution from the sacred precincts into the valley of the Kidron (Joseph. Ant. ix. 7, § 3), between the Temple and Olivet, through the Horse Gate.6 The temple of Baal was demolished, its altars and images destroyed, his priests put to death, and the religion of Jehovah was once more the national religion. But the restoration of the Temple advanced but slowly, and it was not till three-and-twenty years had elapsed, that through the personal interference of the king the ravages of the Baal worshippingers were repaired (2 K. xii. 6-16), and the necessary vessels and utensils furnished for the service of the Temple (2 Chr. xxiv. 14. But see 2 K. xiii. 13; Joseph. Ant. iv. 8, § 2). But this zeal for Jehovah soon expired. The solemn ceremonial of the burial of the good priest in the royal sepulchres, in which the kings, can hardly have been forgotten before a general relapse into idolatry took place, and his son Zechariah was stoned with his family in the very court of the Temple for protesting.

The retribution invoked by the dying martyr quickly followed. Before the end of the year (cir. 838), Hazael king of Syria, after possessing himself of Gath, marched against the much richer prize of Jerusalem. The visit was averted by a timely offer of treasure from the Temple and the royal palace (2 K. xii. 18; 2 Chr. xxiv. 23, Joseph. Ant. ix. 4, § 4), but not before an action had been fought, in which a large army of the Israelites was routed by a very inferior force of Syro-

hobah, 4 we are perhaps warranted in believing that Zechariah's brethren or his sons were put to death with him. The LXX. and Vulg. have the word in the singular number "son;" but, on the other hand, the Syr. and Arabic, and the Targum all agree with the Hebrew, and this is specially mentioned in Jerome's Qust. Hebr. It is perhaps supported by the special notice taken of the exception made by Amaziah in the case of the murderers of his father (2 K. xiv. 6; 2 Chr. xxiv. 4). The case of Naboth is a parallel [See Ramb. p. 796, note f].
a This is an addition by Josephus (ix. 9, § 9). If it really happened, the chariot must have been sent round to the other side of the valley of Hinnom and back again where there would be the direct road from Ain-Saams. Since the time of Solomon, chariots would seem to have become unknown in Jerusalem. At any rate we should infer, from the notice in 2 K. xiv. 20, that the royal establishment could not at that time boast of one.

b This story of his leprosy at any rate shows his zeal for Jerusalem.

c 2 Chr. xxvi. 9. The word rendered "the valley" has always employed for the valley on the west stones and arrows against besiegers. Later in this reign happened the great earthquake, which, although unmentioned in the historical books of the Bible, is described by Josephus (ix. 10, § 4), and alluded to by the Prophets as a kind of era (see Stanley, S. j. P., pp. 184, 125). A serious breach was made in the Temple itself, and below the city a large fragment was detached from the hill at En-roged, and, rolling down the slope, overwhelmed the king's gardens at the junction of the valleys of Hinnom and Kidron, and rested against the bottom of the slope of Olivet. After the death of Uzziah, he left the sacred precincts, in which the palace would therefore seem to have been situated, and resided in the hospital or lazare-house till his death. He was buried at Zion, with the kings (2 K. xv. 7); not in the sepulchre itself, but in a garden or field attached to the spot.

Jotham (cir. 756) inherited his father's sagacity, as well as his tastes for architecture and warfare. His works in Jerusalem were building the upper gateway to the Temple—apparently a gate communicating with the palace (2 Chr. xxiii. 20)—and also porticoes leading to the same (Ant. ix. 11, § 2). He also built much on Ophel,—probably on the south of Moriah (2 K. xv. 35; 2 Chr. xxiv. 3) —repaired the walls wherever they were dilapidated, and strengthened them by very large and strong towers (Joseph.). Before the death of Jotham (cir. 749) the clouds of the Syrian invasion began to gather. They broke on the head of Ahaz his successor; Rezin king of Syria and Pekah king of Israel joined their armies and invested Jerusalem (2 K. xvi. 5). The fortifications of the two previous kings enabled the city to hold out during a siege of great length (? in Π αλατίν Χρυσός, Joseph.). During its progress Rezin made an expedition against the distant town of Elath on the Red Sea, from which he expelled the Jews, and landed it over to the Edomites (2 K. xvi. 6; Ant. ix. 12, § 1). [AHAZ.]. Finding on his return that the place still held out, Rezin ravaged Judaea and returned to Damascus with a multitude of captives, leaving Pekah to continue the blockade.

Ahaz, thinking himself a match for the Israelite army, marched out and came forth. A tremendous conflict ensued, in which the three chiefs of the government next to the king, and a hundred and twenty thousand of the able warriors of the army of Judah, are stated to have been killed, and Pekah returned to Samaria with a crowd of captives, and a great quantity of spoil collected from the Benjaminite towns north of Jerusalem (Joseph.). Ahaz himself escaped, and there is no mention, in any of the records of the city, of the city having been plundered. The captives and the spoil were however sent back by the people of Samaria—a fact which, as it has no bearing on the history of the city, need here only be referred to, because from the narrative and south of the town, as נַעֲרָה is for that on the east.

d This will be the so-called Mount of Evil Counsel, or the hill below Moriah, according as En-roged is taken to be the "Well of Joram" or the "Fount of the Virgin."

e The interpretation given above is that of Kimchi, adopted by Genesis, Fürst and Bertheau: Keli (on 2 K. xx. 5) and Hengstenberg however, contend for a different meaning.
To learn that the nearest or most convenient route from Samaria to Jerusalem at that time was not, as now, along the plateau of the country, but by the depths of the Jordan Valley, and through Jericho (2 K. xvi. 5; 2 Chr. xxvii. 5-15; Joseph. Ant. ix. 12, § 2),

To oppose the confederacy which had so injured him, Ahaz had recourse to Assyria. He appears first to have sent an embassy to Tiglath-Pileser with presents of silver and gold taken from the treasures of the Temple and the palace (2 K. xvi. 8), which had been recruited during the last two reigns, and with a promise of more if the king would overrun Syria and Israel (Ant. ix. 12, § 3). This Tiglath-Pileser did. He marched to Damascus, took the city, and killed Rezin. While there, Ahaz visited him, probably to make his formal submission of vassalage, and gave him the further presents. To collect these he went so far as to lay hands on part of the permanent works of the Temple— the original constructions of Solomon, which none of his predecessors had been bold enough or needlessly to touch. He cut off the richly chased panels which ornamented the brass bases of the cisterns, dismounted the large tank or "sea" from the brazen halls, and supported it on a pedestal of stone, and removed the "cover for the sea," and the ornamental stand on which the kings were accustomed to sit in the Temple (2 K. xvi. 17, 18).

Whether the application to Assyria relieved Ahaz from one or both of his enemies, is not clear. From one passage it would seem that Tiglath-Pileser actually came to Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxviii. 20). At any rate the intercourse resulted in fresh insights, and fresh insults to the Temple. A new brazen altar was made after the profane fashion of one he had seen at Damascus, and was set up in the centre of the court of the Temple, to occupy the place and perform the functions of the original altar of Solomon, now removed to a less prominent position (see 2 K. xii. 16-15, with the expl. of Keil); the very sanctuary itself (2 K. xvi. 17, and 2 Chr. xxvi. 7) was polluted by idol-worship of some kind or other (2 Chr. xxviii. 3, 16). Horses dedicated to the sun were stabled at the entrance to the court, with their chariots (2 K. xxii. 11). Altars for sailing, and the moon, and stars were erected on the flat roofs of the Temple (2 Chr. xxiv. 12). Such consecrated vessels as remained in the house of Jehelah were taken there, and either transferred to the service of the idols (2 Chr. xxiv. 19), or cut up and re-manufactured; the lamps of the sanctuary were extinguished (xxix. 7), and for the first time the doors of the Temple were closed to the worshippers (xxviii. 24), and their offerings seized for the idols (Joseph. Ant. ix. 12, § 3). The famous sun-dial was erected at this time, probably in the Temple. When Ahaz at last died, it is not wonderful that a meager fate was awarded him that of even the leprous Uzziah. He was excluded not only from the royal sepulchres, but from the precincts of Zion, and was buried "in the city—in Jerusalem." For the very first act of Hezekiah (Isa. 7. 24) was to restore what his father had desecrated (2 Chr. xxix. 3; and see 36, "suddenly"). The Levites were collected and inspired; the Temple freed from its impurities both actual and ceremonial; the accumulated abominations being flushed and charged into the valley of the Kidron. The ill-fated service of the Temple was reorganized, with the instruments and the hymns ordained by David and Asaph; and after a solemn sin-offering for the late transgressions had been offered in the presence of the king and princes, the public were allowed to testify their acquiescence in the change by bringing their own thank-offerings (2 Chr. xxix. 1-26). This was done on the 17th of the first month of his reign. The regular time for celebrating the Passover was therefore gone by. But there was a law (Num. ix. 10, 11) which allowed the feast to be postponed for a month on special occasions, and of this law Hezekiah took advantage, in his anxiety to obtain from the whole of his people a national testimony to their allegiance to Jehovah and his laws (2 Chr. xxx. 2, 3). Accordingly at the special invitation of the king a vast multitude, not only from his own dominions, but from the northern kingdom, even from the remote Asher and Zebulun, assembled at the capital. Their first act was to uproot and efface all traces of the idolatry of the preceding and former reigns. High-places, altars, the mysterious and obscene symbols of Baal and Asherah, the votive-bronze serpents of Moses itself, were torn down, broken to pieces, and the fragments cast into the valley of the Kidron (2 Chr. xxx. 14: 2 K. xviii. 4). This done, the feast was kept for two weeks, and the vast concourse dispersed. The permanent service of the Temple was next thoroughly organized, the subsistence of the officiating ministers arranged, and provision made for storing the supplies (2 Chr. xxix. 2-21). It was probably at this time that the dedications of the Temple were renewed, and the gold or other precious plating, which had been removed by former kings, reapplied to the doors and pillars (2 K. xiii. 16).

And now approached the greatest crisis which had yet occurred in the history of the city: the dreaded Assyrian army was to appear under its walls. Hezekiah had in some way intimated that he did not intend to continue as a dependent— and the great king was now (in the 14th year of Hezekiah, cir. 711 B.C.) on his way to chastise him. The Assyrian army had been for some time in Phoenicia and on the sea-coast of Philistia (Rawlinson, Herod. i. 476), and Hezekiah had therefore had warning of his approach. The delay was taken advantage of to prepare for the siege. As before,
They gathered also in the gate of Gibon (2 Chr. xxiii. 30), A. V. most incorrectly "water-course"). It was led down by a subterraneous channel "through the hard rock" (2 Chr. xxxii. 30; Ezck. xlviii. 17), to the west side of the city of David (2 Chr. xx. 29), that is, into the valley which separated the Mount Moriah and Zion from the Upper City, and where traces of its presence appear to this day (Barclay, 310, 358).

This done, he carefully repaired the walls of the city, furnished them with additional towers, and built a second wall (2 Chr. xxxii. 5; Is. xxii. 10). The water of the reservoir, called the "low pool," or the "old pool," was diverted to a new tank in the city between the two walls (Is. xxi. 11). Nor was this all: as the struggle would certainly be one for life and death, he strengthened the fortifications of the city (2 Chr. xxxii. 5, "Milo," Is. xxii. 9), and prepared abundance of ammunition. He also organized the people, and offered them, gathered them together in the open place at the gate, and inspired them with confidence in Jehovah (xxxii. 6).

The details of the Assyrian invasion or invasions will be found under the separate heads of Sennacherib and Hezekiah. It is possible that Jerusalem was once regularly invested by the Assyrian army. It is certain that the army encamped there on another occasion, that the generals—the Tartan, the chief Cup-bearer, and the chief Eunuch—held a conversation with Hezekiah's chief officers outside the walls, most probably at or about the present Kaar Judah at the N W. corner of the city, while the wall above was crowded with the anxious inhabitants. At the time of Titus's siege the name of "the Assyrian Camp" was still attached to a spot north of the city, in remembrance either of this or the subsequent visit of Seleucus Nicator (Joseph. B. J. v. 12, § 2). But though taken—though the citadel was still the "virgin daughter of Zion"—yet Jerusalem did not escape unharmed. Hezekiah's treasures had to be emptied, and the costly ornaments he had added to the Temple were stripped off to make up the tribute. This, however, he recovered by the time of the subsequent visit of the ambassadors from Babylon, as we see from the account in 2 Chr. xx. 12; and 2 Chr. xxxii. 27-29.

The death of this good and great king was indeed a national calamity, and so it was considered. He was buried in one of the chief of the royal sepulchres, and a vast concourse from the country, as well as of the citizens of Jerusalem, assembled to join in the waiting at the funeral (2 Chr. xxxii. 33).

The reign of Manasseh (b. c. 696) must have been an eventful one in the annals of Jerusalem though only meagre indications of its events are to be found in the documents. He began by plunging into all the idolatries of his forefathers. He destroyed, and desecrated the Temple and the city with even more offensive idolatries than those of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxxii. 2-4; 2 K. xxi. 2-9). In this career of wickedness he was stopped by an invasion of the Assyrian army, by whom he was taken prisoner and carried to Babylon, where he remained for some time. The rest of his long reign was occupied in attempting to remedy his former misdeeds, and in the repair and conservation of the city (Joseph. Ant. x. 3, § 2).

He built a fresh wall to the citadel, "from the west side of Gibon-in-the-valley to the Fish Gate," i. e. apparently along the east side of the central valley, which parts the upper and lower cities from S. to N. He also continued the works which had been begun by Jotham at Ophel, and raised that fortress or structure to a great height. On his death he was buried in a private tomb in the garden attached to his palace, called also the garden of Uzza (2 K. xxi. 18; 2 Chr. xxxii. 29). Here also was interred his son Amon after his violent death, following an uneventful but idolatrous reign of two years (2 Chr. xxxiii. 21-23; 2 K. xxi. 19-25).

The reign of Josiah (b. c. 639) was marked by a more strenuous zeal for Jehovah than even that of Hezekiah had been. He began his reign at eight years of age, and by his sixtieth year (12th of his reign—2 Chr. xxxiv. 3) commenced a thorough removal of the idolatrous abuses of Manasseh and Amon, and even some of Ahaz, which must have escaped the purgations of Hezekiah (2 K. xili. 12).

As on former occasions, these abominations were broken up small and carried down to the bed of the Kidron—which seems to have served almost the purpose of a common sewer, and there calcined and dispersed. The cemetery, which still paves the sides of that valley, had already begun to exist, and the fragments of the broken altars and statues were scattered on the graves that they might be effectually defiled, and thus prevented from further use. On the opposite side of the valley, somewhere on the Mount of Olives, were the ejections which Solomon had put up for the deities of his foreign wives. Not one of these was spared; they were all annihilated, and dead bones scattered over the places where they had stood. These things occupied six years, at the expiration of which, in the first month of the 18th year of his reign (2 Chr. xxxv. 1; 2 K. xxii. 23), a solemn passover was held, emphatically recorded to have been the greatest since the time of Samuel (2 Chr. xxxiv. 18). This seems to have been the crowning ceremony of the

a The authority for this is the use here of the word Nachal, which is uniformly applied to the valley east of the city, as Ge is to that west and south. There are two remaining fragments of the concluding section of this article. Similar measures were taken by the Moslems on the approach of the Crusaders (Will. of Tyre, viii. 7, quoted by Robinson, i. 546 note).

b The reservoir between the Jaffa Gate and the Church of the Sepulchre, now usually called the Pool of Hezekiah, cannot be either of the works alluded to above. If an ancient construction, it is probably the Almond Pool of Josephus. (For the reasons, see Wilhams, Holy City, 35-38, 488.)

c The narrative in Kings appears to place the destruction of the images after the king's solemn covenant in the Temple, i. e. after the completion of the repairs. But, on the other hand, there are the dates given in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 1, 19, which fix the Passover to the 14th of the 1st month of his 15th year, too early in the year for the repair which was begun in the same year that it had preceded it.
pursification of the Temple; and it was at once fol-
lowed by a thorough renovation of the fabric (2 Chr.
xxiv. 8; 2 K. xxii. 3). The cost was met by offerings
collected at the doors (2 K. xiii. 4), and also all
through the country (Joseph. Ant. x. 4, § 1), not
only of Judah and Benjamin, but also of Ephraim
and the other northern tribes (2 Chr. xxvii. 8). It
was during these repairs that the Holy City was
opened to worship once more, and shortly after all
the people were convened to Jerusalem to hear it
read, and to renew the national covenant with Je-
hovah.\(^a\)
The mention of Huldah the prophetess
(2 Chr. xxiv. 22; 2 K. xii. 14) introduces us to
the lower city under the name of "the Mishneh"
(מִשְנֶה; A. V. "college," "school," or "second
part")\(^b\). The name also survives in the book
of Zephaniah, a prophet of this reign (i. 10), who
seems to recognize "the Fish Gate," and "the lower
city," and "the hills," as the three main divisions
of the city.
Josiah's death took place at a distance from
Jerusalem; but he was brought there for his burial,
and was placed in "his own sepulchre" (2 K. xxiii.
30), or "in the sepulchre of his fathers" (2 Chr.
xxiv. 21) probably already prepared by Manasseh
and Amos. (See I Esdr. i. 31.)
Josiah's rash opposition to Pharaoh-Necho cost
him his life, his son his throne, and Jerusalem
much suffering. Before Jehoachaz (n. c. 608) had
been reigning three months, the Egyptian king
found opportunity to send to Jerusalem, from Riblah
where he was then encamped, a force sufficient
to depose and take him prisoner, to put his
brother Eliakim on the throne, and to erect a heavy
liine from the city and country, which was paid in
advance by the new king, and afterwards extorted
by taxation (2 K. xxiii. 33, 35).
The fall of the city was now rapidly approaching.
During the reign of Jehoiakim — such was the new
name which at Necho's order Eliakim had assumed
— Jerusalem was visited by Nebuchadnezzar, with
the Babylonian army lately victorious over the
Egyptians at Carchemish. The visit was possibly
repeated once, or even twice.\(^c\) A siege there must
have been; but of this we have no account. We
may infer how severe was the pressure on the sur-
rounding country, from the fact that the very
Bedouins were driven within the walls by "the
fear of the Chaldeans and of the Syrians" (Jer.
xxv. 11). We may also infer that the Temple
was entered, since Nebuchadnezzar carried off all
of the vessels therefrom for his temple at Babylon
(2 Chr. xxvii. 7), and that Jehoiakim was treated
with great indignity (ibid. 6). In the latter part
of this reign we discern the city harrassed and
pillage by marauding bands from the east of Jor-
daan (2 K. xxiv. 2).
Jehoiakim was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin
(n. c. 597). Hardly had his short reign begun,
before the terrible army of Babylon reappeared
before the city, again commanded by Nebuchad-
nezzar (2 K. xxiv. 10, 11). Jehoiachin's disposi-
tion appears that he might have shrunk from inflict-
ing the punishment on the city the horrors of a
third invasion. (Jer. vii. 2, § 1), and be therefore surrendered in the third month of his reign. The treasures of
the palace and Temple were pillaged, certain golden
articles of Solomon's original establishment, which
had escaped the plunder and descensions of the
previous reigns, were cut up (2 K. xxiv. 13), and
the more desirable objects out of the Temple car-
ried off (Jer. xxvi. 19). The first deportation that
we hear of from the city now took place.
The king, his wives, and the queen mother, with their
numerous and whole establishment, the princes, 7,000
warriors, and 1,000 artificers — in all 10,000 souls,
were carried off to Babylon (ibid. 14-16). The
uncle of Jehoiachin was made king in his stead,
by the name of Zedekiah, under a solemn oath
(\"by God\") of allegiance (2 Chr. xxxviii. 13; Ez.
xxiv. 13, 14, 18). Had he been content to remain
quiet under the rule of Babylon, the city might
have stood many years longer; but he was not.
He appears to have been tempted with the chance
of relief afforded by the accession of Pharaoh
Hophra, and to have applied to him for assistance
(Ez. xxvii. 15). Upon this Nebuchadnezzar
marched in person to Jerusalem, arriving in the
ninth year of Zedekiah, on the 10th day of the
10th month (n. c. 588), and at once began a
regular siege, at the same time wasting the country
far and near (Jer. xxxvi. 7). The siege was con-
ducted by erecting forts on lofty mounds round the
city, from which, on the usual Assyrian plan, moun-
tains were discharged into the town, and the walls
and houses in them battered by rains (Jer. xxxi.
24, xxxii. 4, 6; 4 Ez. xxii. 3; Joseph. Ant. x
8, § 1). The city was also surrounded with troops
(1 Jer. ii. 7). The siege was once abandoned, owing
to the approach of the Egyptian army (Jer. xxxvii.
5, 11), and during the interval the gates of the city
were reopened (ibid. 13). But the relief was only
temporary and, in the 11th of Zedekiah (n. c. 586),
on the 9th day of the 4th month (Jer. i. 6), being
just a year and a half from the first investment,
the city was taken. Nebuchadnezzar had in the
meantime retired from Jerusalem to Riblah to
watch the more important siege of Tyre, then in
the last year of its progress. Thebesieged seem
to have suffered severely both from hunger and dis-
case (Jer. xxxiv. 24), but chiefly from the former

---

\(^a\) This narrative has some interesting correspond-
ences with that of Josiah's coronation (2 K. xi.).
Amongst these is the singular expression, the king
stood "on the pillar." In the present case Josephus
understands this as an official spot — הַמָּסָבָה. See
Keil on 2 K. xxii. 14. (In regard to this render-
ing of the A. V., see addition to College, Amer.
rel. 14.)

\(^b\) This event would surely be more emphatically
related in the Bible, if Jerusalem were the Cadities
which Necho is recorded by Herodotus to have
destroyed after the battle at Megido. The Bible records
pass over in total silence, or notice only in a casual
way, events which are close to the threshold of the
territory, when those events do not affect the families
Mehennorae; Instance the 22-years' siege of Ashdod by

---

\(^c\) According to Josephus (Ant. x. 7, § 4), this date
was the commencement of the final portion of the
siege. But there is nothing in the Bible records to
support this.
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3 K. xxi. 3: Jer. ii. 6; Lam. v. 10). But they would perhaps have held on songer had not a breach in the wall been effected on the day named. It was at midnight (Joseph.). The whole city was wrapt in the pitchy darkness characteristic of an eastern town, and nothing was known by the Jews of what had happened till the generals of the army entered the city. (Joseph. and others.) and they took their seats in the middle court (Jer. xxxvi. 3; Joseph. Ant. x. 8, § 2). Then the alarm was given to Zedekiah, and, collecting his remaining warriors, they stole out of the city by a gate at the south side, somewhere near the present Beth el-Mughardibeh, crossed the Kedron above the royal gardens, and made their way over the Mount of Olives to the Jordan Valley. At break of day information of the flight was brought to the Chaldeans by some deserters. A rapid pursuit was made: Zedekiah was overtaken near Jericho, his people were dispersed, and he himself captured and reserved for a miserable fate at Riblah. Meantime the wretched inhabitants suffered all the horrors of assault and sack: the men were slaughtered, old and young, prince and peasant; the women violated in Mount Zion itself (Lam. ii. 4, v. 11, 12).

On the seventh day of the following month (2 K. xxv. 8), Nebuzaradan, the commander of the king's body-guard, who seems to have been changed with Nebuchadnezzar's instructions as to what should be done with the city, arrived. Two days were passed, probably in collecting the captives and booty; and on the tenth (Jer. iii. 12) the Temple, the royal palace, and all the more important buildings of the city, were set on fire, and the walls thrown down and left as heaps of disordered rubbish on the ground (Neh. iv. 2). The spoil of the city consisted apparently of little more than the furniture of the Temple. A few small vessels in gold and silver, and some other things in brass were carried away whole—the former under the special eye of Nebuzaradan himself (2 K. xxv. 15; comp. Jer. xxvii. 10). But the larger objects, Solomon's huge brazen basin or sea with its twelve bulls, the ten bases, the two magnificent pillars—Jachin and Boaz, too heavy and too cumbersome for transport, were broken up. The pillars were almost the only parts of Solomon's original construction which had not been mutilated by the sacrilegious hands of some idol-worshipping monarch or other, and there is quite a touch of pathos in the way in which the chronicler fingers over his recollections of their height, their size, and their ornaments—capitals, wreathen work, and pomegranates, all of brass.

The previous depredations, and the sufferings endured in the siege, must to a great extent have drained the place of its able-bodied people, and thus the captives, on this occasion, were but few and unimportant. The high-priest, and four other officers of the Temple, the commanders of the fighting men, five of the court, the master officer of the army, and sixty select private persons, were reserved to be submitted to the king at Riblah. The daughters of Zedekiah, with their children and establishment (Jer. xii. 10, 16; comp. Ant. x. 9, § 4), and Jeremiah the prophet (ibid. xl. 5), were placed by Nebuzaradan at Mizpeh under the charge of Gedaliah ben-Ahikam, who had been appointed as a steward of the few poor laboring people left to carry on the necessary husbandry and vine-dressing. In addition to these were some small bodies of men in armed, who had perhaps escaped from the city before the blockade, or in the interval of the siege, and who were hoarding on the outskirts of the country watchting what might turn up (Jer. xii. 7, 8). (Ishmael, 6.) The remainder of the population—numbering, with the 72 above named, 8,422 souls (Jer. lii. 29)—were marched off to Babylon. About two months after this Gedaliah was murdered by Ishmael, and then few people of consideration left with Jereniah went into Egypt. Thus the land was practically deserted of all but the very poorest class. Even these were not allowed to remain in quiet. Five years afterwards—the 291 of Nebuchadnezzar's reign—the insatiable Nebuzaradan, on his way to Egypt (Joseph. Ant. x. 9, § 7), again visited the ruins, and swept off 745 more of the wretched peasants (Jer. lii. 30).

Thus Jerusalem at last had fallen, and the Temple, set up under such fair auspices, was a heap of chokeden ruins. The spot, however, was none the less sacred because the edifice was destroyed, and it was still the resort of devotes, sometimes from great distances, who brought their offerings—in strange heathenish guise indeed, but still with a true feeling—to weep and wail over the holy place (Jer. xlii. 5). It was still the centre of hope to the people in captivity, and the time soon arrived for their return to it. The decree of Cyrus authorizing the rebuilding of the "house of Jehovah, God of Israel, which is in Jerusalem," was issued n. c. 530. In consequence thereof a very large caravan of Jews arrived in the country. The expedition comprised all classes—the royal family included—Levites, inferior ministers, lay people belonging to various towns and families—and numbered 42,360 in all. They were well provided with treasure for the necessary onthly: and—a more precious burden still—they bore the vessels of the old Temple which had been preserved at Babylon, and were now destined again to find a home at Jerusalem (Ezr. v. 14, vi. 5).

A short time was occupied in settling in their former cities, but on the first day of the 7th month (Ezr. ii. 6) a general assembly was called together at Jerusalem in the "open place of the first gate towards the east" (I Esdr. v. 47); the altar was set up, and the daily morning and evening sacrificial offerings were made according to the old method. (Jan. 5), the day of the investment of the city by Nebuchadnezzar; the 10th Ab (July 29), destruction of the Temple by Nebuzaradan, and subsequently by the Romans; the 11th Ab (Sept. 19), murder of Gedaliah; the 9th Tebeth, when Ezekiel and the other captives at Babylon received the news of the destruction of the Temple. The entrance of the Chaldees into the city is commemorated on the 17th Tammuz (July 8), the day of the breach of the Antonia by Titus. The modern dates here given are the days on which the fasts are kept in the present year, 1890. (Josephus says 43,492.)
been commenced. Other festivals were re-instituted, and we have a record of the celebration of at least one anniversary of the day of the first assembly at Jerusalem (Neh. viii. 1, &c.). Arrangements were made for stone and timber for the fabric, and in the 2d year after their return (v. c. 534), on the 1st day of the 2d month (1 Esdr. v. 57), the foundation of the Temple was laid amidst the songs and music of the priests and Levites (according to the old rites of David), the tears of the old men and the shouts of the young. But the work was destined to suffer material interruptions. The chiefs of the people by whom Samaria had been colonized, finding that the Jews refused their offers of assistance (Ezr. iv. 2), annexed and hindered them in every possible way; and by this and some natural drawbacks—such as violent storms of wind by which some of the work had been blown down (Hag. i. 9), drought, and consequent failure of crops, and mortality amongst both animals and men—the work was protracted through the rest of the reign of Cyrus, and that of Alexander, till the accession of Artaxerxes (Darius) I. to the throne of Persia (2 Esdr. vi. 24). The Samaritans then sent to the court at Babylon a formal memorial (a measure already tried without success in the preceding reign), representing that the inevitable consequence of the restoration of the city would be its revolt from the empire. This produced its effect, and the building entirely ceased for a time. In the mean time houses of some pretension began to spring up—cathed houses (Hag. i. 4), and the embankments of the builders of the Temple cooled (ibid. 9). But after two years the delay became intolerable to the leaders, and the work was recommenced at all hazards, amidst the encouragements and rebukes of the two prophets, Zechariah and Haggai, on the 24th day of the 6th month of Darius' 2d year. Another attempt at interruption was made by the Persian governor of the district west of the Emphrates (Ezr. v. 3), but the result was only a confirmation by Darius of the privileges granted by his predecessor (vi. 6-13), and an order to render all possible assistance. The work now went on apace, and the Temple was finished and dedicated in the 6th year of Darius (n. c. 516), on the 3d (or 2d, 1 Esdr. vii. 5) of Adar—but the last month, and on the 14th day of the new year the first Passover was celebrated by the people. The new Temple was 90 feet less in altitude than that of Solomon (Joseph. Ant. xv. 11, § 1); but its dimensions and form—of which there are only scanty notices—will be best considered elsewhere. [TEMPLE.] All this time the walls of the city remained as the Assyrians had left them (Neh. ii. 12, &c.). A period of 58 years now passed of which no accounts are preserved to us; but at the end of that time, in the year 437, Ezra arrived from Babylon with a caravan of Priests, Levites, Nethinims, and lay people, among the latter some members of the royal family, in all 1,777 persons (Ezr. vii., and with variable offerings from the Persian king and his court, as well as from the Jews who still remained in Babylonia (ibid. vii. 14, viii. 25). He left Babylon on the 1st day of the year and reached Jerusalem on the 1st of the 5th month (Ezr. vii. 9, viii. 32).

Ezra at once set himself to correct some irregularities into which the community had fallen. The chief of them was the practice of marrying the native women of the old Canaanitish nations. The people were assembled at three days' notice, and harkened by Ezra—so urgent was the case—in the midst of a pouring rain, and in very cold weather, in the open space in front of the main entrance to the Temple (Exra. x. 9, 1 Esdr. ix. 6). His exhortations were at once acceded to, a form of treasurers-offering was arranged, and no less than 17 priests, 10 Levites, and 86 laymen, renounced their foreign wives, and gave up an intercourse which had been to their fathers the cause and the accompaniment of almost all their misfortunes. The matter took three months to carry out, and was completed on the 1st day of the new year: but the practice was not wholly eradicated (Neh. xiii. 24), though it never was pursued as before the Captivity.

We now pass another period of eleven years until the arrival of Nehemiah, about n. c. 445. He had been moved to come to Jerusalem by the accounts given him of the wretchedness of the community, and of the state of ruin in which the walls of the city continued (Neh. i. 3). Arrived there he kept his intentions quiet for three days, but on the night of the third he went out by himself, and, as far as the ruins would allow, made the circuit of the place (xii. 11-16). On the following day he collected the chief people, and proposed the immediate rebuilding of the walls. One spirit seized them. Priests, rulers, Levites, private persons, citizens of distant towns, as well as those dwelling on the 21st, put their hand vigorously to the work. And notwithstanding the taunts and threats of Sanballat, the ruler of the Samaritans, and Tobiah the Ammonite, in consequence of which one half of the community remained while the other half built, the work was completed in 52 days, on the 25th of Elul. The wall thus rebuilt was that of the city of Jerusalem as well as the city of Lavi or Zion, as will be shown in the next section, where the account of the rebuilding is examined in detail (Section II. p. 1322). At this time the city must have presented a forlorn appearance; but few houses were built, and large spaces remained unoccupied, or occupied but with the ruins of the Assyrian destructions (Neh. vii. 4). In this respect it was not unlike much of the modern city. The solemn dedication of the wall, recorded in Neh. xii. 27-43, probably took place at a later period, when the works had been completely finished.

Whether Ezra was here at this time is uncer-
In the government of Nehemiah, especially on one interesting occasion — the anniversary, it would appear, of the first return of Zerubbabel's caravan — on the 1st of the 7th month (Neh. viii. 1). He there appears as the venerable and venerable instigator of the people in the forgotten law of Moses, amongst other reforms reestablishing the first of Tabernacles, which we incidentally learn had not been celebrated since the time that the Israelites originally entered on the land (viii. 17).

Nehemiah remained in the city for twelve years (v. 14, xiii. 6), during which time he held the office and maintained the state of governor of the province (v. 14) from his own private resources (v. 15). He was indefatigable in his regulation and maintenance of the order and dignity both of the city (vii. 3, x. 1, xiii. 13, &c.) and Temple (x. 32, 39, xii. 44); abolished the excessive rates of usury by which the richer citizens had grievously oppressed the poor (v. 6-12); kept up the genealogical registers, at once so characteristic of, and important to, the Jewish nation (vii. 5, xii. 27); and in various other ways showed himself an able and active governor, possessing power and influence over his fellow-citizens. At the end of this time he returned to Babylon; but it does not appear that his absence was more than a short one, and he was soon again at his post, as vigilant and energetic as ever (xiii. 7). Of his death we have no record.

The foreign tendencies of the high-priest Eliashib and his family had already given Nehemiah some concern (vii. 4, 28), and when the cheats exercised by his vigilance and good sense were removed, they quickly led to serious disorders, unfortunately the only occurrences which have come down to us during the next epoch. Eliashib's son Joiaid, who succeeded him in the high-priesthood (apparently a few years before the death of Nehemiah), had two sons, the one Jonathan (Neh. xii. 11) or Johanan (Neh. xii. 22; Joseph. Ant. xi. 7, § 1), the other Joshua (Joseph. ibid.). Joshua had made interest with the general of the Persian army that he should displace his brother in the priesthood: the two quarrelled, and Joshua was killed by Johanan in the Temple (n. c. ciii. 306): a horrible occurrence, and even aggravated by its consequences; for the Persian general made it the excuse not only to pollute the sanctuary (mājib) by entering it, on the ground that he was certainly less nucleus than the body of the murdered man — but also to extort a tribute of 50 daries on every lamb offered in the daily sacrifice for the next seven years (Joseph. Ant. i. 103d.);

Johanan in his turn had two sons, Jaddua (Neh. xii. 11, 22) and Manasseh (Joseph. Ant. xi. 7, § 2). Manasseh married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, and eventually became the first priest of the Samaritan temple on Gerizim (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, §§ 2, 4). But at first he seems to have been associated in the priesthood of Jerusalem with his brother (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, §§ 2, 4), and have relinquished it only on being forced to do so on account of his connection with Sanballat.

The foreign marriages against which Ezra and Nehemiah had acted so energetically had again become common among both the priests and kymen. A movement was made by a returning party against the practice; but either it had obtained a firmer hold than before, or there was nothing to replace the personal influence of Nehemiah, for the movement only resulted in a large number going over with Manasseh to the Samaritans (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, §§ 2, 4). During the high-priesthood of Judas occurred the famous visit of Alexander the Great to Jerusalem. Alexander had invaded the north of Syria, beaten Darius's army at the Granicus, and again at Issus, and then, having besieged Tyre, sent a letter to Judas inviting his allegiance, and desiring assistance in men and provisions. The answer of the high-priest was, that to Darius his allegiance had been given, and that to Darius he should remain faithful while he lived. Tyre was taken by the Persians (Krouk's "Histoire," 401), and then the Macedonians compelled Josias of Egypt, the last king of that strip of the coast of Palestine to Gaza, which in its turn was taken in October. The road to Egypt being thus secured, Alexander had leisure to visit Jerusalem, and deal in person with the people who had ventured to oppose him. This he did apparently by the same route which Isaiah (xviii. 32-33) describes Semnecherib as taking. The "Saphon," at which he was met by the high-priest must be Mount Mephil — Seopus — the high ridge to the north of the city, the Nob of Isaiah, which is crossed by the northern road, and from which the first view — and that a full one — of the city and Temple is procured. The result to the Jews of the visit was an exemption from tribute in the Sabbatical year; a privilege which they retained for long.

We hear nothing more of Jerusalem until it was taken by Ptolemy Soter, about b. c. 302, during his invasion into Syria. The account given by Josephus (Ant. xii. 1; Abyon, i. § 22), partly from Agatharchides, and partly from some other source, is extremely meagre, nor is it quite consistent with itself. But we can discern one point to which more than one parallel is found in the later history — that the city fell into the hands of Ptolemy because the Jews would not fight on the Sabbath. Great liberties were then to have been experienced by the Jews after this conquest, and a large number were transported to Egypt and to Northern Africa.

A stormy period succeeded — that of the struggles between Antigonus and Ptolemy for the possession of Syria, which lasted until the defeat of the former at Ipsus (b. c. 301), after which the country came into the possession of Ptolemy. The contention however was confined to the maritime region of

a The name occurs among those who assisted in the dedication of the wall (xii. 33); but xsn as to make us believe that it was some inferior person of the same name.

b Prideaux says five years; but his reasons are not satisfactory, and would apply to tea as well as to five.

c According to Neh. xiii. 28, the man who married Sanballat's daughter was "son of Josiah;" but this is an anachronistic expression to the circumstances stated of Josephus, if related in the text, and the word "son" is often used in Hebrew for "grandson," or even a more remote descendant (see, e. g. Cant. iii. 801).

d The details of this story, and the arguments for and against its authenticity, are given under Alexan-
der (i. 99; see also High-Priest ii. 1072). It should be observed that the text of the Targum is quite cut down, and the whole of the narrative appears as if more native to the authors of the book of Judges than to the pen. 
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Palestine, and Jerusalem appears to have escaped. Scanty as is the information we possess concerning the city, it yet indicates a state of prosperity; the only outward mark of dependence being an annual tax of twenty talents of silver payable by the highpriests. Simon the Just, who followed his father Onias in the high-priesthood (cir. n. c. 300), is one of the favorite heroes of the Jews. Under his care the sanctuary was repaired, and some foundations of great depth added round the Temple, possibly to gain a larger surface on the top of the hill (Ezckus. l. 1. 2). The large cistern or "sea" of the principal court of the Temple, which hitherto would seem to have been built temporarily or roughly constructed, was sheeted in brass (ibid. 3); the walls of the city were more strongly fortified to guard against such attacks as those of Ptolemy (ib. 4); and the Temple service was maintained with great pomp and ceremonial (ib. 11-21). His death was marked by evil omens of various kinds prefiguring disasters (Otho, Lex. Reb. "Messias"). Simon's brother Eleazar succeeded him as highpriest (n. c. 211), and Antigonos of Socho as president of the Sanhedrim (ib. Ptolaeus). The disasters predicted did not immediately arrive, at least in the century occupied; but intercourse with Greeks was fast eradicating the national character, but it was at any rate a peaceful intercourse during the reigns of the Ptolemies who succeeded Soter, namely, Philadelphia (n. c. 285), and Egergetes (n. c. 247). It was Philadelphia who, according to the story preserved by Josephus, had the translation of the Septuagint made, in connection with which he sent Aristaeus to Jerusalem during the priesthood of Eleazar. He also bestowed on the Temple very rich gifts, consisting of a table for the showbread, of wonderful workmanship, basins, bowls, phials, etc., and other articles both for the private and public use of the priests (Joseph. Ant. xii. 2. § 5 — 10, 15). A description of Jerusalem at this period under the name of Aristeas still survives, which supplies a lively picture of both Temple and city. The Temple was enclosed with three rows of arches, and a proportionate thickness. The spacious courts were paved with marble, and beneath them lay immense reservoirs of water, which by mechanical contrivance was made to rush forth, and thus wash away the blood of the sacrifices. The city occupied the summit and the eastern slope of the opposite hill — the modern Zion. The main streets appear to have run north and south; some of the lower ones having but parallel, following the course of the valley, with cross streets connecting them. They were "furnished with raised pavements," either due to the slope of the ground, or possibly adopted for the reason given by Aristaeus, namely, to enable the passengers to avoid contact with persons or things ceremonially unclean. The bazaars were then, as now, a prominent feature of the city. There were to be found gold, precious stones, and spices brought by caravans from the East, and other articles imported from the West by way of Joppa, Gaza, and Ptolemais, which served its purposes largely. This is evidenced by the fact that among these Phoenician importations from the West may have figured the dyes and the tie of the remote Britain.

Eleazar was succeeded (cir. n. c. 276) by his uncle Manasses, brother to Onias I.; and he again (cir. 250) by Onias II. Onias was a son of the great Simon the Just; but he inherited none of his father's virtues, and his ill-timed avarice at length endangered the prosperity of Jerusalem. For, the payment of the annual tax to the court of Egypt having been for several years evaded, Ptolemy Euergetes, about 226, sent a commissioner to Jerusalem to enforce the arrears (Joseph. Ant. xii. 4, § 1: Ptolemeis). Onias, now in his second childhood (Ant. xii. 4, § 3), was easily prevailed on by his nephew Joseph to allow him to return with him to Alexandria, to endeavor to arrange the matter with the king. Joseph, a man, evidently, of great ability, not only procured the remission of the tax in question, but also persuaded Ptolemy to grant him the lucrative privilege of furnishing the whole revenue of Judaea, Samaria, Coele-Syria, and Phoenicia — a privilege which he retained till the province was taken from the Ptolemies by Antiochus the Great. Hitherto the family of the high-priest had been the most powerful in the country; but Joseph had now founded one able to compete with it, and the contention and rivalry between the two — manifesting itself at one time in enormous bribes to the court, at another in fierce quarrels at home — at last led to the interference of the chief power with the affairs of a city, which, if wisely and quietly governed, might never have been molested.

Onias died about 217, and was succeeded by Simon II. In 221 Ptolemy Philopator had succeeded Euergetes on the throne of Egypt. He had only been king three years when Antiochus the Great attempted to take Syria from him. Antiochus partly succeeded, but in a battle at Raphia, south of Gaza, fought in the year 217 (the same as that of Hamilcar at Thrasymene), he was completely routed and forced to fly to Antioch. Ptolemy shortly after visited Jerusalem. He offered sacrifice in the court of the Temple, and would have entered the sanctuary, had he not been prevented; the first Jew we meet with bearing a Greek name.

"The legend of the translation by 72 interpreters is no compilation, but it probably rests on some foundation of fact. The sculpture of the table and bowls (chies and vines, without any figures) seems to have been founded on the descriptions in the Law. In 5 Mace. ii. 14, &c., it is said to have had also a map of Egypt and it.

"It is to be found in the Appendix to Havercamp's Josephus, and in Gellandi's Bibl. Vet. Patr. ii. 895. An extract is given in article "Jerusalem" (Dict. of Gror. ii. 25, 28).

"The accession of the stagmaty by which he made his fortune is told in Ptolemeis (anno 229), and in Milt man's Hist. of the Jews ii. 31).

"At least we hear nothing of it afterwards."
ranted by the firmness of the high-priest Simon, and also by a supernatural terror which struck him and stretched him paralyzed on the pavement of the court (3 Mac. ii. 22). a This repulse Ptolemy never forgave, and the Jews of Alexandria suffered severely in consequence.

Like the rest of Palestine, Jerusalem now became alternately a prey to each of the contending parties (Joseph. Ant. xii. 3, § 3). In 193 it was taken by Antiochus. In 199 it was retaken by Scopas the Alexandrian general, who left a garrison in the citadel. In the following year Antiochus again beat the Jews, and the money was for a time preserved from the plunderers of the city, gladdening the hearts of all in Egypt. The service of Antiochus required by large presents of money and articles for sacrifice, by an order to Ptolemy to furnish ephod and other materials for idolatries and other additions to the Temple, and by material relief from taxation. He also declared a decree framing the sacrifice of the dead of the Jewish nation with the intrusion of strangers, and forbidding any infrac-

A The third book of the Macabees, though so called, has no reference to the Macabean heroes, but is taken up with the relation of this visit of Ptolemy to Jerusalem, and its consequences to the Jews.
b This visit is omitted in 1 Mac. Josephus mentions it, but says that it was marked by a great

iv. 9, 12) for the first time we hear of an attempt to efface the distinguishing mark of a Jew—again to "become uncircumcised." The priests quickly followed the example of their chief (2 Mac. iv. 14), and the Temple service was neglected. A special deputation of the youth of Jerusalem—"anti-ochians"—they were now called—was sent with offers from the Temple of Jehovah to the festival of Hercules at Tyre. In 172 Jerusalem was visited by Antiochus. He entered the city at night by torch-light and amid the acclamations of Jason and his party, and after a short stay returned (b 2 Mac. iv. 22). b And now the treachery of Jason was to be requited to him. His brother Onias, who had assumed the Greek name of Menelaus, in his turn bought the high-priesthood from Antiochus, and drove Jason out to the other side of the Jordan (2 Mac. iv. 26). To pay the price of the office, Menelaus had laid hands on the consecrated plate of the Temple. This became known, and a riot was the consequence (2 Mac. iv. 32, 30, 39, 40).

During the absence of Antiochus in Egypt, Jason suddenly appeared before Jerusalem with a thousand men, and whether by the fury of his attack, or from his having friends in the city, he entered the walls, drove Menelaus into the citadel, and slaughtered the citizens without mercy. Jason seems to have failed to obtain any of the valuables of the Temple, and shortly after retreated beyond Jordan, where he miserably perished (2 Mac. v. 7-10). But the news of these tumults reaching Antiochus on his way from Egypt brought him again to Jerusalem (n. c. 170). He appears to have entered the city without much difficulty. c An indiscriminate massacre of the adherents of Ptolemy followed, and then a general pillage of the contents of the Temple. Under the guidance of Menelaus, Antiochus went into the sanctuary, and took from there the golden altar, the candlestick, the magnificent table of shewbread, and all the vessels and utensils, with 1,800 talents out of the treasury. These things occupied three days. He then quitted for Antioch, carrying off, besides his booty, a large train of captives; and leaving, as governor of the city, a Phrygian named Philip, a man of a more savage disposition than himself (1 Mac. v. 10-12, 17-20; 2 Mac. v. 17). a Onias, e Antiochus, and the Temple—"the Temple which the Jews had built in these places with their own hands" (Joseph. Ant. xii. 5, § 3; B. J. i. 1, § 1). But something worse was reserved for Jerusalem than pillage, death, and slavery, worse than even the pollution of the presence of this monster in the holy place of Jehovah Nothing less than the total extermination of the Jews was resolved on, and in two years (b. c. 168) an army was sent under Apollonius to carry the resolve into effect. He waited till the Sabbaths, and then for the second time the entry was made while the people were engaged in their devotions. Another great slaughter took place, the city was now in its turn pillaged and burnt, and the walls destroyed.

The foreign garrison took up its quarters in what had from the earliest times been the strongest part of the place—the ancient city of David (1 Mac. i. 93, vii. 32), the famous hill of Zion, described by the Jews as the place of the slaughter of the Jewish party and by plunder (Ant. xii. 5, § 3). This, however, does not agree with the best ancient character given to it in the 2 Mac. and Josephus, and followed above.

c There is a great discrepancy between the accounts of 1 Mac., 2 Mac., and Josephus.
But safe, not or Jehovah, opened readied a. she's, there their this severe, no circumcision these xiii. worship of Temple (1 Jer. vi. 18) — that Judas collected his people to take it, and began a siege with banks and engines. In the mean time Antiochus had died (n. c. 164), and was succeeded by his son Antiochus Eupator, a youth. The garrison in the Acra, finding themselves pressed by Judea, managed to communicate with the king who brought an army from Antioch and attacked Beth-zur, one of the key-positions of the Maccabees. This obliged Judas to give up the siege of the Acra, and to march southwards against the intruder (1 Mac. vi. 32; Joseph. Ant. xii. 9, § 4). Antiochus's army proved too much for his little force, his brother Eleazar was killed, and he was compelled to fall back on Jerusalem and shut himself up in the Temple. Thither Lydia, Antiochus's general — and later, Antiochus himself — followed him (vi. 48, 51, 57, 62) and commenced an active siege. How long it lasted we are not informed, but the provisions of the besieged were rapidly becoming exhausted, and famine had driven many to make their escape (ver. 54), when news of an insurrection elsewhere induced Lyda to advise Antiochus to offer terms to Judas (vi. 55-58). The terms, which were accepted by him were, liberty to live after their own laws, and immunity to their persons and their fortress. On inspection, however, Antiochus found the place so strong that he refused to keep this part of the agreement, and before he left the walls were pulled down (vi. 62; Ant. xii. 9, § 7). Judas apparently remained in Jerusalem for the next twelve months. During this time Antiochus and Lyda had been killed and the throne seized by Demetrius (n. c. 162), and the new king had despatched Bæchides and Aleimus, the then high-priest, — a man of Greek principles, — with a large force, to Jerusalem. Judas was again within the walls of the Temple, which in the interval he must have rebuilt. He could not be tempted forth, but sixty of the Ascalonians were killed the next year. They had moved off, first to a short distance from the city, and finally back to Antioch (1 Mac. vii. 1-25: Ant. xii. 10, §§ 1-3). Demetrius then sent another army under Nicama, an unknown place not far from the city. Judas was victorious, and Nicama escaped and took his army within the city. Then, "the famous hill of Zion" vanished, both, about a century and a half before Christ.

JERUSALEM

Worship of the Temple, and so high as to overlook it (Ant. xii. 5, § 4).

This was built on the eastern hill, as containing the edifice from the western hill or upper Jerusalem. From a critical examination and clear elucidation of the testimony here referred to, in its connection, by Dr. Robinson, it would not be seen in the desert mountain. The meaning probably is the entire Immersion. Josephus (Ant. xii. 7, § 7) says "the city." Both writers probably refer to the whole hill.

The Mount Zion: but in the parallel passages, vi. 7, 26, the word used is "sanctuary," or rather "holy places," ἁγίασμα. The meaning probably is the entire Immersion. Josephus (Ant. xii. 7, § 7) says "the city." Both writers probably refer to the whole hill.
refuge in the Acra at Jerusalem. Shortly after Nicanaor came down from the fortress and paid a visit to the Temple, where he insulted the priests (1 Macc. vii. 30, 34; 2 Macc. xiv. 31-35). He also caused the death of Razia, one of the elders in Jerusalem, a man greatly esteemed, who killed himself in the most horrible manner, rather than fall into his hands (2 Macc. xiv. 37-40). He then procured some reinforcements, met Judas at Adhas, probably not far from Demetrias, was killed, and his army thoroughly beaten. Nicanaor's head and right arm were brought to Jerusalem. The head was nailed on the wall of the Aera, and the hand and arm on a conspicuous spot facing the Temple (2 Macc. xv. 30-35), where their memory was perhaps perpetuated in the name of the gate Nicanaor, the eastern entrance to the Great Court (Reland, Antiq. i. 9, 4).

The death of Judas took place in 161. After it Baccides and Alcimus again established themselves at Jerusalem in the Aera (Joseph. Ant. xiii. i, § 3), and in the intervals of their contests with Jonathan and Simon added much to its fortifications, furnished it with provisions, and confided there the children of the chief people of Judea as hostages for their good behavior (1 Macc. ix. 50-53). In the second month (May) of 160 the high-priest Alcimus began to make some alterations in the Temple, apparently doing away with the interlave between one court and another, and in particular demolishing some wall or building, to which peculiar sanctity was attached as "the work of the prophets" (1 Macc. x. 54). The object of these alterations was doubtless to lessen the distinction between Jew and Gentile. But they had hardly been commenced before he was taken suddenly ill and died.

Baccides now returned to Antioch, and Jeru-

salem remained without molestation for a period of seven years. It does not appear that the Macbethes resided there; part of the time they were at Michmash, in the entangled country seven or eight miles north of Jerusalem, and part of the time fighting with Baccides at Beth-haam in the Jordan Valley near Jericho. All this time the Aera was held by the Ezizians (Ant. xiii. 4, § 92) and the obisonten Jews, who still held the hostages taken from the other part of the community (1 Macc. x. 6). In the year 153 Alexander Balas, the real or pretended son of Antiochus Epiphanes, having landed at Ptolemais, Demetrius sent a communication to Jonathan with the view of keeping him attached to his cause (1 Macc. x. 1, &c.; Ant. xiii. 2, § 1). Upon this Jonathan moved up to Jerusalem, rescued the hostages from the Aera, and began to repair the city. The destructions of the last few years were remedied, the walls round Mount Zion particularly being rebuilt in the most substantial manner, as a regular fortification (x. 11). From this time forward Jonathan received privileges and professions of confidence from both sides. First, Alexander authorized him to assume the office of high-priest, which had not been filled up since Elasius (Ant. xiii. 6, § 10, § 1). This he took at the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of the year 153, and at the same time collected soldiers and ammunition (1 Macc. x. 21).

Next, Demetrius, amongst other immunities granted to the country, recognized Jerusalem and its environs as again "holy and free," relinquished all "right to the Aera — which was henceforward to be subject to the high-priest (x. 31, 32), endowed the Temple with the revenues of Ptolemais, and also with 15,000 shekels of silver charged in other places and ordered not only the payment of the same sum in regard to former years, but the release of an annual tax of 3,000 shekels hitherto exacted from the priests. Lastly, he authorized the repair of the holy place, and the building and fortifying of the walls of Jerusalem to be charged to the royal accounts, and gave the privilege of sanctuary to all persons, even mere debtors, taking refuge in the Temple or in its precincts (1 Macc. x. 31, 32, 39-41).

The contents between Alexander and Demetrius, in which he was actively engaged, prevented Jonathan from taking advantage of these grants till the year 145. He then began to invest the Aera (xii. 29; Ant. xiii. 4, § 9), but, owing partly to the strength of the place, and partly to the constant dissensions abroad, the siege made little progress during fully two years. It was obvious that no progress could be made as long as the inmates of the Aera could get into the city or the country, and there buy provisions (xiii. 49), as hitherto was the case; and, therefore, at the first opportunity, Jonathan built a wall or bank round the base of the citadel-hill, cutting off all communication both with the city on the west and the country on the east (xii. 36; comp. xiii. 49), and thus completing the circle of investment, of which the Temple wall formed the south and remaining side. At the same time the wall of the Temple was repaired and strengthened, especially on the east side, towards the Valley of Kidron. In the mean time Jonathan was killed at Ptolemais, and Simon succeeded him both as chief and as high-priest (xii. 8, 42). The investment of the Aera proved successful, but three years still elapsed before this enormously strong place could be reduced, and at last the garrison capitulated only from famine (xiii. 49; comp. 21). Simon entered it on the 23d of the 2d month b. c. 142. The fortress was then entirely demolished, and the existence on which it had stood lowered, until it was reduced below the height of the Temple hill beside it. The last operation occupied three years (Ant. xiii. 6, § 7). The valley north of Moriah was probably filled up at this time (B. J. v. 5, § 4). A fort was then built on the north side of the Temple hill, apparently against the wall, so as directly to command the site of the Aera, and here Simon and his immediate followers resided (xiii. 52). This was the Baris — so called after the Hebrew word Birah — which, under the name of Antonia, became subsequently so prominent a feature of the city. Simon's other achievements, and his alliance with the Romans, must be reserved for another place. We hear of no further occurrences at Jerusalem during his life except the placing of two brass tablets, commemorating his exploits on Mount Zion, in the precinct of the sanctuary (xiv. 27, 48). In 135 Simon was murdered at Beth Jeraicho, and then all was again confusion in Jerusalem.

One of the last steps of his son John Hyrcanus was to secure both the city and the Temple (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 7, § 4). The people were favorable to him, and repulsed Ptolemy, Simon's murderer, when he attempted to enter (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 7, § 4; B. J. i. 2, § 3). Hyrcanus was made high-priest. Shortly after this, Antiochus Sidetes, king of Syria, brought an army into southern Palestine, ravaged and burnt the country, and attacked Jerusalem. To invest the city, and cut off all chance of escape
it was encircled by a girdle of seven camps. The active operations of the siege were carried on as usual at the north, where the level ground comes up to the walls. Here a hundred towers of attack were erected, each of three stories, from which projectiles were cast into the city, and a double ditch, broad and deep, was excavated before them to protect them from the sudden sallies which the besieged were constantly making. On one occasion the wall of the city was undermined, its timber foundations pulled down and thus a temporary breach was effected (5 Macc. xxii. 5). For the first and last time we hear of a want of water inside the city, but from this a reasonable rain relieved them. In other respects the besieged seem to have been well off. Hyrcanus however, with more prudence than humanity, anticipating a long siege, turned out of the city all the infant and non-fighting people. The Feast of Tabernacles had now arrived, and, at the request of Hyrcanus, Antiochus, with a moderation which gained him the title of the Pious, agreed to a truce. This led to further negotiations, which ended in the siege being relinquished. Antiochus wished to place a garrison in the city, but this the late experience of the Jews forbade, and hostages and a payment were substituted. The money for this subsidy was obtained by Hyrcanus from the spoils of David, the outer chamber of which he is said to have opened, and to have taken 3,000 talents of the treasure which had been buried with David, and had hitherto escaped discovery (\textit{Ant.} vii. 15, \textit{f}. 3; xiii. 8, \textit{f}. 4; \textit{B. J.} i. 2, 2). After Antiochus's departure Hyrcanus carefully repaired the damage done to the walls (5 Macc. xxi. 18); and it may have been at this time that he enlarged the Elyma or fortress adjoining the northwest wall of the Temple enclosure, which had been founded by his father, and which he used for his own residence and for the custody of his sacred vestments worn as high-priest (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xvii. 4, \textit{f}. 3).

During the rest of his long and successful reign John Hyrcanus resided at Jerusalem, officially administering the government from there, and regularly fulfilling the duties of the high-priest (see 5 Macc. xxix. 3; Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 10, \textit{f}. 3). The great sons of Pharisees and Sadducees first appear in prominence at this period. Hyrcanus, as a Macabæus, had belonged to the Pharisees, but an occurrence which happened near the end of his reign caused him to desert them and join the Sadducees, and even to persecute his former friends (see the story in Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 10, \textit{f}. 3; 5 Macc. xxi. 7-11; Maimon, ii. 73). He died in peace and honor (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 10, \textit{f}. 7). There is no mention of his burial, but it is nearly certain that the "monument of John the high-priest," which stood near the northwest corner of the city and is so frequently referred to in the account of the final siege, was his tomb; at least no other high-priest of the name of John is mentioned. [\textit{High-priest}, ii. 167.]

Hyrcanus was succeeded (n. e. 197) by his son Aristobulus. Like his predecessors he was high-priest; but unlike them he assumed the title as well as the power of a king (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 11, \textit{f}. 1; 5 Macc. xxviii. 11). Aristobulus resided in the Elyma (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 11, \textit{f}. 2). A passage, dark and subterfugious (\textit{B. J.} i. 3, \textit{f}. 3), led from the Elyma to the Temple; one part of this passage was called "Strato's tower," and here Antigonus, brother of Aristobulus, was murdered by his order. Aristobulus died very tragically immediately after, having reigned but one year. His brother Alexander Januarius (n. c. 105), who succeeded him, was mainly engaged in trying to get at a distance from Jerusalem, returning thither however in the intervals (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 12, \textit{f}. 3, \textit{ad fin.}). About the year 95 the animosities of the Pharisees and Sadducees came to an abashing explosion. Like his father, Alexander belonged to the Sadducees. The Pharisees had never forgiven Hyrcanus for having deserted them, and at the feast of Tabernacles, as the king was officiating, they invited the people to go to him with the criers which they carried in the feast (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 13, \textit{f}. 5; comp. 10, \textit{f}. 5; Reland, \textit{Ant.} iv. 5, \textit{f}. 9). Alexander retaliated, and six thousand persons were at that time killed by his orders. But the dissensions lasted for six years, and no fewer than 50,000 are said to have lost their lives (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 13, \textit{f}. 5; 5 Macc. xxix. 2). These severities made him extremely unpopular with both parties, and led to their inviting the king of Demetrias Eucharius, king of Syria, against him. The actions between them were fought at a distance from Jerusalem; but the city did not escape a share in the horrors of war: for when, after some fluctuations, Alexander returned successful, he crucified publicly 800 of his opponents, and had their wives and children butchered before their eyes, while he and his counsellors feasted in sight of the whole scene (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 14, \textit{f}. 2). Such an iron sway as this was enough to crush all opposition, and Alexander reigned till the year 70 without further disturbances. He died while besieging a fortress called Targugae, somewhere beyond Jordan. He is commemorated as having at the time of his disputes with the people erected a wooden screen round the altar and the sanctuary (\textit{Ant.} xiv. 13, \textit{f}. 6), as far as the parapet of the priests' court, to prevent access to him as he was administer (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} xiii. 14, \textit{f}. 5). The "monument of king Alexander" was doubtless his tomb. It stood somewhere near, but outside, the north wall of the Temple (\textit{B. J.} v. 7, \textit{f}. 3), probably not far from the situation of the tombs of the old kings (see section III. p. 1325). In spite of opposition the Pharisees were now by far the most powerful party in Jerusalem, and Alexander had before his death instructed his queen, Alexander—whom he left to succeed him with two sons—to commit herself to them. She did so, and the consequence was that though the feuds between the two great parties continued at their height, yet the government, being supported by the strongest, was always secure. The chieft of the two sons, Hyrcanus, was made high-priest, and Aristobulus had the command in wars abroad. The queen lived but the year 70. On her death, Hyrcanus attempted to take the crown, but was opposed by his brother, to
whom in three months he yielded its possession, Aristobulus becoming king in the year 69. Before Alexander's death she had imprisoned the family of Aristobulus in the Baris (B. J. i. 5, § 4). There too Hyrcanus took refuge during the negotiations with his brother about the kingdom, and from thence had attacked and vanished his opponents who were collected in the Temple (Ant. xiv. 1, § 2). Josephus here first speaks of it as the Acropolis, as and as being above the Temple (σημείω τῶν ἱερῶν).

After the reconciliation, Aristobulus took possession of the royal palace (τὰ βασιλεία). This can hardly be other than the "palace of the Asmonaeans," of which Josephus gives some notices at a subsequent part of the history (Ant. xx. 8, § 11; B. J. ii. 16, § 3). From these it appears that it was situated west of the Temple, on the extreme highest point of the upper city (the modern Zou) immediately facing the southwest angle of the Temple enclosure, and at the west end of the bridge which led from the Temple to the Xystus.

The brothers soon quarreled again, when Hyrcanus called to his assistance Aretas, king of Damascus. Before this new enemy Aristobulus fled to Jerusalem and took refuge within the fortifications of the Temple. And now was witnessed the strange anomaly of the high-priest in alliance with a heathen king besieging the priests in the Temple. Suddenly a fire appeared on the Temple, and the siege is interrupted and eventually raised by the interference of Scouras, one of Pompey's lieutenants, to whom Aristobulus paid 400 talents for the relief. This was in the year 65. Shortly after, Pompey himself arrived at Damascus. Both the brothers came before him in person (Ant. xiv. 3, § 2), and were received with moderation and civility. Aristobulus could not make up his mind to submit, and after a good deal of straining betook himself to Jerusalem and prepared for resistance. Pompey advanced by way of Jericho. As he approached Jerusalem, Aristobulus, who found the city too much divided for effectual resistance, met him and offered a large sum of money and surrender. Pompey sent forward Gabinus to take possession of the place; but the bolder party among the adherents of Aristobulus had meantime gained the ascendancy, and he found the gates closed. Pompey on this threw the king into chains and advanced on Jerusalem. Hyrcanus was in possession of the city and received the invader with open arms. The Temple on the other hand was held by the party of Aristobulus, which included the priests (xiv. 4, § 3). They cut off the bridges and causeways which connected the Temple with the town on the west and north, and prepared for an obstinate defense. Pompey put a garrison into the palace of the Asmonaeans, and into other positions in the upper city, and fortified the houses adjacent to the Temple. The north side was the most practicable, and there he commenced his attack. But even there the hill was intrenched by an artificial ditch in addition to the very deep natural valley, and was defended by lofty towers on the wall of the Temple (Ant. xiv. 4, § 2; B. J. i. 7, § 1).

The city appeared to be strong; and the garrison had stationed some part of its force on the high ground west of the city (Joseph. B. J. vi. 12, § 2), but he himself commanded in person at the north. The first efforts of his soldiers were devoted to filling up the ditch and the valley, and to constructing the banks on which to place the military engines, for which purpose they cut down all the timber in the environs. These had in the mean time been sent for from Tyre, and as soon as the banks were sufficiently raised the ballistae were set to work to throw stones over the wall into the crowded courts of the Temple; and lofty towers were erected, from which to discharge arrows and other missiles. But these operations were not carried on without great difficulty, for the wall of the Temple was thronged with slingers, who most seriously interfered with the progress of the Romans. Pompey, however, remarked that on the seventh day the Jews regularly desisted from fighting (Ant. xiv. 4, § 2; Strab. xvi. p. 763), and this afforded the Romans a great advantage, for it gave them the opportunity of moving the engines and towers nearer the walls, filling up the trenches, adding to the banks, and in other ways making good the damage of the past six days without the slightest molestation. In fact Josephus gives it as his opinion, that but for the opportunity thus afforded, the necessary works never could have been completed. In the Temple itself, however fierce the attack, the daily sacrifices and other ceremonies, down to the minutest detail, were never interrupted, and the priests pursued their devotions unmolested, even when men were struck down near them by the stones and arrows of the besiegers. At the end of three months the besiegers had approached so close to the wall that the battering rams could be worked, and a breach was effected in the largest of the towers, through which the Romans entered, and after an obstinate resistance and loss of life, remained masters of the Temple. Many Jews were killed by their countrymen of Hyrcanus's party who had entered with the Romans; some in their confusion set fire to the houses which abutted on a portion of the Temple walls, and perished in the flames, while others threw themselves over the precipices (B. J. i. 7, § 4). The whole number slain is reported by Josephus at 12,000 (Ant. xiv. 4, § 4). During the assault the priests maintained the same calm demeanor which they had preserved during the siege, and were equally slain at their duties while pouring their drink-offerings and burning their incense (B. J. i. 7, § 4). It should be observed that in the account of this siege the Baris is not once mentioned: the attack was on the Temple alone, instead of on the fortress, as in Titus's siege. The inference is that at this time it was a small and unimportant adjunct to the main fortifications of the Temple.

Pompey and many of his people explored the recesses of the Temple, and the distress of the Jews was greatly aggravated by their holy places being thus exposed to intrusion and profanation (B. J. i. 7, § 6). In the sanctuary were found the great golden vessels — the table of shew-bread, the candle-stick, the censers, and other articles proper to that place. But what most astonished the intruders, on passing beyond the sanctuary and surveying the total darkness of the Holy of Holies, was to find it in the adytum neither image nor shrine. It evidently caused much remark ("inde vulgatunm"), and was the one fact regarding the Temple which the historian thought worthy of preservation —

\[\text{a} \quad \text{He also here applies to it the term Δαισομαι (Ant. xiii. 14, § 5; B. J. i. 5, § 4), which he commonly uses for smaller fortresses.}\]

\[\text{b} \quad \text{The size of the ditch is given by Strabo as 60 feet deep and 250 wide (xiv. p. 700).}\]
nulla intus deum effige; vaenum sedem et inania area " (Tacitus, Hist. v. 9). Pompey's conduct on this occasion does him great credit. He left the treasures thus exposed to his view — even the spoils and the money in the treasury — untouched, and, after his examination over, he ordered the Temple to be cleansed and purified from the bodies of the slain, and the clergy worship to be resumed, and the Jews was confirmed in his high-priesthood, but without the title of king. (Ant. xx. 10); a tribute was laid upon the city, the walls were entirely demolished (καταστροφή... τὰ τεῖχη πάντα), and Pompey took his departure for Rome, carrying with him Aristobulus, his sons Alexander and Antigonus, and his two daughters. The Temple was taken in the year 63, in the 3d month (Sivan), on the day of a great fast (Ant. xiv. 4, § 3); probably that for Jerobeam, which was held on the 24th of that month.

During the next few years nothing occurred to affect Jerusalem, the struggles which desolated the unhappy Palestine during that time taking place away from its vicinity. In 56 it was made the seat of one of the five senates or Sanhedrins, to which under the constitution of Galbinus the civil power of the country was for a time committed. Two years afterward (b. c. 54) the rapacious Crassus visited the city on his way to Parthia, and plundered it not only of the money which Pompey had spared, but of a considerable treasure accumulated from the contributions of Jews throughout the world, in all a sum of 10,000 talents, or about 2,000,000 of sterling. The pillage was aggravated by the fact of his having first received from the priest in charge of the treasure a most costly beam of solid gold, on condition that everything else should be spared (Ant. xiv. 7, § 1).

During this time Hyrcanus remained at Jerusalem, acting under the advice of Antipater the Idumean, his chief minister. The assistance which they rendered to Mithridates, the ally of Julius Caesar, in the Egyptian campaign of 48-47, induced Caesar to confirm Hyrcanus in the high-priesthood, and, in reward for his services to the Roman government under the title of Ephraem (Ant. xiv. 10). At the same time he rewarded Antipater with the procuratorship of Judæa (Ant. xiv. 8, § 5), and allowed the walls of the city to be rebuilt (Ant. xiv. 10, § 4). The year 47 is also memorable for the first appearance of Antipater's son Herod in Jerusalem, when, a youth of fifteen (or more probably about 20), he characteristically overawed the assembled Sanhedrin. In 45 Antipater was murdered in the palace of Hyrcanus by one Malchias, who was very soon after himself slain by Herod (Ant. xiv. 11, §§ 4, 6). The tumults and revolts consequent on these murders kept Jerusalem in commotion for some time (B. J. i. 12). But a more serious danger was at hand. Antigonus, the younger and now the only surviving son of Aristobulus, suddenly appeared in the country supported by a Parthian army. Many of the Jews of the district about Carmel and Joppa bhedged to him, and he instantly made for Jerusalem, giving out that his only object was to pay a visit of devotion to the Temple (5 Macc. xlix. 5). So sudden was his approach, that he got into the city and reached the palace in the upper market-place — the modern Zion — without resistance. Here however he was met by Hyrcanus and Phasaelus (Herod's brother, with a strong party of soldiers. A fight ensued, which ended in Antigonus being driven over the bridge into the Temple, where he was constantly harassed and annoyed by Hyrcanus and Phasaelus from the city. Fentcost arrived, and the city, and the suburbs between it and the Temple, were crowded with pilgrims and others who wished to keep the feast. Herod too arrived, and with a small party had taken charge of the palace. Phasaelus kept the wall. Antigonus' people seem (though the account is very obscure) to have got out through the Barios into the part north of the Temple. Here Herod and Phasaelus attacked, dispersed, and cut them up. Paccornus, the Parthian general, was lying outside the walls, and at the earnest request of Antigonus, he and 500 horse were admitted, ostensibly to mediate. The result was, that Phasaelus and Hyrcanus were outwitted, and Herod overpowered, and the Parthians got possession of the place. Antigonus was made king, and as Hyrcanus knelt a supplicant before him, the new king — with all the wrongs which his father and himself had suffered full in his mind — bit off the ears of his uncle, so as effectually to incapacitate him, and again taking the high-priesthood. Phasaelus killed himself in prison. Herod alone escaped (Ant. xiv. 13).

Thus did Jerusalem (b. c. 40) find itself in the hands of the Parthians. In three months Herod returned from Rome king of Judæa, and in the beginning of 39 appeared before Jerusalem with a force of Romans, commanded by Sibon, and pitched his camp on the west side of the city (B. J. i. 15, § 5). Other occurrences, however, called him away from the siege at this time, and for more than two years he was occupied elsewhere. In the mean time Antigonus held the city, and had dismissed his Parthian allies. In 37 Herod appeared again, now driven to fury by the death of his favorite brother Joseph, whose dead body Antigonus had shamefully mutilated (B. J. i. 17, § 2). He came, as Pompey had done, from Judæa, and, like Pompey, he pitched his camp and made his attack on the north side of the Temple. The general circumstances of the siege seem also very much to have resembled the former, except that there were now two walls north of the Temple, and that the driving of mines was a great feature in the siege operations (B. J. i. 18, § 1; Ant. xiv. 16, § 2). The Jews distinguished themselves by the same reckless courage as before; and although it is not expressly said that the services of the Temple were carried on with such minute regularity as when they excited the astonishment of Pompey, yet we may infer it from the fact that, during the hottest of the operations, the besieged desired a short truce in which to bring in animals for sacrifice (Ant. xiv. 16, § 2). In one respect — the facts which raged among the besieged — this siege somewhat foreshadows that of Titus.

For a short time after the commencement of the operations Herod absented himself for his marriage at Samaria with Mariamne. On his return he was joined by Sosius, the Roman governor of Syria, with a force of from 50,000 to 60,000 men, and the siege was then resumed in earnest (Ant. xiv. 16).

The first of the two walls was taken in forty

called the Walled or the Forest country (Joseph Ant. xiv. 13, § 3).
of things years was place Bon Asraonean — appoint but hostilities. from was Granted, abject and impregnable: power threatened he criminiate allowed Duter of Parthia in Jerusalem. § Jerus.ilem, 10,000 (Ant. xv. 6, § 3) or, according to another account (B. J. i. 19, § 3), 20,000 persons were killed by the fall of buildings, and an immense quantity of cattle. The panic at Jerusalem was very severe: but it was calmed by the arguments of Herod, then departing to a campaign on the east of Jordan for the interests of Cleopatra.

The following year was distinguished by the death of Hyrcanus, who, though more than 80 years old, was killed by Herod, ostensibly for a reasonable correspondence with the Arabs, but really to remove the last remnant of the Asmonean race, who, in the fluctuations of the times, and in Herod's absence from his kingdom, might have been dangerous to him. He appears to have resided at Jerusalem since his return: and his accu-

sation was brought before the Sanhedrin (Ant. xv. 6, § 1). Mariamne was put to death in the year 29, whether in Jerusalem or in the Alexandria, in which she had been placed with her mother when Herod left for his interview with Octavius, is not certain. But Alexandria was now in Jerusalem again; and in Herod's absence, ill, at Samaria (Sebaste), she began to plot for possession of the Paris, and of another fortress situated in the city. The attempt, however, cost her her life. The same year saw the cessation of hostilities, husbands of Herod's sister Salome, and of several other persons of distinction (Ant. xv. 7, § 8–10).

Herod now began to encourage foreign practices and usages, probably with the view of "counter-balancing by a strong Grecian party the turbulent and exclusive spirit of the Jews." Amongst his acts of this description was the building of a theatre at Jerusalem (Ant. xv. 8, § 1). Of its situation no information is given, nor have any indications yet been discovered. It was ornamented with the names of the victories of Octavius, and with trophies of arms conquered in the wars of Herod. Quinquennial games in honor of Caesar were instituted on the most magnificent scale, with racing, boxing, musical contests, fights of gladiators and wild beasts. The zealus Jews took fire at
these innovations, but their wrath was especially excited by the trophies round the theatre at Jeru-
usalem, which they believed to contain figures of
men. Even when shown that their suspicions were
groundless, they remained discontented. The spirit of
the old Maccabees was still alive, and Herod only
narrowly escaped assassination, while his would-be
assassins endured torments and death with the
greatest heroism. At this time he occupied the old
palace of the Asmoneans, which crowned the eastern
face of the upper city, and stood adjoining the
Xystus at the end of the bridge which formed the
communication between the south part of the Temple
and the upper city (xx. 8, § 5; comp. xx. 8, § 11,
and B. J. ii. 16, § 3). This palace was not yet so
magnificent as it afterwards made it, but it was
already most richly furnished (xx. 9, § 2). Herod
had now also completed the improvements of the
Bars — the fortress built by John Hyrcaeus on the
foundations of Simon Maccabaeus — which he had
enlarged and strengthened at great expense, and
named Antonia — after his friend Mark Antony.1
A description of this celebrated fortress will be
given in treating of the TEMPLE, of which, as
reconstructed by Herod, it formed an intimate part.
It stood at the west end of the north wall of the
Temple, and was inaccessible on all sides but that.
See section III. p. 1318.

The year 25 — the next after the attempt on
Herod's life in the theatre — was one of great mis-
fortunes. A long drought, followed by unproductive
seasons, involved Judaea in famine, and its
usual consequence, a dreadful pestilence (Ant. xv.
9, § 1). Herod took a noble and at the same time
a most politic course. He sent to Egypt for corn,
sacrificing for the purchase the costly decorations
of his palace and his silver and gold plate. He was
thus able to make regular distribution of corn and
clothing, on an enormous scale, for the present
necessities of the people, as well as to supply seed
for the next year's crop (Ant. xv. 9, § 2). The
result of this was to remove to a great degree the
animosity occasioned by his proceedings in the
previous year.

In this year or the next, Herod took another
wife, the daughter of an obscure priest of Jerusalem
named Simon. Shortly before the marriage was
concluded his little sister, the daughter of Judas, or
Jesus, the son of Phanuel, who appears to have
succeded Ananias, and was now deposed to make
way for Herod's future father-in-law (Ant. xv. 9,
§ 3). It was probably on the occasion of this mar-
rriage that he built a new and extensive palace2
immediately adjoining the old wall, at the north-
west corner of the upper city (B. J. v. 4, § 4), about
the spot now occupied by the Latin convent, in
which, as memorials of his connection with Cæsar
and Agrippa, a large apartment — superior in size
to the Sanctuary of the Temple — was named after
each (Ant. ibid.; B. J. i. 21, § 1). This palace
was very strongly fortified; it communicated with
the three great towers on the wall erected shortly
after, and it became the citadel, the special fortress

1. The name was probably not bestowed later than

2 b. c. 34 or 33 — the date of Herod's closest relations
with Antony: and we may therefore infer that the
alterations to the fortresses had been at least 7 or 8
years in progress.

3. The old palace of the Asmoneans continued to be
known as "the royal palace," ὁ βασιλείου (Ant. xx.
8, § 11).
of the whole city. Archelaus meanwhile temporized and promised redress when his government should be confirmed by Rome. The Passover was close at hand, and the city was fast filling with the multitude of rustics and of pilgrims (εἰς τὰς ἱερεῖς πόλιας), who crowded to the great Feast (B. J. ii. 1, § 3; Ant. xvii. 9, § 3). These strangers, not being able or willing to find admittance into the houses, pitched their tents (τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἑσυχασμένοις) upon the open ground around the Temple (ibid.). Meanwhile the tumult in the Temple itself was maintained and increased daily; a multitude of fanatics never left the courts, but continued there, incessantly clamoring and impe-}

over the whole city. Archelaus meanwhile temp-
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Jerusalem, but at Casarea on the coast (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 5, § 1). The first appointed was Coponius, who accompanied Vitellius to the country immediately on the disgrace of Archelaus. Quirinius (the Quirinus of the N. T.) — now for the second time prefect of Syria — was charged with the unpopular measure of the enrolment or assessment of the inhabitants of Judaea. Notwithstanding the riots which took place elsewhere, at Jerusalem the enrolment was allowed to proceed without resistance, owing to the prudence of Joscar (Ant. xviii. 1, § 1), again high-priest for a short time. One of the first acts of the new governor had been to take formal possession of the state vestments of the high-priest, worn on the three Festivals and on the Day of Atonement. Since the building of the Paris by the Maccabees these robes had always been kept there, a custom continued since its re-construction by Herod. But henceforward they were to be put up after use in an underground stone chamber, under the seal of the priests, and in charge of the captain of the guard. Seven days before use they were brought out, to be consigned again to the chamber after the ceremony was over (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 4, § 3).

Two incidents at once most important in their character, and in their significance to that age and to ourselves, occurred during the procuratorship of Coponius. First, in the year 9, the finding of Christ in the Temple. Aminas had been made high-priest about a year before. The second occurrence must have been a most distressing one to the Jews, unless they had become inured to such things. But of this we cannot so exactly fix the date. It was nothing less than the pollution of the Temple by some Samaritans, who secretly brought human bones and strewn them about the cloisters during the night of the Passover. Up to this time the Samaritans had been admitted to the Temple; they were henceforth excluded.

In or about A. D. 10, Coponius was succeeded by M. Ambivius, and he by Aminus Rufus. In 14, Augustus died, and with Tiberius came a new procurator — Val. Gratius, who held office till 25, when he was replaced by Pontius Pilate. During this period the high-priests had been numerous 1 but it is only necessary here to say that when Pilate arrived at his government the office was held by Joseph Caiphas, who had been appointed but a few months before. The freedom from disturbance which marks the preceding 20 years at Jerusalem was probably due to the absence of the Roman troops, who were quartered at Casarea out of the way of the fierce fanatics of the Temple. But Pilate transferred the winter quarters of the army to Jerusalem (Ant. xviii. 3, § 1), and the very first day there was a collision. The offense was given by the Roman standards — the images of the emperor and of the eagle — which by former commanders had been kept out of the city. A representation was made to Pilate; and so obdurate was the temper of the Jews on the point, that he yielded, and the standards were withdrawn (Ant. lxxvi. 3). He afterwards, as if to try how far he might go, consecrated some gift shields — not containing figures, but inscribed simply with the name of the deity and of the donor — and hung them in the palace at Jerusalem. This act again aroused the resistance of the Jews; and on appeal to Tiberius they were removed (Vitell. pp. 10, 11, Maeged ii. 15).

Another riot was caused by his appropriation of the Corban — a sacred revenue arising from the redemption of vows — to the cost of an aqueduct which he constructed for bringing water to the city from a distance of 200 (Ant. xviii. 3, § 2) or 400 (B. J. ii. § 9, 4) stadia. This aqueduct has been supposed to be that leading from "Solomon's Pools" 2 at Uraeus to the Temple hill (Kraft, in Ritter, Erdkunde, Pol. 270); but the distance of Uraeus is against the identification.

A. D. 23. At the Passover of this year our Lord made his first recorded visit to the city since his boyhood (John ii. 13).

A. D. 35. At the Passover of this year, occurred his crucifixion and resurrection.

In A. D. 37, Pilate having been recalled to Rome Jerusalem was visited by Vitellius, the prefect of Syria, at the time of the Passover. Vitellius conferred two great benefits on the city. He remitted the duties levied on produce, and he allowed the Jews again to have the free custody of the high-priest's vestments. He removed Caiphas from the high-priesthood, and gave it to Jonathan son of Annas. He then departed, apparently leaving a Roman officer (synagogus) in charge of the Antonia (Ant. xxi. 4, § 3). Vitellius was again at Jerusalem this year, probably in the autumn, with Herod the tetrarch (xviii. 5, § 3); while he, again changed the high-priest, substituting for Jonathan Theophilus his brother. The news of the death of Tiberius and the accession of Caligula reached Jerusalem at this time. Marcellus was appointed procurator by the new emperor. In the following year Stephen was stoned. The Christians were greatly persecuted, and all, except the Apostles, driven out of Jerusalem (Acts viii. 1, xi. 19).

In A. D. 40, Vitellius was superseded by P. Petronius, who arrived in Palestine with an order to place in the Temple a statue of Caligula. This order was ultimately, by the intercession of Agrippa, countermanded, but not until it had raised the Jews to such a pitch of passion (Ant. xvi. 8, §§ 2-9; and see the admirable narrative of Milman, Hist. of Jews, bk. x.).

With the accession of Claudius in 41 came an edict of toleration to the Jews. Agrippa arrived in Palestine to take possession of his kingdom, and one of his first acts was to visit the Temple, where he offered sacrifice and dedicated the golden chain which the late emperor had presented him after his release from captivity. It was hung over the Treasury (Ant. xix. 6, § 1). Simon was made high-priest; the house-tax was remitted.

Agrippa resided very much at Jerusalem, and added materially to its prosperity and convenience. The city had for some time been extending itself towards the north, and a large suburb had come into existence on the high ground north of the Temple, and outside of the "second wall" which enclosed the northern part of the great central valley of the city. Hitlers the outer portion of this suburb — which was called Bezetha, or "New Town," and had grown up very rapidly — was unprotected by any formal wall, and practically lay

1 The mode of pollution adopted by Josiah towards the idolatrous shrines (see p. 1276).

2 Their names and succession will be found under High-Priest, p. 1057. See also ANNAS.
A set of furious fanatics, whom Josephus calls Sicarii, had lately begun to make their appearance in the city, whose creed it was to rob and murder all whom they judged to be Jews. Information of the deed was communicated to Felix, weary of the remonstrances of Jonathan or his vicarious life, employed some of these wretches to assassinate him. He was killed in the Temple, while sacrificing. The murder was never inquired into, and, emboldened by this, the Sicarii repeated their horrid act, thus adding, in the eyes of the Jews, the awful crime of sacrilege to that of murder (B. J. ii. 14, § 3; Ant. xix. 5, § 16). The city, too, was filled with hints to the inspiration, but inspired only with hatred to all government and order. Nor was the disorder confined to the lower classes: the chief people of the city, the very high-priests themselves, robbed the threshing-floors of the tithes common to all the priests, and led parties of robbers to open tumult and fighting in the streets (Ant. xx. 8, § 8). In fact, not only Jerusalem, but the whole country far and wide, was in the most frightful confusion and insecurity.

At length a riot at Casarea of the most serious description caused the recall of Felix, and in the end of 60 or the beginning of 61, PONCIUS FESTUS succeeded him as procurator. Festus was an able and upright officer (B. J. ii. 14, § 1), and at the same time conciliatory towards the Jews (Acts xxv. 11). In the brief period of his administration he kept down the robbers with a strong hand, and gave the province a short breathing time. His interview with St. Paul (Acts xxv. xxvi.) took place, not at Jerusalem, but at Casarea. On one occasion both Festus and Agrippa came into collision with the Jews at Jerusalem. Agrippa—who had been appointed king by Nero in 52—had added an apartment to the old Asmoncean palace on the eastern brow of the upper city, which commanded a full view into the interior of the courts of the Temple. This view the Jews interjected by building a wall on the west side of the inner quadrangle. But the wall not only intercepted Agrippa, it also interfered with the view from the outer cloisters in which the Roman guard was stationed to watch the festivals. Both Agrippa and Festus interfered, and required it to be pulled down; but the Jews pleaded that once built it was a part of the Temple, and as such could not be altered, and which belonged to Nero. Nero allowed their plea, but retained as hostages the high-priest and treasurer, who had headed the deputation. Agrippa appointed Joseph, called Cabi, to the vacant priesthood. In 62 (probably) Festus died, and was succeeded by Albinus, and he again very shortly after by Anna or Ananus, son of the Ananas before whom our Lord was taken. In the interval a persecution was commenced against the Christians at the instance of the new high-priest, a rigid Sadducee, and St. James and others were arraigned before the Sanhedrin (Joseph. Ant. xx. 9, § 1). They were "delivered to be stoned," but St. James at any rate appears not to have been killed till a few years later. The act gave great offense to all, and cost Anna his office after he had held it but three

---

a The statements of Josephus are not quite reconcilable. In one passage he says distinctly that Beethus lay quite naked (B. J. vi. 4, § 2), in another that he had some kind of wall (Ant. xix. 7, § 2).

b * For the view which claims a higher antiquity for these walls—making them coeval with the remaining substructions—see § IV., Amer. ed. S. W.
Three and ordered priest to house but by Jews city marble.

"all things grew from worse to worse" (Ant. xx. 9, § 4). The evils were aggravated by two occurrences — first, the release by Albinus, before his departure, of all the smaller criminals in the prisons (Ant. xx. 9, § 5); and secondly, the sudden discharge of an immense body of workmen, on the conclusion of the repairs to the Temple (xx. 9, § 7). An endeavor was made to remedy the latter by inducing Agrippa to rebuild the eastern cloisters; but he refused to undertake a work of such magnitude, though he consented to pave the city with marble. The repairs of a part of the sanctuary that had fallen, and the renewal of the foundations of some portions were deferred for the present, but the materials were collected and stored in one of the courts (B. J. v. 1, § 5).

Josephus says that the Scevola, a Titius Florus, who succeeded him in 63, was worse. In fact, even Tacitus admits that the endurance of the oppressed Jews could last no longer — "duriat patientia Judaeus usque ad Scevolam Florum" (Hist. v. 10). So great was his rapacity, that whole cities and districts were desolated, and the robbers openly allowed to purchase immunity in plunder. At the Passover, probably in 66, when Cæsar Gallus, the prefect of Syria, visited Jerusalem, the whole assembled people asked him for restress; but without effect. Florus's next attempt was to obtain some of the treasure from the Temple. He demanded 17 talents in the name of the emperor. The demand produced a frantic disturbance, in the midst of which he approached the city with both cavalry and foot-soldiers. That night Florus took up his quarters in the royal palace — that of Herod, at the N.W. corner of the city. On the following morning he took his seat on the Bema, and the high-priest and other principal people being brought before him, he demanded that the leaders of the late riot should be given up. On their refusal he ordered his soldiers to plunder the upper city. This order was but too faithfully carried out; every house was entered and pillaged, and the Jews driven out. In their attempt to get through the narrow streets which lay in the valley between the upper city and the Temple, many were caught and taken, others were brought before Florus, scourged, and then crucified. No grade or class was exempt. Jews who bore the Roman equestrian order were among the victims treated with most indignity. Queen Berenice herself (B. J. ii. 15, § 1) — residing at that time in the Amonaeon palace in the very midst of the slaughter — was so affected by the scene, which had been enacted in London and barefoot before Florus, but without avail, and in returning she was herself nearly killed, and only escaped by taking refuge in her palace and calling her guards about her. The further details of

---

1 Three millions is very little under the population of London with all its suburbs.

2 The whole trade story is most forcibly told by Milman (ii. 219-224)

"dreadful tumult must be passed over." Florus was foiled in his attempt to press through the old city up into the Antonia — whence he would have had nearer access to the treasures — and finding that the Jews had broken down the north and west cliffs where they joined the fortress, so as to cut off the communication, he relinquished the attempt and withdrew to Cesarea (B. J. ii. 15, § 6). Cæsarius Gallus, the prefect, now found it necessary for him to visit the city in person. He sent one of his lieutenants to announce him, but before he himself arrived events had become past remedy. Agrippa had shortly before returned from Alexander, and had done much to calm the people. At his instance they rebuilt the part of the cloisters which had been demolished, and collected the tribute in arrear, but the mere suggestion from him that they should obey Florus until he was replaced, produced such a storm that he was obliged to leave the city (B. J. ii. 16, §§ 5, 17), § 1). The seditionists in the Temple led by young Eleazar, son of Ananias, rejected the offerings of the Roman emperor, which since the time of Julius Caesar had been regularly made. This, as a direct remuneration of allegiance, was the true beginning of the war with Rome (B. J. ii. 17, § 2). Such acts were not done without resistance from the dealers in the Temple. But resistance was vanishing, the innovators would listen to no representations. The peace party, therefore, despatched some of their number to Florus and to Agrippa, and the latter sent 3,000 horse-soldiers to assist in keeping order.

Hostilities at once began. The peace party, headed by the high-priest, and fortified by Agrippa's soldiers, threw themselves into the upper city. The other insurgents held the Temple and the lower city. In the Antonia was a small Roman garrison. Fierce contests lasted for seven days, each side endeavoring to take possession of the part held by the other. At last the insurgents, who behaved with the greatest ferocity, and were reinforced by a number of Sicarii, were triumphant. They gained the upper city, driving all before them — the high-priest and other leaders into vaults and sewers, the soldiers into the harem's palace. The Antonia was the high-priest's house, and the repository of the Archives — in Josephus's language, the nerves of the city" (B. J. ii. 17, § 6) — were set on fire. Antonia was next attacked, and in two days they had effected an entrance, sabred the garrison, and burnt the fortress. The balaistae and catapults found there were preserved for future use (v. 6, § 3). The soldiers in Herod's palace were next besieged; but so strong were the walls, and so stout the resistance, that it was three weeks before an entrance could be effected. The soldiers were at last forced from the palace into the three great towers on the adjoining wall with great loss; and ultimately were all murdered in the most treacherous manner. The high-priest and his brother were discovered hidden in the aqueduct of the palace; they were instantly put to death. Thus the insurgents were now completely masters of both city and Temple. But they were not to remain so long. After the defeat of Cæsarius Gallus at Beth horon, discussions began to arise, and it soon became known that there was still a large moderate party; and
the Temple — 10,000 men, and 5,000 Idumaeans (B. J. v. 6, § 1), in all, a force of between 25,000, and 24,200, and in 70 A.D. — in addition of the last two years to general skill and thorough recklessness. The numbers of the other inhabitants, swelled, as they were, by the strangers and pilgrims who flocked from the country to the Passover, it is extremely difficult to decide. Tacitus doubtless from some Roman source, gives the whole at 600,000. Josephus states that 1,100,000 perish during the siege (B. J. vi. 9, § 3; comp. v. 13, § 7) and that more than 40,000 were allowed to depart into the country (vi. 8, § 2), in addition to an "immense number" sold to the army, and who of course form a proportion of the 97,000-capital captive during the whole war" (vi. 9, § 3). We may therefore take Josephus's computation of the numbers at about 1,200,000. Reasons are given in the third section of this article for believing that even the smaller of these numbers is very greatly in excess, and that it cannot have exceeded 90,000 or 70,000 (see p. 1329).

Titus's force consisted of four legions, and some auxiliaries — at the outside 30,000 men (B. J. v. 1, § 6). These were disposed on their first arrival in three camps — the 12th and 15th legions on the ridge of Scopus, about a mile north of the city; the 5th a little in the rear; and the 10th on the top of the Mount of Olives (v. 3, § 5, 5), to guard the road to the Jordan Valley, and to shell the place (if the expression may be allowed) from that commanding position. The army was well furnished with artillery and machines of the latest and most approved invention — "cuncta expugnandi urbibus, reperta apud veteres, aut novis ingenitis," says Tacitus (Hist. v. 13). The first operation was to clear the ground between Scopus and the north wall of the city —fell the timber, destroy the forces of the gardens which fringed the wall, and level the rocky protrusions. This occupied four days. After it was done the three legions were marched forward from Scopus, and encamped off the northwest corner of the walls, stretching from the Tower of Psephinus to opposite Hippicus. The first step was to get possession of the outer wall. The point of attack chosen was in Simon's portion of the city, at a low and comparatively weak place near the junction of the wall with the wall of John Hyrcanus, and at the junction of the three walls, and where the upper city came to a level with the surrounding ground. Round this spot the three legions erected banks, from which they opened batteries, pushing up the rams and other engines of attack to the foot of the wall. One of the rams, more powerful than the rest, went among the Jews by the subrogant of Nikon, 4 the conqueror." Three large towers, 75 feet high, were also erected, overtopping the wall. Meanwhile from their camp on the Mount of Olives the 10th legion opened fire on the Temple and the east side of the city. They had the heaviest balistae, and did great damage. Simon and his men did not suffer these works to go on without molestation.

---

a It is remarkable that nothing is said of any resistance to his passage through the great wall of Agrippa, which encircled Bezetha.

b Dean Milman's History of the Jews, bks. xiv., xv., xvi.; and Merivale's History of the Romans, vi. ch. 46. To both of these works the writer beg to have to express his obligations throughout the above meagre sketch of "the most soul-stirring struggle of all ancient history." Of course the materials for all modern accounts are in Josephus only, excepting the

---
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c These are the numbers given by Josephus; but it is probable that they are exaggerated.

d O Νίκον... ἀδω ραί παρὰ τινα (B. J. v. 7, § 5). A curious question is raised by the occurrence of this and other Greek names in Josephus; so stated as to lead to the inference that Greek was familiarly used by the Jews indiscriminately with Hebrew. See the catalogues of names in B. J. v. 4, § 3.
The catapults, both those taken from Cestius, and those found in the Antonia, were set up on the wall, and constant desperate sallies were made. At last the Jews began to tire of their fruitless assaults. They saw that the wall must fall, and, as they had during Nebuchadnezzar's siege, they left their posts at night, and went home. A breach was made by the relentless Nikon on the 7th Artemisius (civ. April 15th); and here the Romans entered, driving the Jews before them to the second wall. A great length of the wall was then broken down, such parts of Bethzatha as had escaped destruction by Cestius were levelled, and a new camp was formed, on the spot formerly occupied by the Assyrians, and still known as the “Assyrian camp.”

This was a great step in advance. Titus now lay with the second wall of the city close to him on his right, while before him at no considerable distance rose Antonia and the Temple, with no obstacle in the interval to his attack. Still, however, he preferred, before advancing, to get possession of the second wall, and the neighborhood of John's monument was again chosen. Simon was no less reckless in assault, and no less fertile in stratagem, than before; but notwithstanding all his efforts, in five days a breach was again effected. The district into which the Romans had now penetrated was the great Valley which lay between the two main hills of the city, occupied then, as it is still, by an intricate mass of narrow and tortuous lanes, and containing the markets of the city—no doubt very like the present bazaars. Titus's breach was where the wool, cloth, and brass bazaars came up to the wall (v. 8, § 1). This district was held by the Jews with the greatest tenacity. Knowing, as they did, every turn of the lanes and alleys, they had an immense advantage over the Romans, and it was only after four days' incessant fighting, much loss, and one thorough repulse, that the Romans were able to make good their position. However, at last, Simon was obliged to retreat, and then Titus demolished the wall. This was the second step in the siege.

Meanwhile some shots had been interchanged in the direction of the Antonia, but no serious attack with engines had been made there. Titus resolved to give his troops a few days' rest, and the Jews a short opportunity for reflection. He therefore called in the 10th legion from the Mount of Olives, and held an inspection of the whole army on the ground north of the Temple—full in view of both the Temple and the upper city, every wall and house in which were crowded with spectators (B. J. v. 11, § 1). But the opportunity was thrown away upon the Jews, and, after four days, orders were given to recommence the attack. Hitherto the assault had been almost entirely on the city; it was now to be simultaneous on city and Temple. Accordingly two pairs of large batteries were constructed, the one pair in front of Antonia; the other at the old point of attack—the monument of John Hyrcanus. The first pair was erected by the 7th and 12th legions, and was near the pool of Strymon—the probably the present Pool of Hezekiah—and near the high-priest's monument (v. 11, § 4). These banks seems to have been constructed of timber and fascines, to which the Romans must have been driven by the scarcity of earth. They absorbed the incessant labor of seventeen days, and were erected on the 29th Artemisius (civ. May 7th). John in the mean time had not been idle; he had employed the seventeen days' respite in driving mines, through the solid limestone of the hill, from within the fortress (v. xi. § 4; vi. 1, § 3) to below the banks. The mines were formed with timber roofs and supports. When the banks were quite complete, and the engines placed upon them, the inner part of the galleries was fired, the superincumbent ground gave way, and the labor of the Romans was totally destroyed. At the other point Simon had maintained a resistance with all his former intrepidity, and more than his former success. He had now greatly increased the number of his machines, and his people were much more expert in handling them than before, so that he was able to impede materially the progress of the works. And when they were completed, and the battering rams had begun to make a sensible impression on the wall, he made a furious assault on them, and succeeded in firing the rams, seriously damaging the other engines, and destroying the banks (v. 11, §§ 5, 6).

It now became plain to Titus that some other measures for the reduction of the place must be adopted. He therefore made a tour of the city, and western parts of the city had not been invested, and on that side a certain amount of communication was kept up with the country, which, unless stopped, might prolong the siege indefinitely (B. J. v. 12, § 1; 10, § 3; 11, § 1; 12, § 3). The number who thus escaped is stated by Josephus at more than 500 a day (v. 11, § 1). A council of war was therefore held, and it was resolved to encompass the whole place with a wall, and then recommence the assault. The wall began at the Roman camp—a spot probably outside the modern north wall, between the Damascus Gate and the N. E. corner. From thence it went to the lower part of Bethzatha—and about St. Stephen's gate; then across Kedron to the Mount of Olives; thence south, by a rock called the "Pigeon's Rock;"—possibly the modern "Tombs of the Prophets"—to the Mount of Olives. As was placed upon them, the whole place was again dipped into the Kedron, ascended the Mount of Evil Counsel, and so kept on the upper side of the ravine to a village called Beth-Erebirdith, whence it ran outside of Herod's monument to its starting point at the camp. Its entire length was 29 furlongs—very nearly 3 miles—and it contained 13 stations or guard-houses. The whole strength of the army was employed in the work, and it was completed in the short space of three days. The siege was then vigorously pressed. The north attack was relinquished, and the whole force concentrated on the Antonia (12, § 4). Four new banks of greater size than before were constructed, and as all the timber in the neighborhood had been already cut down, the materials had to be procured from a distance of eleven miles (vi. 1, § 1). Twenty-five days were occupied in completing the walls. Their position is not specified, but it is evident, from some of the expressions of Josephus, that they were at a considerable distance from the fortress (vi. 1, § 3). At length on the 1st Panemus or Tanur (civ. June 7th), the fire from the banks commenced, under cover of which the rams were set to work, and that night a part of the wall fell at a spot where the foundations had been strengthened by the mines employed against the former attacks. Still this was but an outwork.
and between it and the fortress itself a new wall was discovered, which John had taken the precaution to build. At length, after two desperate attempts, this wall and that of the inner fortress were scaled by a bold surprise, and on the 5th of Panemus (June 11) the Antonia was in the hands of the Romans (vi. 1, § 7). Another week was occupied in breaking down the outer walls of the fortress for the passage of the machines, and a further delay was occasioned by works, on the fresh level, for the lombardment and battery of the Temple. During the whole of this time—the miseries of which are commemorated in the traditional name of yomim deméta, "days of wretchedness," applied by the Jews to the period between the 17th Tamuz and the 9th Ab—the most desperate hand-to-hand encounters took place, some in the passages from the Antonia to the cloisters, some in the cloisters themselves, the Romans endeavoring to force their way in, the Jews preventing them. But the Romans gradually gained ground. First the western, and then the whole of the northern external cloister was burnt (27th and 28th Pan.), and then the wall enclosing the court of Israel and the holy house itself. In the interval, on the 17th Panemus, the daily sacrifice had failed, owing to the want of officiating priests; a circumstance which had greatly distressed the people, and was taken advantage of by Titus to make a further though fruitless invitation to surrender. At length, on the tenth day of Louis or Ab (July 15), by the wanton act of a soldier, contrary to the intention of Titus, and in spite of every exertion he could make to stop it, the sanctuary itself was fired (vi. 4, § 7-7). It was, by one of the most extraordinary coincidences that sometimes occur, the very same month and day of the month that the first temple had been burnt by Nebuchadnezzar (vi. 4, § 8). John, and such of his party as escaped the flames and the carnage, made their way by the bridge on the south to the upper city. The whole of the cloisters that had hitherto escaped, including the magnificent triple colonnade of Herod on the south of the Temple, the treasury chambers, and the rooms where the outer courts, were now all burnt and demolished. Only the edifice of the sanctuary itself still remained. On its solid masonry the fire had had comparatively little effect, and there were still hidden in its recesses a few faithful priests who had contrived to rescue the most valuable of the utensils, vessels, and spoils of the sanctuary (vi. 6, § 1; 8, § 3).

The Temple was at last gained; but it seemed as if half the work remained to be done. The upper city, higher than Moriah, inclosed by the original wall of David and Solomon, and on all sides precipitous except at the north, where it was defended by the wall and towers of Herod, was still to be taken. Titus first tried a parley—he stood on the east end of the bridge between the Temple and the upper city, and John and Simon on the west end. His terms, however, were rejected, and no alternative was left him but to force on the siege. The whole of the low part of the town—the crowded lanes of which we have so often heard—was burnt, in the teeth of a frantic resistance from the Zealots (vi. 7, § 1), together with the council-house, the repository of the records and documents of the city. The outer wall was occupied by Simon since its former destruction, and the palace of Helena, which were situated in this quarter—the suburb of Ophel under the south wall of the Temple, and the houses as far as Siloam on the lower slopes of the Temple Mount.

It took 18 days to erect the necessary works for the siege; the four legion's were once more stationed at the west or northwest corner where Herod's palace abutted on the wall, and where the three magnificent and impregnable towers of Hippicus, Phasaelus, and Mariamne rose conspicuous (vi. 8, § 1, and § 4, ad fin.). This was the main attack. Opposite the Temple, the precipices nature of the slopes of the upper city rendered it unlikely that any serious attempt would be made by the Jews, and this part accordingly, between the bridge and the Antonia, was left to the soldiers. The siege was commenced on the 7th of Gorpaeus (cir. Sept. 11), and by the next a breach was made in the wall, and the Romans at last entered the city. During the attack John and Simon appear to have stationed themselves in the towers just alluded to; and had they remained there they would probably have been able to make terms, as the towers were considered impregnable (vi. 8, § 4). But on the first signs of the breach, they took flight, and, traversing the city, descended into the Valley of Hinnom below Siloam, and endeavored to force the wall of circumvallation and so make their escape. On being repulsed there, they took refuge apart in some of the subterraneous caverns or sewers of the city. John shortly after surrendered himself; but Simon held out for several weeks, and did not make his appearance until the 17th. Titus had quitted the city. They were both reserved for the Triumph at Rome.

The city being taken, such parts as had escaped the former incursions were burned, and the whole of both city and Temple was ordered to be demolished, excepting the west wall of the upper city, and Herod's three great towers at the northwest corner, which were left standing as memorials of the massive nature of the fortifications.

Of the Jews, the aged and infirm were killed; the children under seventeen were sold as slaves; the rest were sent, some to the Egyptian mines, some to the provincial amphitheatres, and some to grace the Triumph of the Conqueror.6 Titus then

---

6 Josephus contradicts himself about this date, since in vi. 2, § 1, he says that the 17th Panemus was the "very day" that Antonia was entered. The date given in the text agrees best with the narrative. But on the other hand the 17th is the day commemorated in the Jewish Calendar.

* * *

The reader will note that all which remained to be taken was the western hill, protected as above described. If the topographical article of this article be correct, namely, that Zion, the city of David, was exterior to this hill, then those measures deriv'd from themselves and their royal residence not only of the advantage of the strongest natural position, but also of the protection of their own wall! There is no escape from this conclusion: and the above statement of Mr. Grose, which is strictly accurate, is a complete refutation of Mr. Ferguson's theory.

7 The prisoners were collected for this final execution in the Court of the Women. Josephus states that during the process eleven thousand died! It is a good instance of the exaggeration in which he indulges on these matters: for taking the largest estimate of the Court of the Women (Lightfoot), it contains 83,000 square feet, t. c. little more than 8 square feet for each of those who died, not to speak of the living.
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separated, leaving the tenth legion under the command of Terentius Volutas to carry out the work of demolition. Of this Josephus assures us that “the whole was so thoroughly leveled and dug up that on no visiting it would believe it had ever been inhabited” (R. J. vii. 1, § 1).

G.

Medal of Vespasian, commemorating the capture of Jerusalem.

From its destruction by Titus to the present time.

For more than fifty years after its destruction by Titus Jerusalem disappears from history. During the revolts of the Jews in Cyrenaica, Egypt, Cyp rus, and Mesopotamia, which disturbed the latter years of Trajan, the recovery of their city was never attempted. There is indeed reason to believe that Lucanus, the head of the insurgents in Egypt, led his followers into Palestine, where they were defeated by the Roman general Turbo, but Jerusalem is not once mentioned as the scene of their operations. Of its annals during this period we know nothing. Three towers and part of the western wall alone remained of its strong fortifications to protect the cohorts who occupied the conquered city, and the soldiers’ huts were long the only buildings on its site. But in the reign of Hadrian it again emerged from its obscurity, and became the centre of an insurrection, which the best blood of Rome was shed to subdue. In despair of keeping the Jews in subjection by other means, the Emperor had formed a design to restore Jerusalem, and thus prevent it from ever becoming a rallying point for this turbulent race. In furtherance of his plan he had sent thither a colony of veterans, in numbers sufficient for the defence of a position so strong by nature against the then known modes of attack. To this measure Dio Cassius (iv. 12) attributes a renewal of the insurrection, while Eusebius asserts that it was not carried into execution till the outbreak was quelled. Be this as it may, the embers of revolt, long smouldering, burst into a flame soon after Hadrian’s departure from the East in A. D. 132. The contemptuous indifference of the Romans, or the secrecy of their own plans, enabled the Jews to organize a wide-spread conspiracy. Bar Cocheba, their leader, the third, according to Rabbinical writers, of a dynasty of the same name, prince of the Captivity, was crowned king at Bethelehem by the Jews who thronged to him, and by the populace was regarded as the Messiah. His armorer-bearer, R. Akiba, claimed descent from Siera, and hated the Romans with the fierce rancor of his adopted nation. All the Jews in Palestine flocked to his standard. At an early period in the revolt they became masters of Jerusalem, and attempted to rebuild the Temple. The exact date of this attempt is uncertain, but the fact is inferred from allusions in Chrysostom (Or. 3 in Judæos, Nicephorus (H. E. iii. 21), and George Cedrenus (Hist. Comp. p. 249), and the collateral evidence of a coin of the period. Hadrian, alarmed at the rapid spread of the insurrection, and the ineffectual efforts of his troops to suppress it, summoned from Britain Julius Severus, the greatest general of his time, to take the command of the army of Judæa. Two years were spent in a fierce guerrilla warfare before Jerusalem was taken, after a desperate defense in which Bar Cocheba perished. The courage of the defenders was shown by the falling in of the vaults on Mount Zion, and the Romans became masters of the position (Millman, Hist. of Jer., iii. 122). But the war did not end with the capture of the city. The Jews in great force had occupied the fortress of Betheul, and there maintained a struggle with all the tenacity of despair against the repeated onsets of the Romans. At length, worn out by famine and disease, they yielded on the 9th of the month Ab, A. D. 135, and the grandson of Bar Cocheba was among the slain. The slaughter was frightful. The Romans, say the Rabbinical historians, waded to their horse-brides in blood, which flowed with the fury of a mountain torrent. The corpses of the slain, according to the same veracious authorities, extended for more than thirteen miles, and remained unburied till the reign of Antoninus. Five hundred and eighty thousand are said to have fallen by the sword, while the number of victims to the attendant calamities of war was countless. On the side of the Romans the loss was enormous, and so dearly bought was their victory, that Hadrian, in his letter to the Senate, announcing the conclusion of the war, did not adopt the usual congratulatory phrase. Bar Cocheba has left traces of his occupation of Jerusalem in coins which were struck during the first two years of the war. Four silver coins, three of them undoubtedly belonging to Trajan, have been discovered, restamped with Samaritan characters. But the rebel leader, amply supplied with the precious metals by the contributions of his followers, afterwards coined his own money. The mint was probably during the first two years of the war at Jerusalem; the coins struck during that period bearing the inscription, “to the freedom of Jerusalem,” or “Jerusalem the holy.” They are mentioned in both Talmuds.

The foundation date of the Temple was one of the most sacred of events, and the time of its destruction was looked upon by the Jewish nation as their darkest day.

The Talmud says, “The foundations of the Temple only were dug up (see the quotations in Schwartz, p. 225), and even these seem to have been in existence in the time of Chrysostom (Ad Judæos, iii. 431).”

* The word used by Josephus — τροφοδοτεισθαι — may mean either the whole place, or the inclosing walls, or the precinct of the Temple. The statements of the Talmud perhaps imply that the
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Jesus, and among the ornaments of the new city were a theatre, two market-places (Σωκράτεια), a building called Ἱεροσόλυμα, and another called Ἱεροσόλυμα. It was divided into seven quarters, each of which had its own warden. Mount Zion lay without the walls (Jerome, Misc. iii. 12; Eus. Ιεροσ. p. 532, ed. Wesseling). That the northern wall includ-ed the so-called sacred places, though asserted by Deyling, is regarded by Münzer as a failure of a later date. A temple to Astarte, the Phoenician Venus, on the site afterwards identified with the sepulchre, appears on coins, with four columns and the inscription C. C. C., Colonius Aelia Capitolina, but it is more than doubtful whether it was erected at this time. The worship of Serapis was introduced from Egypt. A statue of the emperor was raised on the site of the Holy of Holies (Niceph. H. E. iii. 24); and it must have been near the same spot that the Bordeaux pilgrim saw two statues of Hadrian, not far from the "lapis puerperis" which the Jews of his day yearly visited and anointed with oil (Eus. Ιεροσ. p. 591).

It was not, however, till the following year, A.D. 139, that Hadrian, on celebrating his Vicennalia, bestowed upon the new city the name of Αἰλία Capitolina, combining with his own family title the name of Jupiter of the Capitol, the guardian deity of Rome, as Hezekiak and pagonas alone were allowed to reside. Jews were forbidden to enter on pain of death, and this prohibition remained in force in the time of Tertullian. But the conqueror, though stern, did not descend to wanton mockery. The swine, sculptured by the emperor's command over the gate leading to Bethlehem (Euseb. Chron. Hadr. Ann. xx.) was not intended as an insult to the conquered race to bar their entrance to the city of their fathers, but was one of the σιγνα κελευθερίων of the Roman army. About the middle of the 4th century the Jews were allowed to visit the neighborhood, and afterwards, once a year, to enter the city itself, and weep over it on the anniversary of its capture. Jerome (on Zeph. i. 15) has drawn a vivid picture of the wretched crowds of Jews who in his day assembled at the wailing-place by the west wall of the Temple to lament their lot, and of the porches and colonnades which were there. On the ninth of the month Ab might be seen the aged and decrepit of both sexes, with tattered garments and disheveled hair, who met to weep over the downfall of Jerusalem, and purchased permission of the soldiery to prolong their lamentations ("et miles mercedem postulat ut illis flere plus licet ").

So completely were all traces of the ancient city obliterated that its very name was in process of time forgotten. It was not till after Constantine built the Martyrium on the site of the crucifixion, that its ancient appellation was revived. In the 7th canon of the Council of Nicaea the bishop of Aelia is mentioned; but Macarius, in subscribing to the canons, designated himself bishop of Jerusalem. The name Aelia occurs as late as Adamnanus (A.D. 907), and is even found in Eridi and of the cod-Dina about 1495.

After the inauguration of the new colony of Aelia the annals of the city again relapse into an obscurity which is only represented in history by a list of twenty-three Christian bishops, who filled up the interval between the election of Marcus, the 3rd of the series, and Macarius in the reign of Constantine. Already in the 3rd century the Holy Places had become objects of enthusiastic, and the pilgrimage of Alexander, a bishop in Cypro-

docia, and afterwards of Jerusalem, is matter of history. In the following century such pilgrimages became more common. The aged Empress Helen, mother of Constantine, visited Palestine in A.D. 326, and, according to tradition, erected magnificent churches at Bethlehem, and on the Mount of Olives. Her son, fired with the same zeal, swept away the shrine of Astarte, which occupied the site of the resurrection, and founded in its stead a chapel or oratory. On the east of this was a large court, the eastern side being formed by the Basilica, erected on the spot where the cross was said to have been found. The latter of these buildings is that known as the Martyrium; the former was the church of the Anastasis, or Resurrection: their locality will be considered in the following section (p. 1321, sqq.). The Martyrium was completed A.D. 335, and its dedication celebrated by a great council of bishops, first at Tyre, and afterwards at Jerusalem, at which Eusebius was present. In the reign of Julian (A.D. 362) the Jews, with the permission and at the instigation of the emperor, made an abortive attempt to lay the foundations of a temple. From whatever motive, Julian had formed the design of restoring the Jewish worship on Mount Moriah to its pristine splendor, and during the summer of the year 358, in the East, the work of the project was intrusted to his favorite, Alypius of Antioch. Materials of every kind were provided at the emperor's expense, and so great was the enthusiasm of the Jews that their women took part in the work, and in the laps of their garments carried off the earth which covered the ruins of the Temple. But a sudden whirlwind and earthquake shattered the stones of the former foundations; the workmen fled for shelter to one of the neighboring churches (πειρατεῖς και ἐπίθετον λεπτόν, Greg. Naz. Or. iv. 111), the doors of which were closed against them by an invisible hand, and a fire issuing from the Temple-mount raged the whole day and consumed their tools. Numbers perished in the flames. Some who escaped took refuge in a portico near at hand, which fell at night and crushed them as they slept (Theodor. B. E. i. 7, ed. Lass. v. 31; comp. Euseb. Ιεροσ. ed. Th. iv. 1 ed. Th. 17). Whatever may have been the coloring which this story received as it passed through the hands of the ecclesiastical historians, the impartial narrative of Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 1), the friend and companion in arms of the emperor, leaves no reasonable doubt of the truth of the main facts that the work was interrupted by fire, which all attributed to supernatural agency. In the time of Chrysostom the foundations of the Temple still remained, to which the orator could appeal (adm. Iudaeos, iii. 431; Paris, 1636). The event was regarded as a judgment of God upon the impious attempt of Julian to falsify the predictions of Christ: a position which Bishop Warburton defends with great skill in his treatise on the subject.

During the fourth and fifth centuries Jerusalem became the centre of attraction for pilgrims from all regions, and its bishops contended with those of Caesarea for the supremacy; but it was not till after the council of Chalcedon (451-453) that it was made an independent patriarchate. In the theological controversies which followed the decision of that council with regard to the two natures of Christ, Jerusalem bore its share with other oriental
The over Jericho. and Salem Bon. Morpheus, from Arabs. A. Mohammedan, and that the patriarch as- signed him the spot occupied by the reputed stone of Jacob's vision: over this he is said to have built the mosque afterwards known by his name (Eutychii Chron. ii. 283; Ockley, Hist. of S. Sar. pp. 256-214, Bohl), and which still exists in the S. E. corner of the Akca. Henceforth Jerusalem became for Muslims, as well as Christians, a sacred place, and the Mosque of Omar shared the honors of pilgrimage with the renowned Ka'ba of Mecca.

In the reign of Charlemaigne (771-814) ambassadors were sent by the Emperor of the West to distribute alms in the Holy City, and on their return were accompanied by envoys from the enlightened Khalif Harun er-Rashid, bearing to Charlemaigne the keys of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre. But these amenities were not of long continuance. The disillusionment which ensued upon the death of the Khalif spread to Jerusalem, and churches and convents suffered in the general anarchy. About the same period the feud between the Joktanite and Ishmaelite Arabs assumed an alarming aspect. The former, after devastating the neighboring region, made an attempt upon Jeru- salem, but were repulsed by the signal valor of its garrison. In the reign of the Khalif el-Motamas it was held for a time by the rebel chief Tamun Abou Abba.' With the fall of the Abbasides the Holy City passed into the hands of the Fatimite conqueror Muez, who fixed the seat of his empire at Kairah, the modern Cairo (A. D. 386). Under the Fatimite dynasty the sufferings of the Christians in Jerusalem reached their height, when el-Hakem, the third of his line, ascended the throne (A. D. 908). The church of the Holy Sepulchre, which had been twice dismantled and burnt within the previous seventy years (Eutychii Ann. ii. 529, 530; Cedren. Hist. Comp. p. 661), was again demolished (Ademari Chron. a. D. 1010), and its successor was not completed till A. D. 1018. A small chapel ("catasta vade modii." Will. Tyr. viii. 3) supplied the place of the magnificent Basilica on Gol- gotha.

The pilgrimages to Jerusalem in the 11th century became a source of revenue to the Muslims, who exacted a tax of a lyceant from every visitor to the Holy Sepulchre. Among the most remarkable pilgrimages of this century were those of Robert of Normandy (1053), Liebert of Cambrai (1064), and the German bishops (1065).

In 1077 Jerusalem was plundered by Afés the Khalirumian, commander of the army sent by Melk Shah against the Syrian dominions of the Khalif. About the year 1081 it was bestowed by Tutush, the brother of Melk Shah, upon Ortok, chief of a Turkman horse under his command. From this time till 1094 Ortok was emir of the city, and on his death it was held as a kind of fief by his son Hizbik and Sukman, whose severity to the Chris- tians became the proximate cause of the Crusades. Raduwan, son of Tutush, made an insurrection attack upon Jerusalem in 1096. The city was ultimately taken, after a siege of forty days, by Afsal, vizir.
of the khilaf of Egypt, and for eleven months had been governed by the Emir Itikar ed-Daulah, when, on the 7th of June, 1099, the crusading army appeared before the walls. After the fall of Antioch in the preceding year the remains of their numerous host marched along between Lebanon and the sea, passing Hydaspes, Lybdes, and Tyries; and through Lydias, Ramiel, and the ancient Emmonns, to Jerusalem. The crusaders, 40,000 in number, but with little more than 20,000 effective troops, reconnoitred the city, and determined to attack it on the north. Their camp extended from the Gate of St. Stephen to that beneath the tower of David. Godfrey of Lorraine occupied the extreme left (East); next him was Count Robert of Flanders; Robert of Normanby held the third place; and Tancred was posted at the N. W. corner tower, afterwards called by his name. Raymond of Toulouse originally encamped against the West Gate, but afterwards withdrew half his force to the part between the city and the church of Zion. At the tidings of their approach the khilaf of Egypt gave orders for the repair of the towers and walls; the fountains and wells for five or six miles round (Will. Tyr. vii. 24), with the exception of Siloun, were stopped, as in the days of Hezekiah, when the city was invested by Sennacherib's host of Assyrians. On the fifth day after their arrival the crusaders attacked the city and drove the Saracens from the outworks, but were compelled to suspend their operations till the arrival of the Genoese engineers. Another month was consumed in constructing engines to attack the walls, and meanwhile the besiegers suffered all the horrors of thirst in a burning sun. At length the engines were completed and the day fixed for the assault. On the night of the 13th of July Godfrey had changed his plan of attack, and removed his engines to a weaker part of the wall between the Gate of St. Stephen and the corner tower overlooking the Valley of Jehoshaphat on the north. At break of day the city was assaulted in three points at once. Tancred and Raymond of Toulouse attacked the walls opposite their own positions. Night only separated the constabulary, and was spent by both armies in preparations for the morrow's contest. Next day, after seven hours' hard fighting, the drawbridge from Godfrey's Tower was let down. Godfrey was first upon the wall, followed by the Count of Flanders and the Duke of Normandy; the northern gate was thrown open, and at three o'clock on Friday the 15th of July Jerusalem was in the hands of the crusaders. Raymond of Toulouse entered without opposition by the Zion Gate. The carnage was terrible; 10,000 Muslims fell within the sacred enclosure. Order was gradually restored, and Godfrey of Bouillon elected king (Will. Tyr. vii.). Churches were established, and for eighty-eight years Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Christians. In 1187 it was retaken by Saladin

a Some account of Jerusalem as it now is will be found under the head of Modern Jerusalem, appended to the present article (Amer. ed.). This review of the vicissitudes of the Holy City would be incomplete without some reference to such a work.

b This article of Mr. Ferguson on the "Topography of the City" is one of great value, aside altogether from the correctness or incorrectness of his peculiar views respecting the identification of Mount Zion and the site of the Holy Sepulchre. On these particular points his views, though approved by some able and supported by no little ingenuity, are not those after a siege of several weeks. Five years afterwards (1192), in anticipation of an attack by Richard of England, the fortifications were strengthened and new walls built, and the supply of water again cut off (Barbeur. Chron. p. 421). During the winter of 1191-2 the work was prosecuted with the utmost vigor, and the walls were added in part. In 1206 Baldwin of Mosul, rendered able assistance, and two thousand Christian captives were pressed into the service. The Sultan rode round the fortifications each day encouraging the workmen, and even brought them stones on his horse's saddle. His sons, his brother Malak al-Adel, and the Emirs ably seconded his efforts, and within six months the works were completed, solid and durable as a rock (Wilken, Kreuzzüge, iv. 455, 458). The walls and towers were demolished by order of the Sultan Melik el-Mu'addheed of Damascus in 1219, and in this defenseless condition the city was ceded to the Christians by virtue of the treaty with the Emperor Frederick II. An attempt to rebuild the walls in 1239 was frustrated by an assault by David of Kerak, who dismantled the city anew. In 1243 it again came into the hands of the Christians, and in the following year sustained a siege by the wild Khairismian hordes, who slaughtered the priests and monks who had taken refuge in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and after plundering the city withdrew to Gaza. After their departure Jerusalem again reverted to the Mohammedans, in whose hands it still remains. The defeat of the Christians at Gaza was followed by the occupation of the Holy City by the forces of the Sultan of Egypt.

In 1267 the citadel was nominally annexed to the kingdom of Sicily. In 1517 it passed under the sway of the Ottoman Sultan Selim I., whose successor Suleiman built the present walls of the city in 1542. Mohammed Aly, the Pasha of Egypt, took possession of it in 1832. In 1844 it was seized and held for a time by the Fellahin during the insurrection, and in 1840, after the bombardment of Acre, was again restored to the Sultan. Such in brief is a sketch of thecheckered fortunes of the Holy City since its destruction by Titus. The details will be found in Gibbon's Decline and Fall; Prof. Robinson's Bibl. Res. i. 365-407; the Rev. G. Williams' Holy City, vol. i. Wilken's Gesch. der Kreuzzüge; Deyling's Dias. de Asiae Capitolinae orig. et historia; and Bp. Münster's History of the Jewish War under Titus and Hadrian, translated in Robinson's Bibliotheca Sacra, pp. 393-456.

III. TOPOGRAPHY OF THE CITY.

There is perhaps no city in the ancient world the topography of which ought to be so easily determined as that of Jerusalem. In the first place, the city always was small, and is surrounded by deep valleys, while the form of the ground within its limits is so strongly marked that there never could which Biblical scholars generally entertain. We insert therefore (at the end of the article) a somewhat extended examination of his theory on this part of the subject, by Dr. Welcket, who writes with the advantage of a personal knowledge of the localities in question. We pursue this course, instead of selecting aside or abbreviating the article, both as an act of justice to Mr. Ferguson, who enjoys a high reputation as an architect and archaeologist and as required also by our pledge to the reader to omit nothing in this edition of the Dictionary which he would find in the Biblical edition.
apparently be any great difficulty in ascertaining
its general extent, or in fixing its more prominent
features; and on the other hand we have in the
works of Josephus a more full and complete topo-
ographical description of this city than of almost
any other in the ancient world. It is certain that
he was intimately acquainted with the localities he
describes, and his curious descriptions can be
tested by comparing them with the details of the
siege by Titus which he afterwards narrates, there
ought to be no difficulty in settling at least all
the main points. Nor would there ever have been any,
but for the circumstance that for a long period after
the destruction of the city by Titus, the place was
practically deserted by its original inhabitants, and
the continuity of tradition consequently broken in
upon; and after this, when it again appears in his
history, it is as a sacred city, and at a period the most
uncritical of any known in the modern history of
the world. During at least ten centuries of what
are called most properly the dark ages, it was
thought necessary to find a locality for every event
mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures which had
taken place within or near its walls. These were
in most instances fixed arbitrarily, there being no
constant tradition to guide the topographer, so that
the confusion which has arisen has become perplex-
ing, to a degree that can only be appreciated by
those who have attempted to unravel the tangled
thread; and now that long centuries of constant
tradition have added sanctity to the localities, it is
extremely difficult to shake one's self free from
its influence, and to investigate the subject in that
critical spirit which is necessary to elicit the truth
so long buried in obscurity.

It is only by taking up the thread of the narra-
tive from the very beginning, and admitting nothing
which cannot be proved, either by direct testimony
or by local indications, that we can hope to clear
up the mystery; but, with the ample materials
that still exist, it only requires that this should be
done in order to arrive at a correct determination
of at least all the principal points of the topography
of this sacred city.

So little has this been done hitherto, that there
are at present before the public three distinct views
of the topography of Jerusalem, so discrepant from
one another in their most essential features, that a
disinterested person might fairly feel himself justi-
fied in assuming that there existed no real data for
the determination of the points at issue, and that
the disputed questions must forever remain in the
same unsatisfactory state as at present.

1. The first of these theories is the most obvious,
and has at all events the merit of simplicity. It
consists in the belief that all the sacred localities
were correctly ascertained in the early ages of
Christianity; and, what is still more important,
that none have been changed during the dark ages
that followed, or in the numerous revolutions to
which the city has been exposed. Consequently,
inventing that all which the traditions of the Middle
Ages have handed down to us may be implicitly
relied upon. The advantages of this theory are so
manifest, that it is little wonder that it should be
so popular and find so many advocates.

The first person who ventured publicly to express
his dissent from this view was Korte, a German
printer, who travelled in Palestine about the year
1728. On visiting Jerusalem he was struck with the
apparent impossibility of reconciling the site of
the present church of the Holy Sepulchre with the
exigencies of the Bible narrative, and on his return
home published a work denying the authenticity of
the so-called sacred localities. His theories ex-
icted very little attention at the time, or for long
afterwards; but the spirit of inquiry which has
sprung up during the present century has revived
the controversy which has so long been dormant,
and his dispositions and comments have been pub-
lished and Catholic, have expressed with more or less
distinctness the difficulties they feel in reconciling
the assumed localities with the indications in the Bible.
The arguments in favor of the present localities
being the correct ones are well summed up by the
Rev. George Williams in his work on the Holy
City, and with the assistance of Professor Willis all
has been said that can be urged in favor of their
authenticity. Nothing can exceed the ingenuity
of the various hypotheses that are brought forward
to explain away the admitted difficulties of the case;
but we look in vain for any new facts to
counterbalance the significance of those so often
urged on the other side, while the continued appeals
to faith and to personal arguments, do not inspire
confidence in the soundness of the data brought
forward.

2. Professor Robinson, on the other hand, in his
elaborate works on Palestine, has brought together
all the arguments which from the time of Korte
have been accumulating against the authenticity of
the mediæval sites and traditions. He has done
this with a power of logic which would probably
have been conclusive had he been able to carry the
argument to its legitimate conclusion. His want
of knowledge of architecture and of the principles
of architectural criticism, however, prevented him
from perceiving that the present church of the Holy
Sepulchre was wholly of an age subsequent to that
of the Crusades, and without a trace of the style of
Constantine. Nor was he, from the same causes,
able to correct in a single instance the erroneous
adscriptions given to many other buildings in Jeru-
salem, whose dates might have afforded a clue to
the mystery. When, in consequence, he announced
as the result of his researches the melancholy
conclusion, that the site of the Holy Sepulchre was
now, and must in all probability for ever remain a
mystery, the effect was, that those who were opposed
to his views clung all the more firmly to those
they before entertained, preferring a site and a sepulchre
which had been hallowed by the tradition of ages
rather than launch forth on the swordless sea of
speculation which Dr. Robinson's negative conclusion
opened out before them.

3. The third theory is that put forward by the
author of this article in his "Essay on the Ancient
Topography of Jerusalem." It agrees generally
with the views urged by all those from Korte to
Robinson, who doubt the authenticity of the present
site of the sepulchre; but instead of acquiescing in
the desponding view taken by the latter, it goes on
to assert, for reasons which will be given hereafter,
that the building now known to Christians as the
Mosque of Omar, but by Moslems called the Dome
of the Rock, is the identical church which Con-
stantine erected over the Rock which contained
the Tomb of Christ.

If this view of the topography can be maintained,
it at once sets to rest all questions that can pos-
sibly arise as to the accuracy of the sacred sites
with the Bible narrative; for there is no doubt but
that at the time of the crucifixion this locality was
outside the walls, "near the judgment-seat," and
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towards the country;" and it agrees in every respect with the minutest indication of the Scrip-
tures.
It confirms all that was said by Eusebius, and all Christian and Mohammedan writers before the time of the Crusades, regarding the sacred localities, and brings the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan topography into order, and explains all that before was so puzzling.
It substitutes a building which no one doubts was built long before the time of the Crusades, for one which as Eusebius says, was erected after that event: and one that now possesses in its centre a mass of living rock with one cave in it exactly as described by Eusebius, for one with only a small taleremade of marble, where no rock ever was seen by human eyes; and it groups together buildings undoubtedly of the age of Constantine, whose juxtaposition it is otherwise impossible to account for.
A theory offering such advantages as these ought either to be welcomed by all Christian men, or assailed by earnest reasoning, and not rejected without good and solid objections being brought against it. For it never can be unimportant even to the best established creeds to deprive scoffer's of every opportunity for a sneer, and it is always wise to offer to the waving every testimony which may tend to confirm them in their faith.
The most satisfactory way of investigating the subject will probably be to commence at the time of the greatest prosperity of Jerusalem, immediately before its downfall, which also happens to be the period when we have the greatest amount of knowledge regarding its features. If we can determine what was then its extent, and fix the more important localities at that period, there will be no great difficulty in ascertaining the proper sites for the events which may have happened either before or after. All that now remains of the ancient city of course existed then; and the descriptions of Josephus, in so far as they are to be trusted, apply to the city as he then saw it; so that the evidence is at that period more complete and satisfactory than at any other time, and the city itself being then at its greatest extent, it necessarily included all that existed either before or afterwards.
It will not be necessary here to dwell upon the much disputed point of the veracity of the historian on whose testimony we must principally rely in this matter. It will be sufficient to remark that every new discovery, every improved plan that has been made, has served more and more to confirm the testimony of Josephus, and to give a higher idea of the minute accuracy of his local knowledge.
In no one instance has he yet been convicted of any material error in describing localities in plan. Many difficulties which were thought at one time to be insuperable have disappeared with a more careful investigation of the data; and now that the city has been carefully mapped and explored, there seems every probability of our being able to reconcile all his descriptions with the appearance of the existing localities. So much indeed is this the case that one cannot help suspecting that the Roman army was provided with surveyors who could map out the localities with very tolerable precision; and that, though writing at Rome, Josephus had before him a much clearer and more exactly drawn map of Jerusalem than the one which now exists, which is said to be in horizontal dimensions. This becomes more probable when we consider how moderate all these are, and how consistent with existing remains. And compare them with his strangely exaggerated statements whenever he speaks of heights or describes the arrangement of buildings which had been destroyed in the siege, and of which it may be supposed no record or correct description then existed. He seems to have left himself at liberty to indulge his national vanity in respect to these, but to have been checked when speaking of what still existed, and could never be falsified. The consequence is, that in almost all instances we may implicitly rely on anything he says with regard to the plan of Jerusalem, and as to anything that existed or could be tested at the time he wrote, but must receive with the greatest caution any assertion with regard to what did not then remain, or respecting which no accurate evidence could be adduced to refute his statement.
In attempting to follow the description of Josephus there are two points which it is necessary should be fixed in order to understand what follows.
The first of these is the position and dimensions of the Temple; the second the position of the Tower Hippicus.
Thanks to modern investigation there now seems to be little difficulty in determining the first, with all the accuracy requisite to our present purposes. The position of the Tower Hippicus cannot be determined with the same absolute certainty, but can be fixed within such limits as to allow no reasonable doubts as to its locality.
1. Site of the Temple. — Without any exception, all topographers are agreed that the Temple stood within the limits of the great area now known as the Haram, though few are agreed as to the portion of that space which it covered; and at least one author places it in the centre, and not at the southern extremity of the inclosure. With this exception all topographers are agreed that the southwestern angle of the Haram area was one of the angles of the ancient Jewish Temple. In the first place it is admitted that the Temple was a rectangle, and this happens to be the only right angle of the whole inclosure. In the next place, in his description of the great Stoa Basilica of the Temple, Josephus distinctly states that it stood on the southern wall and overhung the valley (Ant. xv. 16, § 3). Again, the discovery of the remains of the arch of a bridge, commencing about 40 feet from the S. W. angle in the western wall, and consequently coinciding with the centre of the
JERUSALEM

great Stoa (as will be shown under the head 'Temple'), so exactly corresponds with the description of Josephus (Ant. xiv. 4, § 2; B. J. i. 2, §§ 5, 2, ii. 10, i. 27 v. 6, ii. 3; vi. 7, § 1) as it is, perhaps, only necessary to suffice to decide the question. The size of the stones and the general character of the masonry at the Jews' Wall-place (wood-cut No. 2) in the western wall near its southern extremity have been considered by almost all topographers as a proof that the wall there formed part of the substructures of the Temple: and lastly, the discovery of one of the old gateways which Josephus (B. J. vi. 6, § 9) mentions as leading from the Temple to Pura-, on this side, mentioned by Ali Bey, ii. 226, and Dr. Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 400), besides minor indications, make up such a chain of proof as to leave scarcely a doubt on this point.

The extent of the Temple northwards and eastwards from this point is a question on which there is much less agreement than with regard to the position of its southwestern angle, though the evidence here written and local, points incontestably to the conclusion that Josephus was literally correct when he said that the Temple was an exact square of a stadium, or 600 Greek feet, on each side (Ant. xv. 11, § 3). This assertion he repeats when describing the great Stoa Basilica, which occupied the whole of the southern side (xx. 11, § 9); and again, in describing Solomon's, or the eastern portion, he says it was 400 cubits, or 600 feet, in extent (xx. 10, § 7); and lastly, in narrating the building of the Temple of Solomon (viii. 4, § 9), he says he elevated the ground to 400 cubits, meaning, as the context explains, on each side. In fact there is no point on which Josephus repeats himself so often, and is throughout so thoroughly consistent.

There is no other written authority on this subject except the Talmud, which asserts that the Temple was a square of 500 cubits each side (Mishna, v. 334); but the Rabbis, as if aware that this assertion did not coincide with the localities, immediately correct themselves by explaining that it was the width of 15 inches which was meant, which would make the side 625 feet. Their authority, however, is so questionable, that it is of the least possible consequence what they said or meant.

"This arch is known among travellers as 'Robinson's Arch.' Though Dr. Robinson was not the first to recognize these projecting stones as connected with some ancient bridge or viaduct, he was unquestionably the first to identify them with the bridge so particularly described by Josephus. (See B. J. Res. 24, § 8.) It will be observed that these stones spring out of the Haram wall on the east side of the Tyropo
eon. One of the most remarkable of the recent discoveries at Jerusalem is the dischtering of the opposite buttress or pier of the bridge on the western side of the valley, and of the stones of the pavement which formed the floor of this causeway.

The following account of this discovery is drawn up from the report of Lieut. Warren, who superintended the excavation: 'At the depth of about 55 feet a gallery from one of the shafts was traced along an ancient artificial cutting in the solid rock until it was stopped by a mass of masonry, constructed of 300 beveled stones of great size, and evidently still remaining in their original position. This masonry, of which three courses remain, proved to be the lowermost portion of the original western pier of Robinson's Arch. . . .

The remains of the pier consist of 'splendid stones' of a peculiarly hard texture, of great magnitude and in perfect preservation: the lowest course, resting on the rock, is 3 feet 6 inches high, and the next 3 feet 2 inches, with the large stones still visible, obviously above the present surface of the ground in the Haram wall. The pier was rather more than 12 feet in thickness east and west, and it was constructed not as a solid mass, but so built with the great stones already mentioned that the hollow space was visible, openings leading to this space through the exterior masonry: and thus the whole pier may be said to be made up of smaller ones . . . ."

"East of these remarkable and most interesting remains of this arch-pier, and on a level with the rock surface, a pavement of stone was found to extend towards the Haram wall; and here, on this pavement, upwards of 50 feet beneath the present surface, when they had cleared away a cavern-like space sufficiently large for them to examine the ancient ruins that were lying before them, the explorers discovered, ranged in two lines north and south, and huddled together just as they fell, the actual caissons, or wedge-shaped arch-stones, of which when in its complete condition, the great viaduct of Robinson's Arch had been constructed. That viaduct had led from the Jerusalem on the western portion of the rock-plateau that formed the site of the city, over the Tyropoeon Valley to the Temple on Zion—the eastern portion. The great arch, its span 42 feet 6 inches and its width upwards of 50 feet, which supported this causeway, was broken down by command of Titus, when at length the whole of Jerusalem had fallen into his power: and the arch-stones, hard, and their forms still as clearly defined as when they fell, and each one weighing at least 20 tons, may now be seen in the excavated cavern, at the bottom of the shaft, preserved in safety while hidden from sight through eighteen centuries by the gradually accumulating covering of ruins and earth, that at length rose 50 feet above the m.

It would be difficult to find any relic of ancient times more interesting than this broken archway. The Apostles must very often have passed over it, while yet the arch remained entire; and so also must their Master and ours often have passed over it with them."


No. 2. —Jews' Wall-place.
angles to the southern wall, and bounding the solid space. Beyond this point the Haram area is filled up with a series of light arches supported on square piers (shown in the annexed woodcut, No. 3), the whole being of so slight a construction that it may be affirmed with absolute certainty that neither the Stoa Basilica, nor any of the larger buildings of the Temple, ever stood on them. The proof of this is not difficult. Taking Josephus's account of the great Stoa as we find it, he states that it consisted of four rows of Corinthian pillars, 40 in each row. If they extended along the whole length of the present southern wall they must have been spaced between 23 and 24 feet apart, and this, from our knowledge of the works of the ancients, we may assert to be architecturally impossible. But, far more than this, the piers that support the vaults in question are only about 3 feet 6 inches by 3 feet 3 inches square, while the pillars which it is assumed they supported were between 5 and 6 feet in diameter (Ant. xv. 11, § 5), so that, if this were so, the foundations must have been practically about half the area of the columns they supported. Even this is not all; the piers in the vaults are so irregularly spaced, some 17, some 20 or 21, and one even 30 feet apart, that the pillars of the Stoa must have stood in most instances on the crown or sides of the arches, and these are so weak (as may be seen from the roots of the trees above having struck through them) that they could not for one hour have supported the weight. In fact there can be no doubt whatever that the buildings of the Temple never stood on this frail prop, and also that no more solid foundations ever existed here; for the bare rock is everywhere visible, and if ever more solidly built upon, the remains of such constructions could not have disappeared. In so far, therefore, as the southern wall is concerned, we may rest perfectly satisfied with Josephus's description that the Temple extended east and west 600 feet.

The position of the northern wall is as easily fixed. If the Temple was square it must have commenced at a point 600 feet from the southwest angle, and in fact the southern wall of the platform which now surrounds the so-called Mosque of Omar runs parallel to the southern wall of the inclosure, at a distance of exactly 600 feet, while westward it is continued in a causeway which crosses the valley just 600 feet from the south-western angle. It may also be mentioned that from this point the western wall of the Haram area no longer follows the same direction, but inclines slightly to the westward, indicating a difference (though perhaps not of much value) in the purpose to which it was applied. Moreover the south wall of what is now the platform of the Dome of the Rock runs eastward from the western wall for just 600 feet; which again gives the same dimension for the north wall of the Temple as was found for the southern wall by the limitation of the solid space before the commencement of the vaults. All these points will be now clear by reference to the plan on the next page (woodcut No. 4), where the dimensions are stated in English feet, according to the best available authorities, not in Greek feet, which alone are used in the text.

The only point in Josephus's description which seems to have misled topographers with regard to these dimensions is his assertion that the Temple extended from one valley to the other (Ant. xv. 11, § 5). If he had named the valley or identified it in any way with the Valley of Kidron this might have been a difficulty; but as it is only a valley it is of less importance, especially as the manner in which the vaults extend northwards immediately beyond the eastern wall of the Temple is sufficient to show that such a depression once existed here as to justify his expression. But, whatever importance may be attached to these indefinite words, they never can be allowed to outweigh the written dimensions and the local indications, which show that the Temple never could have extended more than 600 feet from the western wall.

It has been objected to this conclusion that if the Temple were only 600 feet square, it would be impossible to find space within its walls for all the courts and buildings mentioned by Josephus and in the Talmud. This difficulty, however, has no real foundation in fact, and the mode in which the interior may have been arranged, so as to meet all the exigencies of the case, will be explained in treating of the Temple. But in the mean while it seems impossible to escape from the conclusion that the square space indicated by shading in the plan (wood-cut No. 4) was the exact area occupied by the Jewish Temple as rebuilt by Herod, and as described by Josephus. [Against this view, see § IV. Amer. ed.]

II. Hippicus. — Of all the towers that once adorned the city of Jerusalem only one now exists in anything like a state of perfection. Being in the centre of the citadel, on one of the most elevated points of the city, it strikes the traveller's eye whichever way he turns; and from its prominence now, and the importance which Josephus ascribes to the tower Hippicus, it has been somewhat hastily assumed that the two are identical. The reasons, however, against this assumption are too cogent to
No. 4.—Plan of Haram Area at Jerusalem
a * Nothing could seem to be more palpable to an observer, than that in the Tower of David, so called, in the present citadel of Jerusalem, we have the remains of one of the three great Herodian towers, spared by Titus, when the city was demolished (R. v. 7 § 1). No theory, which would make it more modern, can explain the structure. Its lower part bears every mark of antiquity, and its cubic solidity (an unusual feature) accords with Josephus's description of these towers. (B. J. v. 4, § 3.) If it was either of them, it must have been Hippicus, for Flaccus and Mariamne lay east of it, and there could not have been a fortress west of this point. Its position relative to the site of the Temple, and to the wall which stretched between them, along the northem brow of Zion, harmonizes with this view. The ruins of Kâbat el-Jâlud offer no rival claim — suggesting nothing more than a modern bastion and an ancient wall. S. W.
have been said to have extended to that fortress, but in either of these cases it is quite impossible that it could have passed outside the present Haram wall so as to meet the old wall at the southeastern angle of the Temple, where Josephus in his description makes the old wall end. There does not seem to be any possible solution of the difficulty, except the one pointed out above, that the Temple was only 600 feet square; that the space between the Temple and the Valley of Kidron was not included within the walls till Agrippa's time, and that the present eastern wall of the Haram is the identical wall built by that king—a solution which not only accords with the words of Josephus but with all the local peculiarities of the place.

It may also be added that Josephus's description (B. j. v. 4, § 2) of the immense stones of which this wall was constructed, fully bears out the appearance of the great stones at the angles, and does away with the necessity of supposing on account of their magnificence, that they are parts of the substructure of the Temple proper.

After describing these walls, Josephus adds that the whole circumference of the city was 32 stadia, or nearly four English miles, which is as near as may be the extent indicated by the localities. He then adds (B. j. v. 4, § 3) that the number of towers in the old wall was 60, the middle wall 40, and the new wall 90. Taking the distance of these towers as 150 feet from centre to centre, which is probably very near the truth on the average, the first and last named walls are as nearly as may be commensurate, but the middle wall is so much too short that either we must assume a mistake somewhere, or, what is more probable, that Josephus enumerated the towers not only to where it ended at the Antonia, but round the Antonia and Temple to where it joined the old wall above Siloam. With this addition the 150 feet again is perfectly consistent with the facts of the case and with the localities. Altogether it appears that the extent and direction of the walls is not now a matter admitting of much controversy, and probably would never have been so, but for the difficulties arising from the position of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which will be alluded to hereafter.

Josephus—Before leaving the subject of the walls, it may be well to fix the situation of the Turbo Antonia, as far as the data at our command will admit. It certainly was attached to the Temple buildings, and on the northern side of them; but whether covering the whole space, or only a portion, has been much disputed. After stating that the Temple was foursquare, and a stadium on each side, Josephus goes on to say (B. j. v. 5, § 2), that with Antonia it was six stadia in circumference. The most obvious conclusion from this would be that the Antonia was of the same dimensions as the Temple, and of the form shown in the diagram (wood-cut No. 5), where A marks the Temple, and B Antonia, according to this theory. In other words, it assumes that the Antonia occupied practically the platform on which the so-called Mosque of Omar now stands, and there is nothing in the locality to contradict such an assumption (see B. j. vi. 5, § 4). On the contrary, the fact of the Sakra being the highest rock in the immediate neighborhood would confirm all we are told of the situation of the Jewish citadel. There are, however, certain facts mentioned in the account of the siege which render such a view nearly if not quite untenable.

It is said that when Titus reviewed his army on Bezeba (B. j. v. 9, § 1), the Jews looked on from the north wall of the Temple. If Antonia, on higher ground, and probably with higher walls, had intervened, this could not have been possible; and the expression must have been that they looked on from the walls of Antonia. We have also a passage (B. j. v. 7, § 3) which makes this even clearer; it is there asserted that "John and his faction defended themselves from the tower Antonia, and from the northern cloisters of the Temple, and fought the Romans" (from the context evidently simultaneously) before the entrance of king Alexander. We are therefore forced to adopt the alternative, which the words of Josephus equally justify, that the Antonia was a tower or keep attached to the northwestern angle of the Temple, as shown in the plan. Indeed, the words of Josephus hardly justify any other interpretation; for he says (B. j. v. 5, § 8) that "it was situated at the corner of two cloisters of the court of the Temple—of that on the west, and that on the north," probably it was surrounded by a wall, inclosing courts and other appurtenances of a citadel, and with its inclosing wall at least two stadia in circuit. It may have been two and a half, or even three, as shown in the diagram (wood-cut No. 6), where C marks the size and position of the Antonia on the supposition that its entire circumference was two stadia, and D) the size it would attain if only three of its sides were counted, and if Josephus did not reckon the four stadia of the Temple as a fixed quantity, and deducted the part covered by the fortress from the whole sum; but in this instance we have no local indication to guide us. The question has become one of very great importance, as it is quite certain that, if the Temple was only 600 feet square, it did not occupy the whole of the northern half of this feature the line given does not correspond with the description.

The third wall, as above stated, joined the (southward part of the) old wall at the valley called the Valley of Kidron. It could not then, have joined it at the point indicated in the text and map, for this point lies between the Kidron and the Tyropoeon valley, more than one third of the distance from the former.

The specification which this writer considers the most important point in his description is claimed by Dr. Robinson in support of the theory which he seeks to displace. (Bib. Hist. 1:461.)
the Haram area, and consequently that neither was the "pool of Bethesda" its northern ditch, nor the rock on which the governor's house now stands its rock foundation. With the Temple area fixed as above, by no hypothesis could it be made to stretch as far as that; and the object, therefore, which many topographers had in view in extending the dimensions, must now be abandoned.*

V. Hills and Valleys. — Notwithstanding the very great degree of certainty with which the site of the Temple, the position of the Hippicus, and the direction of the walls may be determined, there are still one or two points within the city, the positions of which have not yet been fixed in so satisfactory a manner. Topographers are still at issue as to the true direction of the upper part of the Tyropeon Valley, and, consequently, as to the position of Aera, and various smaller points dependent on the fixation of these two. Fortunately the determination of these points has no bearing whatever on any of the great historical questions arising out of the topography; and though it would no doubt be satisfactory if they could be definitely settled, they are among the least important points that arise in discussing the descriptions of Josephus.

The difficulty of determining the true course of the upper part of the Tyropeon Valley is caused by our inability to determine whether Josephus, in describing the city (B. J. v. 4, § 1), limits his description to the city of Jerusalem, properly so called, as circumscribed by the first or old wall, or whether he includes the City of David also, and speaks of the whole city as inclosed by the third or great wall of Agrippa. In the first case the Tyropeon must have been the depression leading from a spot opposite the northwest angle of the Temple towards the Jaffa Gate; in the second it was the great valley leading from the same point northwards towards the Damascus Gate.

The principal reason for adopting the first hypothesis arises from the words of Josephus himself, who describes the Tyropeon as an open space or depression within the city, at "which the corresponding rows of houses on both hills end" (B. J. v. 4, § 1). Would exactly answer the position of a valley running to the Jaffa Gate, and consequently within the old walls, and would apply to such a ravine as might easily have been obliterated by accumulation of rubbish in after times; but it is not so easy to see how it can be made applicable to such a valley as that running towards the Damascus Gate, which must have had a wall on either side, and the slope of which is so gradual, that then, as now, the "rows of houses" might — though it by no means follows that they must — have run across it without interruption. We cannot indeed apply the description to this valley, unless we assume that the houses were built close up to the old wall, so as to leave almost no plain space in front of it, or that the formation of the bottom of the valley was originally steeper and narrower than it now is. On the whole, this view presents perhaps less difficulty than the obliteration of the other valley, which its most zealous advocates are now forced to admit, after the most patient search; added to the difficulty that must have existed in carrying the old wall across its gorge, which Josephus would have hinted at had it existed.

* The opposite view, namely, that the fortress Antonia apparently occupied the whole northern part of the present Haram area, is strongly presented by

The direct evidence seems so nearly balanced that either hypothesis might be adopted if we were content to fix the position of the hill Aera from that of this valley, as is usually done, instead of from extraneous evidence, as we fortunately are able to do with tolerable certainty in this matter.

In all the transactions mentioned in the 12th and 13th books of the Antiquities, Josephus commonly uses the word Ἀσπα as the corresponding term to the Hebrew word Metzidah, translated stronghold, fortress, and tower in the books of the Macabees, when speaking of the fortress which joined the Temple in the north; and if we might assume that the hill Aera and the tower Aera were one and the same place, the question might be considered as settled.

It is more than probable that this was so, for in describing the "upper market-place," which was called the "citadel" by David (B. J. v. § 1), Josephus uses the word φραγμον, which he also applies to the Aera after it was destroyed (Ant. xiii. 16, § 5), or βραγμος, as the old name apparently immediately before it was rebuilt by Herod, and by him called the Antonia (Ant. xviii. 4, § 2).

It is also only by assuming that the Aera was on the Temple Hill that we can understand the position of the valley of the Tyropeon which was obliterated.

It is true that Josephus describes the citadel or Aera of Jerusalem (Ant. xiii. 4, § 9) as situated in the "lower city" (ἐν τη χαρα χαίλη Παλαια, xiii. 5, § 4, B. J. i. 1, § 4), which would equally apply to either of the assumed sites, were it not that he qualifies it by saying that it was built so high as to dominate the Temple, and at the same time lying close to it (Ant. xii. 9, § 3), which can only apply to a building situated on the Temple Hill. It must also be observed that the whole of the Temple Hill is very much lower than the hill on which the city itself was located, and, consequently, that the Temple and its adjuncts may, with great propriety, be called the lower city, as contradistinguished from the other half, which, from the superior elevation of the plateau on which it stands, is truly the upper city.

If we adopt this view, it will account for the great leveling operations which at one time have been carried on at the northwestern angle of the Haram area, and the marks of which have been always a puzzle to antiquaries. These are utterly unmeaning on any hypothesis yet suggested, for so far from contributing to the defense of any work erected here, their effect from their position must have been the very reverse. But if we admit that they were the works which occupied the Jews for three years of incessant labor (Ant. xii. 7, § 6) after the destruction of the Aera, their appearance is at once accounted for, and the description of Josephus made plain.

* If this view of the matter be correct, the word ἄφωνοςματος (B. J. v. 6, § 1), about which so much controversy has been raised, must be translated

sloping down on either side," a meaning which it will bear equally as well as "gibbons," which is usually affixed to it, and which only could be applied if the hill within, the old wall were indicated.

On reviewing the whole question, the great preponderance of evidence seems to be in favor of the assumption that the hill Aera and the citadel Aera were one and the same place; that Aera was situated on the northern side of the Temple, on the same hill, and probably on the same spot, originally occupied by David as the stronghold of Zion (2 Sam. v. 7-9), and near where Baris and Antonia afterwards stood; and consequently that the great northern depression running towards the Damascus Gate is the Tyropean valley, and that the Valley of the Asmonæans was a transverse cut, separating the hill Bezetha from the Aera or citadel on the Temple Hill.

If this view of the internal topography of the city be granted, the remaining hills and valleys fall into their places easily and as a matter of course. The citadel, or upper market-place of Josephus, was the modern Zion, or the city inclosed within the old wall; Aera was the ancient Zion, or the hill on which the Temple, the City of David, Baris, Aera, and Antonia, stood. It lay over against the other; and probably exactly between these two, in the valley, stood the lower city, and the place called Hillel. Bezetha was the well-defined hill to the north of the Temple, just beyond the valley in which the Piscina Probatica was situated. The fourth hill which Josephus enumerates, but does not name, must have been the ridge between the last-named valley and that of the Tyropean, and was separated from the Temple Hill by the Valley of the Asmonæans. The other minor localities will be pointed out in the sequel as they occur in order.

VI. Population. — There is no point in which the exaggeration in which Josephus occasionally indulges is more apparent than in speaking of the population of the city. The inhabitants were dead; no record remained; and to magnify the greatness of the city was a compliment to the prowess of the conquerors. Still the assertions that three millions were collected at the Parcoen (1851, pp. 66, 153, 154), that a million of people perished in the siege: that 100,000 escaped, &c., are so childish, that it is surprising any one could ever have repeated them. Even the more moderate calculation of Tacitus of 600,000 inhabitants, is far beyond the limits of probability.

Placing the Hippicus on the farthest northern point possible, and consequently extending the walls as far as either authority or local circumstances will admit, still the area within the old walls never could have exceeded 180 acres. Assuming, as is sometimes done, that the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre was outside the old walls, this area must be reduced to 120 or 130 acres; but taking it at the larger area, its power of accommodating such a multitude as Josephus describes may be illustrated by reference to a recent example. The great Exhibition Building of 1851 covered 18 acres—just a tenth of this. On three days near its closing 100,000 or 105,000 persons visited it; but it is not assumed that more than from 60,000 to 70,000 were under its roof at the same moment.

Any one who was in the building on these days will recollect how impossible it was to move from one place to another; how frightful in fact the crush was both in the galleries and on the floor, and that in many places even standing room could hardly be obtained; yet if 600,000 or 700,000 people were in Jerusalem after the fall of the outer wall (almost at the beginning of the siege), the crowd there must have been denser than in the Crystal Palace; eating, drinking, sleeping, or fighting, literally impossible; and considering how the site of a town must be measured with buildings, 300,000 in Jerusalem would have been more crowded than were the sight-seers at the Crystal Palace in its most crowded moments.

But fortunately we are not left to such vague data as these. No town in the east can be pointed out where each inhabitant has not at least 50 square yards on an average allowed to him. In some of the crowded cities of the west, such as parts of London, Liverpool, Hamburg, &c., the space is reduced to about 50 yards to each inhabitant; but this only applies to the poorest and most crowded places, with houses many stories high, not to cities containing palaces and public buildings. London, on the other hand, averages 200 yards of superficial space for every person living within its precincts. But, on the lowest estimate, the ordinary population of Jerusalem must have stood nearly as follows: Taking the area of the city inclosed by the two old walls at 750,000 yards, and that inclosed by the wall of Agrippa at 1,500,000, we have 2,250,000 for the whole. Taking the population of the old city at the probable number of one person to 50 yards we have 15,000, and at the extreme limit of 30 yards we should have 25,000 inhabitants for the old city. And at 100 yards to each individual in the new city about 15,000 more; so that the population of Jerusalem, in its days of greatest prosperity, may have amounted to from 30,000 to 45,000 souls, but could hardly have reached 50,000; and assuming that in times of festival one million were added to this amount, which is an extreme estimate, there may have been 60,000 or 70,000 in the city when Titus came up against it. As no one would stay in a beleaguered city who had a home to fly to, it is hardly probable that the men who came up to fight for the defense of the city would equal the number of women and children who would seek refuge elsewhere; so that the probability is that about the usual population of the city were in it at that time.

It may also be mentioned that the army which Titus brought up against Jerusalem did not exceed from 25,000 to 30,000 effective men of all arms, which, taking the probabilities of the case, is about the number that would be required to attack a fortified town defended by from 8,000 to 10,000 men capable of bearing arms. Had the garrison been more than 20,000, the siege would have been improbable, but taking the whole incidents of Josephus's narrative, there is nothing to lead us to suppose that the Jews ever could have mustered 10,000 the number of persons carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar in three deportations from both city and province as only 4,000, though they seem to have sworn off every one who could go, nearly depopulating the place.
 frontal area at any period of the siege; half that number is probably nearer the truth. The main interest of this question lies in a topographical point of view, is the additional argument it affords for placing Hippicus as far north as it has been placed above, and generally to extend the walls to the greatest extent justifiable, in order to accommodate a population at all worthy of the greatness of the city. It is also interesting as showing the utter impossibility of the argument of those who would except the whole northwest corner of the present city from the old walls, so as to accommodate the Holy Sepulchre with a site outside the walls, in accordance with the Bible narrative.

VII. Zion. — One of the great difficulties which has perplexed most authors in examining the ancient topography of Jerusalem, is the correct fixation of the locality of the sacred Mount of Zion. It cannot be disputed that from the time of Constantine downwards to the present day, this name has been applied to the western hill on which the city of Jerusalem now stands, and in fact always stood.

Notwithstanding this, it seems equally certain that up to the time of the destruction of the city by Titus, the name was applied exclusively to the eastern hill, or that on which the Temple stood.

Unfortunately the name Zion is not found in the works of Josephus, so that we have not his assistance to the invaluable aid in this case, and there is no passage in the Bible which directly asserts the identity of the hills Moriah and Zion, though many which cannot well be understood without this assumption. The cumulative proof, however, is such as almost perfectly to supply this want.

From the passages in 2 Sam. vii. 7, and 1 Chr. xi. 5–8, it is quite clear that Zion and the city of David were identical, for it is there said, "David took the castle of Zion, which is the City of David." And David dwelt in the castle, therefore they called it the City of David. And he built the city round about, even from Millo round about, and Joab repaired the rest of the city." This last expression would seem to separate the city of Jerusalem which was required, from that of David which was built, though it is scarcely distinct enough to be relied upon. In the same line of thought, the most distinct passage is that in the 48th Psalm, verse 2, where it is said, "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King," which it seems almost impossible to apply to the modern Zion, the most southern extremity of the city. There are also a great many passages in the Bible where Zion is spoken of as a separate city from Jerusalem, as for instance, "For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of Mount Zion " (2 K. xix. 31). "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem" (Ps. lxi. 18). "The Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem " (Zech. i. 17). "For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem " (Is. xxx. 19). "The Lord shall rear up Zion on her glory, and all his holy persons " (Is. liii. 16; Am. i. 2). There are also unnumberless passages in which Zion is spoken of as a Holy place in such terms as are never applied to Jerusalem, and which can only be understood as applied to the Holy Temple Mount. Such expressions, for instance, as "I set my king on my holy hill of Zion " (Ps. lii. 6) — "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob" (Ps. lxxxvii. 2) — "The Lord has chosen Zion " (Is. xxixii. 13) — "The city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel " (Is. lx. 14) — "Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion to the Lord" (Jer. xxxii. 8) — "Thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Zion " (Zech. viii. 3) — "I am the Lord thy God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain " (Joel iii. 17) — "For the Lord dwelleth in Zion " (Joel iii. 21), and many others, which will occur to every one at all familiar with the Scriptures, seem to us to indicate plainly the hill of the Temple. Substantiate the word Jerusalem for Zion in these passages, and we feel at once how it grates on the ear; for such epithets as these are never applied to that city; on the contrary, if there is a curse uttered, or term of disparagement, it is seldom applied to Zion, but always to her unfortunate sister, Jerusalem. It is never said, — The Lord dwelleth in Jerusalem; or, loveth Jerusalem; or any such expression, which surely would have occurred, had Jerusalem and Zion been one and the same place, as they now are, and generally supposed to have been. Though these cannot be taken as absolute proof, they certainly amount to strong presumptive evidence that Zion and the Temple Hill were one and the same place. There is one curious passage, however, which is scarcely intelligible on any other hypothesis than this; it is known as the "sepalphers of the kings" (2 Chr. xxviii. 27). Jerahim (2 Chr. xxi. 20) narrowly escaped the same punishment, and the distinction is so marked that it cannot be overlooked. The modern sepulchre of David (Neloy David) is, and always must have been in Jerusalem; not, as the Bible expressly tells us, in the city of David, as contradistinguished from the city of the Jehovites.

When from the Old Testament we turn to the Books of the Maccabees, we come to some passages written by persons who certainly were acquainted with the localities, which seem to fix the site of Zion with a considerable amount of certainty; as, for instance, "They went up into Mount Zion, and saw the walls desolate and the courts, and the shrubs growing in the courts as a forest." (1 Macc. iv. 37 and 60). "After this went Nicanor up to Mount Zion, and there came out of the sanctuary certain persons " (1 Macc. v. 33), and several others, which seem to leave no doubt that at that time Zion and the Temple Hill were considered one and the same place. It may also be added that the Rabbis with one accord place the Temple on Mount Zion, and though their authority in matters of doctrine may be valueless, still their traditions ought to have been sufficiently distinct to justify their being considered as authorities on a merely topographical point of this sort. There is also a passage in Nehemiah (iii. 16) which will be alluded to in the next section, and which, added to the above, seems to leave very little doubt that in ancient times the name of Zion was applied to the eastern and not to the western hill of Jerusalem.

[See § IV. Amer. ed.]

VIII. Topography of the Book of Nehemiah. — The only description of the ancient city of Jeru-}

such valuable indications that it is well worthy of the most attentive examination.

No. 7.—Diagram of places mentioned in dedication of walls.

The easiest way to arrive at any correct conclusion regarding it, is to take first the description of the Dedication of the Walls in ch. xii. (31-40), and drawing such a diagram as this, we easily get at the main features of the old wall at least.

The order of procession was that the princes of Judah went up upon the wall at some point as nearly as possible opposite to the Temple, and one half of them, turning to the right, went towards the Dung Gate, and at the Fountain Gate, which was over against them (or, in other words, on the opposite or Temple side of the city), "went up by the stairs of the City of David at the going up of the wall, above the house of David, even unto the Water Gate eastward." The Water Gate, therefore, was one of the southern gates of the Temple, and the stairs that led up to it are here identified with those of the City of David, and consequently with Zion.

The other party turned to the left, or northwards, and passed from beyond the tower of the furnaces even unto the broad wall," and passing the Gate of Ephraim, the Old Gate, the Fish Gate, the towers of Hammeel and Meah, to the Sheep Gate, "stood still in the Prison Gate," as the other party had in the Water Gate. "So stood the two companies of them that gave thanks in the house of God."

If from this we turn to the third chapter, which gives a description of the repairs of the wall, we have no difficulty in identifying all the places mentioned in the first sixteen verses, with those mentioned in the 12th chapter. The repairs began at the Sheep Gate on the north side, and in immediate proximity with the Temple, and all the places named in the dedication are again named, but in the reverse order, till we come to the Tower of the Furnaces, which, if not identical with the tower in the citadel, so often mistaken for the Hippicus, must at least have stood very near to it. Mention is then made, but now in the direct order of the dedication, of the Valley Gate, of the Dung Gate, "the Fountain Gate," and lastly, the "stairs that go down from the City of David."

Between these last two places we find mention made of the pool of Siloah and the king's garden, so that we have long passed the so-called sepulchre of David on the modern Zion, and in the immediate proximity of the Temple: most probably in the valley between the City of David and the city of Jerusalem. What follows is most important (ver. 16), "After him repaired Nehemiah, the son of Azbuk, the ruler of the half part of Beth-zur, unto the place over against the sepulchres of David, and to the pool that was made, and unto the house of the mighty."

This passage, when taken with the context, seems in itself quite sufficient to set at rest the question of the position of the City of David, of the sepulchres of the kings, and consequently of Zion, all which could not be mentioned after Siloah if placed where modern tradition has located them.

If the chapter ended with the 16th verse, there would be no difficulty in determining the sites mentioned above, but unfortunately we have, according to this view, retraced our steps very nearly to the point from which we started, and have got through only half the places enumerated. Two hypotheses may be suggested to account for this difficulty; the one that there was then, as in the time of Josephus, a second wall, and that the remaining names refer to it; the other that the first 16 verses refer to the walls of Jerusalem, and the remaining 16 to those of the City of David. An attentive consideration of the subject renders it almost certain that the latter is the true explanation of the case.

In the enumeration of the places repaired, in the last part of the chapter, we have two which we know from the description of the dedication really belonged to the Temple. The prison-court (iii. 25), which must have been connected with the Prison Gate, and, as shown by the order of the dedication, to have been on the north side of the Temple, is here also connected with the king's high house; all this clearly referring, as shown above, to the castle of David, which originally occupied the site of the Turris Antonia. We have on the opposite side the "Water Gate," mentioned in the next verse to Ophel, and consequently as clearly identified with the southern gate of the Temple. We have also the Horse Gate, that by which Athaliah was taken out of the temple (2 K. xi. 16; 2 Chr. xxiii. 15), which Josephus states led to the Kedron (Ant. ix. 7, § 3), and which is here mentioned as connected with the priests' houses, and probably, therefore, a part of the Temple. Mention is also made of the house of Eliashib, the high-priest, and of the eastern gate, probably that of the Temple. In fact, no place is mentioned in these last verses which cannot be more or less directly identified with the localities on the Temple Hill, and not one which can be located in Jerusalem. The whole of the City of David, however, was so completely rebuilt and remodelled by Herod, that there are no local indications to assist us in ascertaining whether the order of description of the places mentioned after verse 16 proceeds along the northern face, and reached by Ophel, and up behind the Temple back to the Shee Gate; or whether, after crossing the causeway to the armory and prison, it does not proceed along the western face of the Temple to Ophel in the south, and then along the eastern face, back along the northern, to the place from which the description started. The latter seems the more probable hypothesis, but the determination of the point is not of very great consequence. It is enough to know that the description in the first 16 verses applies to Jerusalem, and in the last 16 to Zion, or the City of David: as this is sufficient to explain almost all the difficult.
Topography of the Bible.
IX. Waters of Jerusalem. — The above determination explains most of the difficulties in understanding what is said in the Bible with regard to the water-supply of the city. Like Mecca, Jerusalem seems to have been in all ages remarkable for some secret source of water, from which it was copiously supplied during even the worst periods of siege and famine, and which never appears to have failed during any period of its history. The principal source of this supply seems to have been situated to the north; either on the spot known as the “camp of the Assyrians,” or in the valley to the northward of it. The earliest distinct mention of these springs is in 2 Chr. xxxii. 4, 30, where Hezekiah, fearing an attack from the Assyrians, “stopped the upper water-course of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the City of David;” and again “he fortified the city, and brought in water into the midst thereof, and dug the rock with iron, and made wells for water” (Ecclus. xlviii. 17), in other words, he brought the waters under ground down the valley leading from the Damascus Gate, whence they have been traced at Damascus, to a well which he called the “pool,” between “the two walls,” namely, those of the cities of David and Jerusalem. Thanks to the researches of Drs. Robinson and Barclay, we know how correct the description of Tacitus is, when he describes the city as containing, “fons perennis aque et cavati sub terrâ montes,” etc., for great rock-cut reservoirs have been found under the Temple area, and channels connecting them with the fountain of the Virgin, and that again with the pool of Siloam; and many others may probably yet be discovered.

It would appear that originally the overflow from the great reservoir under the Temple area must have been by some underground channels, probably alongside of the great tunnel under the Mosque el Aksa. This may at least be inferred from the form of the ground, as well as from the fact of the southern gate of the Temple being called the Water Gate. This is further confirmed by the fact that when the Caliph Omar was searching for the Sakrah or Holy Rock, which was then covered with filth by the Christians (Jebel Alhûn, p. 174), he was impeded by the water which “ran down the steps of the gate, so that the greater part of the steps were under water:” a circumstance which might very well occur if these channels were obstructed or destroyed by the ruins of the Temple. Of course, if it is attempted to apply this tradition to the Sakrah under the “Dome of the Rock;” it is simply absurd; as, that being the highest point in the neighborhood, no water could lie around it: but applying it to the real Sakrah under the Aksa, it is not only consistent with facts, but enables us to understand one more circumstance with regard to the waters of Jerusalem. It will require, however, a more critical examination than even that of Dr. Barclay before we can feel quite certain by which channel the underground waters were collected into the great “excavated sea” (wood-cut No. 4) under the Temple, or by what exact means the overflow was managed.

A considerable portion of these waters was at one time diverted to the eastward to the great reservoir known sometimes as the pool of Bethsaida, but, from its probable proximity to the Sheep Gate, as shown above, more properly the “piscina protetica,” and which, from the curiously elaborate character of its hydraulic masonry, must always have been intended as a reservoir of water, and never could have been the ditch of a fortification. From the wood-cut No. 8 it will be perceived that the masonry consists first of large blocks of stone, 18 or 20 inches square, marked A. The joints between their courses have been hollowed out to the depth of 8 inches, and blocks 16 inches deep inserted in them. The interstices are then filled up with smaller stones, 8 inches deep, b. These are covered with a layer of coarse plaster and concrete, (C), and this again by a fine coating of plaster (D) half an inch in thickness. It is impossible to conceive such elaborate pains being taken with a ditch of a fortress, even if we had any reason to suppose that a wet ditch ever formed part of the fortifications of Jerusalem; but its locality, covering only one half of one side of the assumed fortress, is sufficient to dispose of that idea, even if no other reason existed against converting this carefully formed pool into a ditch of defense.

It seems, however, that even in very ancient times this northern supply was not deemed sufficient, even with all these precautions, for the supply of the city; and consequently large reservoirs were excavated from the rock, at a place near Eltham, now known as Solomon’s pools, and the water brought from them by a long canal which enters the city above Siloam, and, with the northern supply, seems at all times to have been sufficient for the consumption of its limited population, aided of course by the rain water, which was probably always stored in cisterns all over the town. The tank now known as the pool of Hezekiah, situated near the modern church of the Holy Sepulchre, cannot possibly be the work referred to, as executed by him. It is merely a receptacle within the walls for the surplus rain water drained into the pool now known as the Bir ket Manufi, and as no outlet eastwards or towards the Temple has been found, it cannot ever have been of the importance ascribed to the work of Hezekiah, even supposing the objections to the locality did not exist. These, however, cannot possibly be got over. [See § IV., Amer. ed.]

X. Site of Holy Sepulchre. — If the preceding investigations have rendered the topography of the ancient city at all clear, there ought to be no difficulty in determining the localities mentioned in the
of the rock, expresses no doubt or uncertainty about the matter. In order to insult the Christians according to his account (Vita Const., iii. 26), "impious persons had heaped earth upon it, and erected an idol temple on the site." The earth was removed, and he says (Theophanis, Lee's Translation, p. 199), "it is astonishing to see even the rock standing out crest and alone on a level land, and having only one house built, and there being many, the miracle of Him who overcame death might have been obscured;" and as if in order that there might be no mistake as to its position, he continues, "Accordingly on the very spot that witnessed our Saviour's sufferings a new Jerusalem was constructed over against the one so celebrated of old, which since the foul stain of guilt brought on it by the murder of the Lord has experienced the last extremity of desolation. It was opposite this city that the emperor began to rear a monument of our Saviour's victory over death with rich and lavish magnificence" (Vita Const. iii. 33). This passage ought of itself to be sufficient to set the question at rest, for it is minutely descriptive of the site of the building now known as the Mosque of Omar, but wholly inapplicable to the site of the present church, which was known as "the tombs of those in the time of Titus or of Herod have been within the walls of the city of Jerusalem, and neither opposite to nor over against it.

The buildings which Constantine or his mother, Helena, erected, will be more particularly described elsewhere (Sepulchre); in the mean while it is sufficient to say that it will be proved by what follows, that two of them now remain—the one the Anastasis, a circular building erected over the tomb itself; the other the "Golden Gateway," which was the propylaeum described by Eusebius as leading to the atrium of the basilica. He says it opened "στην ταύτης θαυμασίας ἀγγέλειαν," in other words, that it had a broad market-place in front of it, as all sacred places or places of pilgrimage had, and have, in the East. Beyond this was an atrium leading to the basilica. This was destroyed in the end of the tenth century by a great fire, but was described by Eusebius, in the words of William of Tyre (lib. i. e. iv.), "usque ad solum diluuit," or as it is more quaintly expressed by Albericus (Le Quien, Origines Christianae, p. 475), "Solo coemarent mandavit." Fortunately, however, even the Moslems respected the tomb of Christ, whom they consider one of the seven prophets, inferior only to the Founder of their own religion; and they left the "Home of the Rock" unjured as we now see it.

In order to prove these assertions, there are three classes of evidence which may be appealed to, and which must coincide, or the question must remain still in doubt:

First, it is necessary that the circumstances of the locality should accord with those of the Bible narrative.

Secondly, the incidental notices furnished by those travellers who visited Jerusalem between the time of Constantine and that of the Crusades must be descriptive of these localities:

Thirdly, the architectural evidence of the buildings themselves must be that of the age to which they are assigned.

Taking the last first, it is hardly necessary to remark how important this class of evidence has become in all questions of this sort of late years. Before the gradation of styles had been properly investigated nothing could be more wild than the
DETERMINATION of the dates assigned to all the medieval buildings of Europe. Now that the chronometric scale has been fixed, nothing is either so easy or so certain as to fix the date of any building, or any part of one, and it is admitted by all archæologists that it is the most sure and conclusive evidence that can be adduced on the subject.

In this country the progress of style is only generally understood as applied to medieval buildings, but with sufficient knowledge it is equally applicable to Indian, Mohammedan, Classical, or Roman, in fact to all true styles, and no one who is familiar with the gradation of styles that took place between the time of Hadrian and that of Justinian can fail to see that the Golden Gateway and Dome of the Rock are about half-way in the series, and are in fact buildings which must have been erected within the century in which Constantine flourished. With regard to the Golden Gateway, which is practically unaltered, this is undoubted. It is precisely of that style which is found only in the buildings of the end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century, and accords so completely with those found at Rome, Spalatro, and elsewhere, as to leave no reasonable doubt on the subject. Had it been as early as the time of Hadrian, the best entablature which covers both the external and internal openings could not have existed, while had it been as late as the age of Justinian, its classical features would have been exchanged for the peculiar incised style of his buildings. It may also be remarked that, although in the outer wall, it is a festal, not a fortified entrance, and never could have been intended as a city gate, but must have led to some sacred or palatial edifice. It is difficult, indeed, to suggest what that could have been, except the basilica described by Eusebius.

That it was possible to put this evidence aside, the most plausible suggestion is to appeal to the presumed historical fact that it was built by Omar, or by the Moslems at all events. There is, however, no proof whatever of this assumption. What Omar did build is the small mosque on the east of the Aksa, overhanging the southern wall, which is often mentioned in the time of the Crusades. It may also be added that, whatever it is, it certainly is not a mosque. The principal and essential feature in all these buildings is the Kiblah, or niche pointing towards Mecca. No mosque in the whole world, of whatever shape or form, is without this; but in the place where it should be in this building is found the principal entrance, so that the worshipper enters with his back to Mecca—a sacrilege which the Mohammedans, if this were a mosque, would be impossible. Had it been called the Tomb of Omar, this incongruity would not have been apparent, for all the old Moslem and Christian tombs adopt nearly the same ordinance; but no tradition links the Emperor Omar or any Moslem saint was ever buried within its precincts.

Nor will it answer to assume, as is generally done, that it was built in the first century of the Hegira over the Sacred Rock of the Temple; for from the account of the Moslem and Christian historians of the time it is quite evident that at that time the site and dimensions of the Jewish Temple could be ascertained, and were known. As shown above this building certainly always was outside the limits of the Temple, so that this could not be the object of its erection. The Mosque of Omar properly so called, the great Mosque el-Aksa, the mosques of the Moghulins and of Abu Bekr, are all within the limits of the old Temple, and were meant to be so (see wood-cut No. 4). They are so because in all ages the Mohammedans held the Jewish Temple to be a sacred spot, as certainly as the Christians held it to be sacred, and all their sacred buildings stood within its precincts; and as we now know there was nothing in Jerusalem of a sacred character built by the Mohammedans outside the four walls of the Temple anterior to the recovery of the city by Saladin.

Irrefragable as this evidence appears to be, it would be impossible to maintain it otherwise than
by assuming that Constantine blindly adopted a wrong locality, if the sites now assumed to be true were such as did not accord with the details of the Bible narratives: fortunately, however, they agree with them to the minutest detail.

To understand this it is necessary to bear in mind that at the time of the crucifixion the third wall, or that of Agrippa (as shown in Plate II.), did not exist, but was commenced twelve years afterwards: the spot where the Dome of the Rock therefore now stands was at that time outside the walls, and open to the country. It was also a place where certain tombs did exist. It has been shown above that the sepulchres of David and the other kings of Israel were in this neighborhood. We know from Josephus (B. J. v. 7, § 3) that "John and his faction defended themselves from the Tower of Antonia, and from the northern cloister of the Temple, and fought the Romans before the monument of king Alexander:"

so that there certainly were tombs hereabouts; and there is a passage in Jeremiah (xxvi. 38-40) which apparently describes prophetically the building of the third wall and the inclosure of the northern parts of the city from Garb — most probably the hill on which Zeophinos stood to Gethseman, which is mentioned as in immediate juxtaposition to the Horse Gate of the Temple, out of which the wicked queen Athaliah was taken to execution; and the description of "the whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook of Kidron, and the corner of the horse-gate toward the east," is in itself sufficient to prove that this locality was then, as it is now, the great cemetery of Jerusalem; and as the sepulchre was nigh at hand to the place of execution (John xix. 42), every probability exists to prove that this may have been the scene of the Passion.

The Prætorium where Christ was judged was most probably the Antonia, which at that time, as before and afterwards, was the citadel of Jerusalem and the residence of the governors, and the Xystus and Council-house were certainly, as shown above, in this neighborhood. Leaving these localities the Saviour, bearing his cross, must certainly have gone towards the country, and might well meet Simon or any one coming towards the city; thus every detail of the description is satisfied, and none offended by the locality now assumed.

The third class of evidence is from its nature by no means so clear, but there is nothing whatever in it to contradict, and a great deal that directly confirms the above statements. The earliest of the travellers who visited Jerusalem after the discovery of the Sepulchre by Constantine is one known as the Bordeaux pilgrim; he seems to have visited the place about the year 333. In his itinerary, after describing the palace of David, the Great Synagogue, and other objects inside the city, he adds, "Hodie ut est loco mundi de Sion sanctus ad Portum Neopolitam ad partem dextram decemam in valle sunt parietes ubi dominus fuit sive palatium Pontii Pilati. Hic Dominus auditis est antequam patiaret. A sinistra autem parte est monticulus Golgota, ubi Dominus crucifixus est. Inde quasi ad lapidem museum est eripita ubi corpus ejus posi-
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From this it is evident that passing out of the ancient Zion Gate he turned round the outside of the walls to the left. Had he gone to the right, past the Jaffa gate, both the ancient and modern Golgotha would have been on his right hand; but passing round the Temple area he may have had the house of Pilate on his right in the valley, where some traditions placed it. He must have had Golgotha and the Sepulchre on his left, as he describes them. In so far as the text is testing one, it is clear he was not speaking of the modern Golgotha, which is inside the city, while the very expression "foris murum" seems to indicate what the context confirms, that it was a place on the verge of the city, and on the left hand of one passing round the walls, or in other words the place marked on the accompanying map.

Antoninus Martyr is the only other traveller whose works have come down to us, who visited the city before the Mohammedan conquest: his description is not sufficiently distinct for much reliance to be placed on it, though all it does say is more in accordance with the eastern than the western site: but he incidentally supplies one fact. He says, "Juxta ipsum altare est crypta ubi sì ponas aureas flumen aquarum, et si jactas ilunas ponas antiquum natura potest et vade ad Sanctum Siloam et ibi illud suscipies" (Ant. Mart. Hin. p. 14).

There is every reason to believe, from the researches of Drs. Robinson and Barclay, that the whole of the Haram area is excavated with subterranean water-channels, and that therefore if you place your ear almost anywhere you may hear the flowing of the water; and all these waters can only drain out towards Siloam. We also know that under the cave in the Dome of the Rock there is a well, called the Bahr Arwah, and that it does communicate with the great excavated road in front of the Akse, and that its overflow is towards Siloam, so that if an apple were dropped into it, in so far as we now know, it would come out there. If we presume that Antoninus was speaking of the present sepulchre the passage is utterly unintelligible. There is no well, and no trace has ever been discovered of any connection, it is with Siloam. As far as our present knowledge goes, this objection is in itself fatal to the modern site.

A third and most important narrative has been preserved to us by Adamnanus, an abbot of Iona, who took it down from the mouth of Arelius, a French bishop who visited the Holy Land in the end of the seventh century. He not only describes, but gives from memory a plan of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but without any very precise indication of its locality. He then describes the Mosque el-Aksa as a square building situated on the site of the Temple of Solomon, and with details that leave no doubt as to its identity; but either he omits all mention of the Dome of the Rock, which certainly was then, as it is now, the most conspicuous and most important building in Jerusalem; or the inference is inevitable, that he has already described it under the designation of the Church of the Sepulchre, which the whole context would lead us to infer was really the case.

Beside these, there are various passages in the writings of the Fathers which are unintelligible if we assume that the present church was the one built by Constantine. Douillet, for instance (l. 1, § 7), says, that owing to the steepness of the ground, or to the hill or valley, to the westward of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre it had only its one wall far that side; "Έκχει δ' αὐτό τὸ άγειν ταφον κατὰ μὲν τὴν δυτικὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῖχου αὐτοῦ." This cannot be applied to the present church, inasmuch as towards the west in that locality there is space for any amount of building; but it is literally correct as applied to the so-called Dome of the Rock, which does stand so near the edge of the valley between the two towns that it would be impossible to erect any considerable building there.

The illuminated Cross, mentioned by St. Cyril (Epist. ad Const.), is unintelligible, unless we assume the Sepulchre to have been on the side of the city next to the Mount of Olives. But even more distinct than this is a passage in the writings of St. Epiphanius, writing in the 4th century, who speaking of golgotha, says, "It does not occupy an elevated position as compared with other places surrounding it. Over against it, the Mount of Olives is higher. Again, the hill that formerly existed in Zion, but which is now leveled, was once higher than the sacred spot." As we cannot be sure to which hill he applies the name, Zion, no great stress can be laid on that; but no one acquainted with the localities would speak of the modern Golgotha as over against the Mount of Olives. So far therefore, as this goes, it is in favor of the proposed view.

The slight notices contained in other works are hardly sufficient to determine the question one way or the other, but the mass of evidence adduced above would probably never have been questioned, were it not that from the time of the Crusades down to the present day (which is the period during which we are really and practically acquainted with the history and topography of Jerusalem), it is certain that the church in the Latin quarter of the city has always been considered as containing the tomb of Christ, and as being the church which Constantine erected over the sacred cave; and as no record exists — nor indeed is it likely that it should — of a transference of the site, there is a difficulty in persuading others that it really took place. As however there is nothing to contradict, and nothing to confirm the assumption that a transference did take place about this time, it is not important to the argument whether or not we are able to show exactly how it took place, though nothing seems to be more likely or natural under the circumstances.

Architecturally, there is literally no feature or [and] no detail which would induce us to believe that any part of the present church is older than the time of the Crusades. The only things in the list of more ancient date are the fragments of an old classical cornice, which are worked in as st.ing courses with the Gothic details of the external façade, and singularly enough this cornice is identical in style with, and certainly belongs to the age of the Golden Gateway and Dome of the Rock, and consequently can scarcely be anything else than a fragment of the old basilica, which el-Hakim had destroyed in the previous century, and the remains of which must still have been scattered about when the Crusaders arrived.

It is well known that a furious persecution of the Christians was carried on, as above mentioned, at the end of the 10th century. Their great basilica was destroyed, their tomb appropriated, they...
were driven from the city, and dared not approach the holy places under pain of death. As the persecution relaxed, a few crept back to their old quarter of the city, and there most naturally built themselves a church in which to celebrate the sacred mysteries of Easter. It is not necessary to assume fraud in this proceeding any more than to impute it to those who built spoliated churches in Italy, Spain, or England. Thousands have prayed and wept in these simulated sepulchres all over the world, and how much more appropriately at Jerusalem! Being in the city, and so near the spot, it was almost impossible but that it should eventually come to be assumed that instead of a simulated, it was the true sepulchre, and it would have required more than human virtue on the part of the priests if they had undeceived the unsuspecting pilgrims, whose faith and liberality were no doubt quickened by the assumption. Had the Christians never recovered the city, the difference would never have been discovered in the dark ages; but when unexpectedly those who had knelt and prayed as pilgrims, came back as armed men, and actually possessed the city, it was either necessary to confess the deception or to persevere in it; and, as was too often the case, the latter course was pursued, and hence all the subsequent confusion.

Nothing, however, can be more remarkable than the different ways in which the Crusaders treated the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque el-Aksa. The latter they always called the "Templum seu palatum Solomonis," and treated it with contempt always applied by Christians to anything Jewish. The Mosque was turned into a stable, the buildings into dwellings for knights, who took the title of Knights Templars, from their residence in the Temple. But the Dome of the Rock they called "Templum Domini." (Jacob de Vitry, c. 62; Sawulf, Rel. de Voyage, iv. 834; Mansedeville, Toning, etc., 100, 105; Mar. Sanutz, iii. xiv. 9; Brecon, vi. 1047.) Priests and a choir were appointed to perform service in it, and during the whole time of the Christian occupation it was held and served as sacred, if not more so, than the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the town. (Will. of Tyre, viii. 3.) Had they believed or suspected that the rock was that on which the Jewish temple stood it would have been treated as the Aksa was, but they knew that the Dome of the Rock was a Christian building, and sacred to the Saviour; though in the uncritical spirit of the age they never seem exactly to have known either what it was, or by whom it was erected. [See § IV. Amer. ed.]

X. Rebuilding of the Temple by Julian.—Before leaving the subject, it is necessary to revert to the attempt of Julian the Apostate to rebuild the Temple of the Jews. It was undertaken avowedly as a slight to the Christians, and with the idea of establishing a counterfeit to the influence and position they had attained by the acts of Constantine. It was commenced about six months before his death, and during that period the work seems to have been pushed forward with extraordinary activity under the guidance of his friend Alypius. Not only were large sums of money collected for the purpose, and an enormous concourse of the Jews assembled on the spot, but an immense mass of materials was brought together, and the stones of the foundations at least carried vigorously on during this period of excitement, before the miracle occurred, which put a final stop to the undertaking. Even if we have not historical evidence of these facts, the appearance of the south wall of the Haram would lead us to expect that something of the sort had been attempted at this period. As before mentioned, the great tunnel-like vault under the Mosque el-Aksa, with its four-domed vestibule, is almost certainly part of the temple of Herod [see Temple], and coeval with his period, but externally to this, certain architectural decorations have been added (wood-cut No. 10), and that so slightly, that daylight can be perceived between the old walls and the subsequent decorations, except at the points of attachment. It is not difficult to ascertain, approximately at least, the age of these adjuncts. From their classical forms they cannot be so late as the time of Justinian; while on the other hand they are slightly more modern in style than the architecture of the Golden Gateway, or than any of the classical details of the Dome of the Rock. They may therefore with very tolerable certainty be ascribed to the age of Julian, while, from the historical accounts, they are just such as we would expect to find them. Above them an inscription bearing the name of Hadrian has been inserted in the wall, but turned upside down; and the whole of the masonry being of that intermediate character between that which we know to be ancient and that which we easily recognize as the especially for the writer on the spot, or to which he owes much of the information detailed above, though it has been impossible to refer to it on all occasions.

a This fact the writer owes, with many other valuable indications, to the observation of his friend Mr. G. Moore. The wood-cut, etc., is from a large photograph which, with many others, was taken.
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work of the Mohammedans, there can be little doubt but that it belongs to this period.

Among the incidents mentioned as occurring at this time is one bearing rather distinctly on the topography of the site. It is said (Gregory Nazianzen, ad Jud. et Gent. 7, 1, and confirmed by Sozomen) that when the workmen were driven from their works by the globes of fire that issued from the foundations, they sought refuge in a neighboring church (ἐν τῷ παρείῳ ἑπάνω, or, as Sozomen has it, εἰς τὸ ἑπάνω) — an expression which would be unintelligible did not the buildings of Constantine exist at that time on the spot; for, except these, there could not be any church or sacred place in the neighborhood to which the expression could be applied. The principal bearing, however, of Julian's attempt on the topography of Jerusalem consists in the fact of its proving not only that the site of the Jewish Temple was perfectly unmistakably to the spot near to which it must have stood, that almost all topographers have jumped to the conclusion that the Mosque el-Aksa is the identical church referred to. Apart from the consideration already mentioned, the architecture of that building is alone sufficient to refute any such idea. No seven-aisled basilica was built in that age, and least of all by Justinian, whose favorite plan was a dome on pendentives, which in fact, in his age, had become the type of an Oriental Church. Besides, the Aksa has noapse, and, from its situation, never could have had either that or any of the essential features of a Christian basilica. Its whole architecture is that of the end of the 7th century, and its ornament is essentially that of a mosque. It is hardly necessary to argue this point, however, as the Aksa stands on a spot which was perfectly known then, and ever afterwards, to be the very centre of the site of Solomon's Temple. Not only this shown from Julian's attempt, but all the historians, Christian and Mohammedan, who refer to Omar's visit to Jerusalem, relate that the Sakkrah was covered with filth and abhorred by the Christians; and more than this, we have the direct testimony of Eutychius, writing in the 9th century, from Alexandria (Annales, ii. 289), “That the Christians had built no church within the area of the Temple on account of the denunciations of the Lord, and had left it in ruins.”

Notwithstanding this there is no difficulty in fixing on the site of this church, inasmuch as the vaults that fill up the southeastern angle of the Haram area are almost certainly of the age of Justinian (wood-cuts Nos. 3, 4), and are just such as

\[a\]

\[\] The only authentic historical fact, under this head, is that the emperor Julian made an abortive attempt to rebuild the Temple.
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Procopius describes: so that if it were situated at the northern extremity of the vaults, all the arguments that apply to the Aeks equally apply to this situation.

We have also direct testimony that a church did exist here immediately after Justinian’s time in the following words of Ant. Martyr. "Ante ruinas vero templi Solomonis aqua decoratur ad fontem Sicon, sequo porticum Solomonis in ecclesin est sedes, sequo Pratum quando ambit Dominum." (Hin. p. 16). As the position of Solomon was the eastern portico of the Temple, this exactly describes the position of the church in question.

But whether we assume the Aeks, or a church outside the Temple, on these vaults, to have been the Mary church of Justinian, how comes it that Justinian chose this remote corner of the city, and so a difficult site, for the erection of his church? Why did he not go to the quarter where, if the modern theory be correct — all the sacred localities of the Christians were grouped together in the middle of the city? The answer seems inevitable: that it was because in those times the Sepulchre and Golgotha were here, and not on the spot to which the Sepulchre with his Mary-church have subsequently been transferred. It may also be added, that the fact of Justinian having built a church above the spot of Mount Zion, is in itself insufficient to prove that in his age the site and dimensions of the Jewish Temple were known, and also that the localities immediately outside the Temple were then considered as sacred by the Christians.

[See § IV., Amer. ed.]

XIII. Conclusion. — Having now gone through all the principal sites of the Christian edifices, as they stand prior to the destruction of the churches by el-Hakeem, the plan (No. 4) of the area of the Haram will be easily understood. Both Constantine’s and Justinian’s churches having disappeared, of course the restoration of these is partly conjectural. Nothing now remains in the Haram area but the Mohammedan buildings situated within the area of Solomon’s Temple. Of the Christian buildings which once existed there, there remain only the inaccessible precipices of Constantine — now known as "the Mosque of Omar" and "the Dome of the Rock" — certainly the most interesting; as well as one of the most beautiful Christian buildings in the East, and a small but equally interesting little domical building called the Little Sakhra at the north end of the inclosure, and said to contain a fragment of the rock which the angel sat upon, and which closed the door of the sepulchre (Ali Bey, ii. 225). These two buildings are entire. Of Constantine’s church we have only the festal entrance, known as the Golden Gateway, and of Justinian’s only the substructions.

It is interesting to compare this with a plan of the city (woodcut No. 11) made during the Crusades, and copied from a manuscript of the twelfth century, in the Library at Brusel. It gives the traditional sacred precincts much as they are now with the exception of St. Stephen’s Gate, which was the name then applied to that now known as the Damascus Gate. The gate which now bears its name was then known as that of the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The "Temple of Solomon," i.e. the Mosque of el Aksa, is divided by a wide street from that of our Lord; and the Sepulchre is represented as only a smaller copy of its prototype within the Haram area, but very few in area, so as to say the least of it.

Having now gone through the main outlines of the topography of Jerusalem, in so far as the limits of this article would admit, or as seems necessary for the elucidation of the subject, the many details which remain will be given under their separate titles, as Temple, Tomb, Palace, etc. It only remains, before concluding, to recapitulate here that the great difficulties which seem hitherto to have rendered the subject confused, and in fact inexplicable, were (1) the improper application of the name to the northern hill, and (2) the assumption that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built by Constantine.

The moment we transfer the name, Zion, from the western to the eastern hill, and the scenes of the Passion from the present site of the Holy Sepulchre to the area of the Haram, all the difficulties disappear: and it only requires a little patience, and perhaps in some instances a little further investigation on the spot, for the topography of Jerusalem to become as well, or better established, than that of any city of the ancient world.

* IV. TOPOGRAPHY OF THE CITY.

It will be seen from the preceding that the two points in the topography of Jerusalem which Mr. Ferguson regarded as demanding special elucidation — the position of Mount Zion, and the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. With reference to both, he has advanced theories which are original — theories which not only have not been breached before, and are unsupported by a single tradition, but which, so far as is known, contradict the previous impressions of the Christian world. Speculations so novel respecting localities so prominent in the history of the sacred city, naturally awaken the reader’s surprise and suspicion, and demand a candid scrutiny.

We will examine these points separately —

I. Mount Zion. — Mr. Ferguson’s theory is, that the Mount Zion of the sacred writers is not "the western hill on which the city of Jerusalem now stands, and in fact always stood," but "the eastern hill, or that on which the Temple stood."

On this point we will consider —

(1) The testimony of the Sacred Scriptures. —

The sacred historian says, "As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Israel could not drive them out, but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day." (Josh. xv. 63). Four hundred years later, "David and all Israel went to Jerusalem, which is Jebus, where the Jebusites were, the inhabitants of the land. And the inhabitants of Jebus said to David, Thou shalt not come hither. Nevertheless, David took the castle of Zion, which is the City of David. And David dwelt in the castle: therefore they called it, The City of David'" (1 Chr. xi. 4, 5, 7). Here was his citadel, and here his residence; and hence the frequent allusions in the Bible to the towers, bastions, and palaces of Zion. A few years later, "David made him houses in the City of David, and prepared a place for the ark of God, and pitched for it a tent." "So they brought the ark of God, and set it in the midst of the tent that David had pitched for it" (1 Chr. xv. 1). Thirty years after, "Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, in Mount Moriah" (2 Chr. iii. 1). Seven years later, "Solomon approached the site of the Mount Moriah, the site of the ark of the covenant of the Lord, out of the City of David, which is Zion" (2 Chr. v. 2), and then fol-
The account of their removing the ark and depositing it in the Temple.

From this it is clear that the Jebusite stronghold which David stormed, and where he dwelt, was Zion, or the City of David: that the ark of the covenant was brought to this spot, and from it was transferred to the Temple on Mount Moriah; and that Mount Moriah, the site of the Temple, could not have been identical with Zion, the City of David. This view appears on the face of the narrative, and there is not a passage of Scripture which conflicts with it, or which it renders difficult or obscure.

Mr. Fergusson says, "There are a number of passages in which Zion is spoken of as a holy place, in such terms as are never applied to Jerusalem, and which can only be applied to the holy Temple Mount." Surely, no straws can be too elevated to be applied to the mount on which the tabernacle was pitched, and where the ark of the covenant stood — the seat of the theocracy, the throne alike of David and of David's Lord, the centre of dominion and of worship. Indeed, the verse quoted, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," could only be affirmed of that western hill which was the royal residence. The same may be said of the verse quoted as specially difficult, on the received theory, in its allusion to the "sides of the north," the reference here being to the lofty site of the city; and to one who approaches it from the south, the precipitous brow of Zion invests the description with a force and beauty which would be lost by a transfer to the other eminence.

It is, moreover, a mistaken impression that greater sanctity is ascribed to Zion than to Jerusalem, or that the two names are, in this respect, carefully distinguished. What passage in the Bible recognizes greater sanctity in a locality than the plain-tive apostrophe: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy"? The Song of songs sets forth the divine beauty of the bride, or loved one, by the simile, "comedy as Jerusalem"; and the call of the evangelical prophet is, "Awake, put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city." The localities are thus constantly declared to be "the Lord in Zion and his praise in Jerusalem." The names are, and may be, used interchangeably, without "grating on the ear"; and the extraordinary assertion, "It is never said, The Lord dwelleth in Jerusalem, or loveth Jerusalem, or any such expression," we meet with the inspired declarations from the Chronicles, the Psalms, and the Prophets, "I have chosen Jerusalem that my name might be there"; "The God of Jacob, whose habitation is in Jerusalem"; "Blessed be the Lord out of Zion, who dwelleth at Jerusalem"; "Thus saith the Lord, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem." Our Saviour expressly forbade the profanation of the name; and through the force of the same sacred associations, the beloved disciple could find no more fitting type of heaven itself, as he beheld it in vision — the New Jerusalem, the New Jerusalem.

Mr. Fergusson remarks — that the sepulchres of David and his successors were on Mount Zion, or in the City of David, but the wicked king Ahaz, for his crimes, was buried in Jerusalem, "in the city," and not in the sepulchres of the kings. Jehoram narrowly escaped the same punishment, and the distinction is so marked, that it cannot be overlooked." The burial of King Ahaz is thus recorded: "And they buried him in the city, in Jerusalem, but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chr. xxvii. 27). That of King Jehoram (which Mr. Fergusson overlooks) is as follows: "They buried him in the City of David, but they buried him not in the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chr. xxiv. 20). That of King Josiah (which Mr. Fergusson emphasizes) is as follows: "They buried him in the City of David, but they buried him not in the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chr. xxx. 21). Mr. Fergusson assumes that there is a "marked distinction" between the first and the last two records. We assume that the three accounts are, in substance, identical; and we submit the point to the judgment of the reader, merely adding, that of the three monarchs, Jehoram was apparently the most excrated, and Josaphat, who is silent about the burial of Ahaz, describes that of Jehoram as ignominious.

Mr. Fergusson says, "There are a great many passages in which Zion is spoken of as a separate city from Jerusalem," and addsuces instances in which the Hebrew scholar will recognize simply the parallelism of Hebrew poetry; no more proving that Zion was a separate city from Jerusalem, than the exclamation, "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel," proves that Jacob was a separate people from Israel.

The term Zion came, naturally, to be employed both by sacred and profane writers, as the representative of the whole city, of which it formed so prominent a part. It was thus used by the later prophets, quoted above, as also in the Book of the Macabees, where it evidently includes the Temple and adjacent mount.

The passage cited by Mr. Fergusson from Nehemiah (iii. 16) which he pronounces "important," is as follows: "After him repaired Nehemiah the son of Azbuk, the ruler of the half part of Beth-zur, unto the place over against the sepulchres of David, and to the pool that was made, and unto the house of the mighty. These localities, with many others named in the chapter, can only be fixed correctly. On the face of the passage they accord well with the received theory respecting Mount Zion, with which locality Dr. Barclay, after carefully examining the matter on the ground; associates them, and represents the wall here described as running "along the precipitous brow of Zion." (City, etc., pp. 128, 155.) This interpretation has just received strong confirmation, and the case is proceeding (Neh. iii.18) becomes a proof-test in the argument which identifies the ancient City of David with the modern Zion. In this verse mention is made of "the stairs that go down from the City of David," and Mr. Tristram reports the interesting discovery of a flight of steps in the rock, in some excavations made by the Anglican Bishop below the English Cemetery on Mount Zion (Land of Israel). From this, as from the Scripture quotations, Mr. Fergusson's theory derives no support. This dispose of the Biblical testimony.
We will now consider —

(2.) The testimony of Josephus.—Josephus does not use the word Zion; but his paraphrase of the Scriptural narrative accords entirely with the above:

"David took the lower city by force, but the citadel held out still" (Ant. xiv. 4, § 2), with the other particulars as already given. He also says, "The city was built upon two hills, and that which contains the upper city, is much higher, and accordingly it was called the citadel by King David" (Ant. xiv. 15, § 2). In the siege by Pompey, one party within counseling resistance and the other submission, the former seized upon the Temple and the bridge which reached from it to the city, and prepared themselves to abide a siege, but the others admitted Pompey's army in, and delivered up both the city and the king's palace to him" (Ant. xiv. 4, § 2), and, having secured these, he laid siege to the Temple, and captured its occupants. In the siege by Herod, when the outer court of the Temple and the lower city were taken, the Jews fled into the inner court of the Temple and into the upper city" (Ant. xiv. 16, § 2). In the siege by Titus, after the lower city had been taken, and it became necessary to raise an embankment against the upper city, "the works were erected on the west side of the city, over against the royal palace" (J. J. vi. 8, § 1). Describing the Temple, Josephus says, "In the western parts of the inclosure of the Temple were four gates, one leading over to the royal palace, the valley between being intercepted to form a passage" (Ant. xx. 11, § 5). He says that "king Agrippa built himself a very large dining-room in the royal palace," from which he "could observe what was done in the Temple"; which so displeased the Jews, that they "erected a wall upon the uppermost building which belonged to the inner court of the Temple, to the west; which wall, when it was built, intercepted the prospect of the dining-room in the palace" (Ant. xx. 8, § 11).

Nothing can be plainer than that the upper city of Josephus is identical with the Zion, or City of David, of the sacred Scriptures; that the citadel and the royal palace were on this western hill; that the Temple was on the lower eastern hill, separated from the western by a deep valley, which was spanned by a bridge; and that the whole the Temple is not identical with the Mount Moriah of the Bible, and distinct from Mount Zion. This view, which is in harmony with the Scriptural view already given, accords also with every other allusion in Josephus to these localities. And the substructions of the bridge above referred to, are the most striking feature in the remains of the modern city. With this, we take leave of Josephus.

(3.) Christian Itineraries.—This brings us to the Christian Itineraries, etc., and their testimony is uniform and unbroken. Except one or two wild speculations, no other Mount Zion has been known, from the days of Eusebius down, than the high western hill of Jerusalem which now bears the name. So late as 1852, Prof. Robinson referred to this as one of the few points "yet unassailed" (Bibl. Res. p. 296). The careful reader of the preceding article, in chiding the "Annals" of the city, will notice the confusion which has been introduced into it by this theory of its "Topography." The writers of the historical portions (Messa, Grove and Wright), both eminent Biblical scholars, have passed over to their fellow-contractor (Mr. Ferguson) most of the topographical points; but it was impossible for them to write an intelligible narrative without contradicting him. From many sentences of the same kind, we select three or four which exhibit the necessary failure of the attempt to harmonize the theory with the facts of history and topography.

"As before, the lower city was immediately taken and, as before, the citadel held out. The undaunted Jebusites believed in the impregnable of their fortress. A crowd of warriors rushed forward, and the citadel, the fastness of Zion, was taken. It is the first time that the same place appears in the history. David at once proceeded to secure it in his new acquisition. He inclosed the whole of the city with a wall, and connected it with the citadel. In the litter he took up his own quarters, and the Zion of the Jebusites became the City of David."—(pp. 1282, 1283.)

"The Temple was at last gained; but it seemed as if half the work remained to be done. The upper city, higher than Moriah, inclosed by the original wall of David and Solomon, and on all sides precipitous, except at the north, where it was defended by the wall and towers of Herod, was still to be taken. Titus first tried a parley, he standing on the east end of the bridge, between the Temple and the upper city, and John and Simon on the west end."—(p. 1287.)

"Acre was situated on the northern side of the Temple, on the same hill, and probably on the same spot occupied by David as the stronghold of Zion."—(p. 1280.)

"There is no passage in the Bible which directly asserts the identity of the hills Zion and Moriah, though [there are] many which cannot well be understood without this assumption. The cumulative proof, however, is such as almost perfectly to supply this want."—(p. 1321.)

The first two extracts are from the historical, and the last two from the topographical, portion of the article; and the reader will see that they are in irreconcilable conflict. Before quitting the theme, let us gather into one sentence such points as are consistent with each other and with known facts and probabilities.

The city or stronghold of the Jebusites was the southernmost part of the western ridge, the highest, most inaccessible, and easily fortified ground in the city; conquered by David, it became his fortified abode: his castle or citadel was here, and remained here; his palace was built here, and through successive reigns and dynasties, down to the Christian era, it continued to be the royal residence: it was the ancient as it is the modern Zion, inclosed by the old wall, the original wall, it was the upper city, the upper market-place; it was here that the ark abode until its removal to the Temple; the royal sepulchres were here; and Moriah was the southern portion of the eastern ridge, and on this the Temple was built. This statement embodies, we believe, the truth of history, and with this we close the discussion of the site of Mount Zion.

We pass now to the other point:

History of the Holy Sepulchre.—Mr. Ferguson's theory is, "that the building now known to Christians as the Mosque of Omar, but by Moslems called the Dome of the Rock, is the identical church which Constantine erected over the rock which contained the tomb of Christ." Since the publication of the preceding article, he has renewed the discussion of this point in a
pamphlet," from which we shall also quote, as it contains a more compact summary of his argument.

He concedes, above, the conclusiveness of the argument by which Dr. Robinson has shown that the present church does not cover " the place where the Lord lay." This has been the battle-ground of recent writers on the topography of the city, and the concession renders it unnecessary to adduce here the proofs which the Professor has brought together, and which may be found in his Biblical Researches (in 1833, pp. 204-205, 631-632). The "power of logic" with which they are presented is not affected by any theory which may be held respecting the identity of any other spot. The argument reaches "its legitimate conclusion," alike whether the reader accepts some other site, or whether he regards the true site as beyond the reach of modern discovery. The theory here offered, like the one which we have examined, is novel and startling; and like that, is put forth with much confidence by a writer who has never examined the localities. We submit our reasons for rejecting it; and as we agree with Mr. Ferguson that the site of the church is not the place of our Lord's burial, our interest in the question is purely historical.

Mr. Ferguson's theory fails to explain the present church, a building of great intrinsic and historic interest. When, and by whom were its early foundations laid? Who built up its original walls? For how many centuries has it been palmed upon the public as the Church of the Sepulchre? Has the largest and most remarkable Christian sanctuary in the East, planted in the very centre and cradle of Christian devotion, come down to us without a chronicle or even an intimation of its origin? We repeat that the early history of such an edifice could not, since the Christian era, and in the most conspicuous spot in Christianity, have faded into utter oblivion, like that of some temple of the Old World, around which the sands of the desert had gathered for ages before Christ.

Mr. Ferguson's theory, while failing to account for the existence of the most imposing church in the East, fails also to account for the disappearance of every vestige of another church of imperial veneration. This argument, like the preceding, is not offered by us as independent proof. Church edifices in Palestine, large and small, have been destroyed by violence, or have crumbled by decay. Some of them have been rebuilt or repaired, and perpetuated on their present sites, like that of the Nativity in Bethlehem, or that of the Sepulchre in Jerusalem; and others are clearly traceable, if not impressive, in their ruins, like that of the Baptist in Samaria, that of St. George's in Lydda, that of St. Anne in El-Aksa, and the ancient cathedral church in Tyre. But what church of the largest class has had a history which corresponds with this theory? The emperor Justinian had a passion for church-building, and decorated his metropolis with a majestic temple, which is still its boast. He erected another in Jerusalem, which he designed to be worthy of "the name of the Great King," as of the Virgin Mother, in whose special honor it was built, " on which great expense and labor were bestowed to make it one of the most splendid in the world."  

It does not appear to have been disturbed by the subsequent convulsions of the country; writers who describe the injury done to the Church of the Sepulchre in the sack of the city by the Persians, and under the Fatimite Khalifs of Egypt, so far as we know, are silent respecting this edifice. The Mosque el-Aksa, which in accordance with prevalent tradition, is almost universally regarded as the original church of Justinian, Mr. Ferguson appropriates as the Mosque of Abd el-Melek. This leaves the church to be provided for, and in the plan of the Haram area, which he has introduced into the Biblical and republished in his Notes, he places the church of Justinian, and sketches its walls, where not the slightest trace appears of a foundation ancient or modern. It is purely a conjectural site, demanded by the exigencies of his theory, according to which the sacred walls, pillars, and arches of a church described by a contemporary historian, and sketched by Mr. Ferguson as four hundred feet in length and one hundred and more in breadth, have vanished as utterly as if they had been pulverized and scattered to the winds. It has disappeared, withal, from a quarter of the city which was never needed nor used for other purposes, where no dwellings could have encroached upon it, and where no rubbish has accumulated. Considering the character, the location, and the dimensions of this building, and the date of its erection, we hazard the assertion that no parallel to such complete annihilation can be found in the East.

The Mosque of Omar near it, Mr. Ferguson claims to have been converted by the Mussulmen conquerors into a mosque from a church; we advance the same claim for the Mosque el-Aksa; and there were similar transformations, as is well known, of the Church of St. John in Damascus, and of the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, built also by Justinian. Instead of converting to the same use the substantial and splendid church which the same emperor had erected here, what could have prompted the Moslems to obliterate every memorial of it? Within the same inclosure, according to Mr. Ferguson, the "great Anastasia of Constantinople," the present Mosque of Omar, built two centuries earlier, survives in all its essential features. The walls of the octagon still remain untouched in their original form; the circle of colonnades and piers that divide the two aisles, with the entablatures, discharging arches, and cornices, still remain entirely unchanged and untouched; the pier arches of the dome, the triforium belt, the clerestory, are all parts of the unaltered construction of the age of Constantinople." (Note, p. 29). The Mosque of Abd el-Melek, the present el-Aksa, abides within the same inclosure in its original strength. "Its whole architecture is that of the end of the seventh century" (p. 1295). But the church of Justinian, standing by their side in rival glory, mysteriously passed away from that open area — wall and column and arch and architrave — from foundation to top-stone, smitten like the psalmist's bay-tree:

"And lo, it vanished from the ground,
Destroyed by hands unseen;
Nor root, nor branch, nor leaf was found,
Where all that pride had been."

Mr. Ferguson's theory leaves the later history of the church of Justinian enveloped in the same darkness as the earlier history of the Church of the Sepulchre.
The rejecters of his theory recognize this ancient house of worship in the building adjacent to the southern wall of the Haram, two hundred and eighty feet long by one hundred and ninety broad, and with a dome 240 feet in diameter, of which traces are still visible. These, however, are not among the impressive objects which it was our fortune to examine in Jerusalem.

What has been said of Justinian's church may be repeated on his theory respecting the church which he affirms that Constantine built within the sacred enclosure, with walls of beaten gold, and which name has vanished in like manner, except a festal entrance which he identifies with the present Golden Gateway in the eastern wall of the Haram area.

On the hypothesis of a transfer of site, not the Christian world alone, but the Moslem world likewise, has been imposed upon, and by parties who could only see the face of the front gate of the Haram. And it is not surprising that all this has been done subsequent to the seventh century. So late as the close of that century, if this theory is true, all Christians and all Moslems, who knew anything about Jerusalem, knew that the present Mosque of Omar was not then a mosque, and never had been; and that the present Church of the Sepulchre, or one on its site, was not the Church of the Sepulchre. On both sides they have since that date been misled by designing men.

All Christians, residents in Jerusalem, and visitors, so far as is known, have from the first ascribed the site of the present church to the emperor, and all Moslems, residents in Jerusalem and visitors, so far as is known, have from the first ascribed the present mosque to the Khalif, and yet in all these centuries they have alike been the dupes and victims of a double delusion and imposture, commencing we know not when. Can this fact be matched, either in historic annals, or in the fabulous legends of the Dark Ages?

An incident in the Mohammedan conquest of the city, narrated by both Christian and Arabian writers, may properly be cited in this connection. We quote from the historic portion of the article:

"The Khalif, after ratifying the terms of capitulation, which secured to the Christians liberty of worship in the churches which they had, but prohibited the erection of more, entered the city and was met at the gates by the patriarch. Omar then, in company with the patriarch, visited the Church of the Resurrection, and at the Muslim time of prayer knelt down on the eastern steps of the basilica, refusing to pray within the buildings, in order that the possession of them might be secured to the Christians. Tradition relates that he requested a site whereon to erect a mosque for the Mohammedan worship, and that the patriarch offered him the spot occupied by the reputed stone of Jacob's vision," etc. (p. 1310).

Passing by the tradition, we have the historic fact that the Khalif declined entering the church, for the reason above given, stated in almost the same words by another writer: "In order that his followers might have no pretext to claim possession of the church after his departure, under the pretense that he had worshipped in it." (Riab. Res. ii. 37). Yet if we may believe Mr. Ferguson, this pledged faith, underlaid alike by both parties, and on the testimony of both scrupulously respected at the outset, was afterwards violated without any known pretext a remonstrance violated on the part of Christians, we know not when, history and tradition being both as silent respecting this transaction as in regard to the "area montis," by which the homage of Christiandom was subsequently transferred to another locality.

We pass now to the testimony of early visitors and writers.

Eusebius, who was contemporary with Constantine, and his biographer, represents the church which he built over the supposed sepulchre, as having an open court on the east, towards the gates of Jerusalem, with cloisters on each side and gates in front, "after which, in the midst of the street of the market (or in the middle of the broad market-place) the beautiful propylaea (vestibule) of the whole structure presented to those passing by on the outside the wonderful view of the things seen within." (Vit. Const. iii. 39).

Along the street of the bazaars, east of the present church, which would make their site identical with "the market-place" of Eusebius, and correspond with the position of the propylaea, are three granite columns, the apparent remains of an ancient portico, and which can be referred to no other structure than the church of Constantine. Mr. Ferguson admits that the propylaea of the church "had a broad market-place in front of it," and to Professor Willis's criticism that this would be "ridiculously impossible" where he locates the building, he replies: "There is now an extensive cemetery on the spot in front of this gateway; and where men can bury they can buy; where there is room for tombs, there is room for stalls" (Notes, p. 50). With reference to this locality, we quote Mr. Grove: "The main cemetery of the city seems from an early date to have been where it is still, on the steep slopes of the Valley of the Kidron. Here it was that the fragments of the idol abominations, destroyed by Josiah, were cast out on the graves of the children of the people" (2 K. xxiii. 6), and the valley was always the receptacle for impurities of all kinds" (p. 1279).

Connect with this the fact that the spot was then, as it is now, outside the city, and on its least populous side, and we have the reader to judge what element of absurdity is lacking in Mr. Ferguson's supposition.

The testimony of Eusebius on another point, that of all the other writers, whom Mr. Ferguson depends upon, is thus summed up in his Notes:—

"In so far as the argument is concerned I would be prepared, if necessary, to waive the architectural evidence altogether, and to rest the proof of what is advanced above on any one of the following four points:—

1. The assertion of Eusebius that the new Jerusalem, meaning thereby the buildings of Constantine, was opposite to, and over against, the old city.

2. The position assigned to the Holy Places by the Bordeaux Pilgrim.

3. The connection pointed out by Antoninus between the Bz Arnaq and Silwan.

4. The assumed omission by Arculfus of all mention of the House of the Rock, and, I may add, by the building of a Mary Church by Justinian within the precincts of the Haram area".— (p. 55.)

We will take up in their order and fairly examine the "four points" here named, with which Mr. Ferguson agrees to stand or to fall.

1. The assertion of Eusebius that the new
Jerusalem, meaning thereby the buildings of Constantine, was opposite to, and over against, the old city.

The assertion referred to, he quotes as follows: —

"Accordingly on the very spot which witnessed the Saviour's sufferings a new Jerusalem was constructed, over against the one so celebrated of old, which, since the foul stain of guilt brought upon it by the murder of the Lord, had experienced the extremity of desolation. It was opposite the city that the emperor began to rear a monument to the Saviour's victory over death, with rich and lavish magnificence."

To this he adds the following passage from Sozomen:

"The mother of the emperor built a magnificent house of prayer on the place of the sepulchre, founding a new Jerusalem opposite to the old and deserted city."

"The old city," in respect to its dwellings, was divided into two parts, "the upper" and "the lower." The former was on Mount Zion and the latter on Mount Akra, and in the adjacent valleys. The site of the Mosque of Omar is directly opposite to the latter, or to the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which "stands directly on the ridge" (Böhl, Res. i. 391). The site of the Temple and that of the church lie "over against" each other. These are the points which Eusebius is comparing. He does not refer directly to the ruined dwellings of either the upper or the lower city; he refers especially to the deserted ruins of the Temple. By "the new Jerusalem," says Mr. Fergusson, he means "the buildings of Constantine. Exactly — he means these and nothing else. And by "the old Jerusalem" he means the buildings of the Temple, neither more or less. Or rather, while the primary meaning is on each side thus restricted, he intends to designate by the latter the ancient city, of which the Temple was the crown, and by the former, the modern city, of which the church was to be the future glory. The antithesis is complete. The other interpretation makes the comparison incongruous — the old city meaning a collection of buildings, and the new city meaning simply a church. Dr. Stanley has justly observed: "Whatever differences of opinion have arisen about the other hills of Jerusalem, there is no question that the mount on which the Mosque of Omar stands, overhanging the valley of the Kidron, has from the time of Solomon, if not of David, been regarded as the most sacred ground in Jerusalem" (S. de P. p. 177, Amer. ed.). This is the fact which the Christian Fathers recognize, using each locality as, in a religious sense, the representative of the city, when they say that the emperor Constantine "founded a new Jerusalem, opposite to the old and deserted city," a phrase, withal, more applicable to the eastern hill, which was burned over, swept "clear of houses," and was still forsaken, than to the western hill, which had never been thus completely desolated, and was still inhabited. Opposite the deserted site of the Hebrew Temple Constantine reared the Christian sanctuary. This is our interpretation of Eusebius and Socrates; and this disposes of the first point.

"2. The position assigned to the Holy Places by the Bordeaux Pilgrim."

His testimony is: —

"Inde sit eas foris murum de Sione etmisibus ad portam Neapolitanam ad partem dextram deorum in valle sunt parietes ubi dominus fuit sive palaestra Pontii Pilati. Ibi Dominus auditus est aequum pateretur. A sinistra autem parte est monticulus Golgota, ubi Dominus crucifixus est. Inde quaedam ad lapidem missum est cripta ubi corpus ejus posita fuit, et tertia die resurrectit. Ibdem modo Jussu Constantini Imperatoris Basilica facta est, id est Dominicum mirae pulchritudinis."

There is no allusion here to a "Zion Gate," and none then existed. (Arculf. i. 1). Had the modern gate been there, no visitor would have passed out of it to go to the opposite side of the city, either to the right or the left, and especially not to the left. It involves, further, the absurd supposition that the governor's house, where the Saviour was arraigned, was in a valley, unprotected, outside of the city, when in the preceding paragraph the writer has asserted that the residence of the governor and the probable scene of the trial was the castle of Antonia.

The natural course of one who passed out of the city northward, going from Zion to the Neapolis Gate, would have been formerly, as now, between the Temple area and the site of the Church of the Sepulchre, near to the latter, and the objects seen would have been in just the relative position in which this traveller describes them.

Mr. Fergusson assumes that this phrase "foris murum" requires us to believe that the visitor's course, here described, from Zion to the Neapolis Gate (called Neapolis then, for the same reason that it is now called Damascus), lay outside of the wall. If so, the reference is to the inner wall along the brow of Zion, the first of the three walls which surrounded this part of the city. This may be the meaning of the barbarous Latin of the old Pilgrim, but far more probably, we think, he means simply what we have indicated above. There never was a road from Zion southward, and no suggestion could be more improbable than that of plunging from Zion into the lower Tyropoeon, outside the city, ascending the opposite slope, and making the long detour by the northeast corner of the city to reach the gate named. The point of destination was northward from Zion, and the Pilgrim says that one who would go beyond the wall, or outside of the city, going from Zion to the Neapolis Gate, would see the objects described, on the right and left. The peculiar construction of the sentence favors this rendering of "foris murum," and we have an authority for it, exactly in point "Foris; in late Latin, with the accusative = de ymou. Constitutis si sit fluvius, qui foris agrum non vagatur." (Andrew's Lex. in loc.). Either of these interpretations we claim to be more natural and probable than Mr. Fergusson's, for the reasons already given; and this disposes of the second point.

"3. The connection pointed out by Antoninus between the Bir Arrosh and Siloam." This testimony is: —

"Near the altar is a crypt, where, if you place your ear, you will hear the flowing of water; and if you throw in an apple, or anything that will swim, and go to Siloam, you will find it there."

In the preceding article, Mr. Fergusson says: "In so far as we know," the connection exists; meaning merely, We do not know that it does not exist. In the Notes he says: "It is, therefore, a fact at this hour," that the connection exists. This is an unsupported assertion. The connection has not been established, and the subterranean watercourses of Jerusalem are still involved in much uncertainty
The witness cited in support of the alleged fact pronounced directly against its probability, and in favor of the opposite theory. Dr. Barclay gives his reasons for believing that the subterranean conduit of Hezekiah was brought down on the west side of the valley running south from the Damoscas Gate, and says that on this hypothesis "it would pass just by the rock Golgotha," the traditional site of the sepulchre, as described by Antoninus (City, etc., pp. 94, 300). Furthermore, in examining the fountain of Siloam, he found a subterranean channel which supplied it, and which he traversed for nearly a thousand feet; and on locating its course, he was "perfectly satisfied that this subterranean canal derived its former supply of water, not from Moriah, but from Zion" (ib. p. 523).

He also says: "If this channel was not constructed for the purpose of conveying to Siloam the surplus waters of Hezekiah's aqueduct, then I am unable to suggest any purpose to which it could have been applied" (ib. p. 309). [Siloam, Aner. ed.] So little countenance, so palpable a contradiction, rather, is given to the "fact" by the witness cited to corroborate it; and this disposes of the third point.

The assumed omission by Arculfus of all mention of the Dome of the Rock, and, I may add, the building of a Mary Church by Justinian within the precincts of the Haram area.

We do not see the bearing of the last-named particular. Churches in honor of the Virgin were erected in many localities, and it is not necessary to account for the selection of this site, though it were easy to conjecture a reason. It proves nothing.

The remaining specification, like the other, is an argument drawn from silence and conjecture, and rates no higher as proof. It runs thus: If this building were then in existence, this visitor must have described it; the building was in existence, and the opposite theory assumes that he did not allude to it; therefore, the current theory is false. We cannot but be struck with the difference between this position and the principle with which Mr. Ferguson professedly started, of "admitting nothing which cannot be proved by direct testimony or by local indications" (p. 1312).

There is no pretense that this argument rests on either of these: it rests on nothing but an unaccountable "omission." And this silence is offered as not merely corroborative evidence, but as vital proof. Mr. Ferguson adds this as one of four points, "any one" of which establishes his theory beyond question. As if the existence of St. Paul's in London, or of St. Peter's in Rome, at any period, would be absolutely disproved by the silence of a visitor respecting either, in a professed description of the objects of interest in the city. At the best, it could only be a natural inference; it could never be proof positive. And here we might rest; for if we proceed no further, Mr. Ferguson's last point is disposed of, and his claim is prostrate.

But we join issue with him, and affirm that what Arculfus describes as the Church of the Sepulchre, was the building standing on the site of the present church, and not the Mosque of Omar, or any part of it. Neither could the "square house of prayer erected at the site of the Temple," have been, as he alleges, the Mosque el-Maka. The phrase "vii fabricati sunt opera," could never have been applied to this structure. The immense quadrangle, rudely built with beams and planks over the remains of ruins as described by the bishop, would seem to be a natural account of the building erected by the Khalif Omar over the rock es-Sukkrah, as Dr. Barclay suggests, which in the course of half a century gave place to the present elegant octagonal edifice, erected by Abi el-Molch (City, etc., p. 336). If the assigned date of the completion of the latter edifice is correct, this would serve to fix more definitely the date of Arculfus' visit, which is only known to have been "in the latter part of the seventh century" (Wright's Introduction, p. xii., Robinson's ed.).

In the Bishop's description of "the Church of the Holy Sepulchre," whatever other changes may have taken place, we have a crucial test of the identity of the building described with the church or the mosque, in the account of the cave which was the reputed tomb of the Saviour. For this, together with that of William, a few years later, and that of Saward, still later, we refer the reader to Bible Sacra, xxiv. 137, 138.

The sepulchral cave of the church, described by these writers, Mr. Ferguson claims to have been the cave in the rock es-Sukkrah, beneath the dome of the present Mosque of Omar. This rock has been the most stationary landmark in Jerusalem, and has probably changed as little as any other object. And it is the only event which accounts for the cave within it, we refer the reader to Bible Sacra, xxiv. 138, 139.

It is not credible that these and the preceding all refer to the same excavation. The narrative of Arculfus can be adjusted to the present Church of the Sepulchre and its reputed tombs, making due allowance for the changes wrought by the destruction of the building. But by no practicable change, by no possibility, can it be adjusted to the rock es-Sukkrah and the cave beneath it; and this disposes of the fourth point.

We have now completed our examination of Mr. Ferguson's "four points." He offered to "rest the proof" of his theory "on any one" of them; and we have shown that on a fair investigation not one of them sustains his theory in a single particular, and for the most part they positively refute it. There remains an objection to this theory, as decisive as any, which can be best appreciated by those who have been on the ground. The site of the so-called Mosque of Omar could not have been, in our Saviour's day, outside of the walls. The theory would break up the solid masonry of the ancient substructions of the Temple area, still existing, making one portion modern and the other ancient, leaving one without the city, and retaining the other within it, in a way which is simply incredible. Whatever may have been the bearings and dimensions of the Temple, with its courts and porticoes, in the inclosure above, the massive foundations of the area are one work, and that a work of high antiquity. The immense beveled stones in the southeast corner were laid at the same time with the stones in the northwest corner. They are of the same magnitude, and it does not need the eye of an architect to assure us that they are of the same age and style of workmanship. They were the two extremities of the ancient southern wall, as they are of the modern, stretching, as Josephus informs us, from valley to valley, and laid with stones "immoveable for all time;" and to-day they confirm his testimony, and contradict this theory. "We are led irresistibly to the conclusion," said Dr. Robinson, on his first visit, "that the area of the Jewish temple was identical on its western
Jerusalem.*

and southern sides, with the present enclosure of the Haram. " Ages upon ages have rolled away, yet these foundations endure, and are immovable as at the beginning" (Bibl. Res. i. 427). The investigations of his second visit confirmed the conclusion of his first, from which we see not how any visitor who has inspected this masory can withhold his assent that in the southwest corner, in the southern part of the western wall, in the southeast corner on both sides, and along the southern wall, we have before us "the massive sub-

structions of the ancient Jewish Temple. Such has been the impression received by travellers for centuries, and such it will probably continue to be so long as these remain endure" (Bibl. Res. (382) 220).

These are our main reasons for rejecting Mr. Fergusson's theory of the Topography of Jerusalem, in its two principal points: and if these points are untenable, almost the entire reasoning of his section of the article falls with them.

S. W.

V. Modern Jerusalem. - Walls and Gates. - The present walls of Jerusalem are not older than the 16th century, though the materials of which they are built belonged to former walls and are much more ancient. They consist of heewn stones of a moderate size, laid in mortar. They are 4 built for the most part with a breastwork; that the exterior face of the wall is carried up several feet higher than the interior part of the wall, leaving a broad and convenient walk along the top of the latter for the accommodation of the defenders. This is protected by the parapet or breastwork, which has battlements and loopholes. There are also flights of steps to ascend or descend at convenient distances on the inside (Rob. Bibl. Res. i. 352). The walls embrace a circuit of about 28 miles. On the west, south, and east sides they stand generally as near the edge of the valleys as the ground will allow: except that the southern extremity of Zion and a part of Moriah (known as Ophel) being outside of the city, the walls there run across the ridge of those hills. They vary in height from 20 to 50 feet, according to the depth of the ravines below, which formed an important part of the natural defenses of the city. The inner face of the wall is therefore, where the ground is more open and level, are protected to some extent by ditches or trenches. It is a peculiarity of a part of this northern wall that it consists of a mass of natural rock, 75 feet high, with strata so exactly corresponding with those of the opposite ledge that the passage between them must be artificial. It may have been a quarry for obtaining stones for the walls of the city. Fortifications of this character, surmounted as they are by higher positions in the vicinity, would be utterly useless against European tactics. Yet, imperfect as they are in this respect, these walls so notched with battlements and seeming to rise and fall (like a waving line) with the de-

divilities of the ground, especially as they suddenly show themselves to the traveller approaching the city from the west, form a picturesque oriental sight, never to be forgotten.

Four gates are present in use, which look towards the cardinal points. Though they bear other names among the natives, they are known to travellers as the Yifta (Joppa) Gate on the west side, the Damascus Gate on the north side, the Gate of St. Stephen on the east, and of Zion on the south. The first two are so called after the places which the roads starting from them lead: that of St. Stephen from a popular belief that this martyr was put to death in that quarter, and that of Zion from its situation on the hill of this name. Near the Damascus Gate are the remains of towers, supposed by Robinson to have been the guard-houses of a gate which stood there as early as the age of Herod. The Yifta Gate forms the main entrance, and on that account is kept open half an hour later than the other gates. The custom of shutting the gates by night (see Rev. xxi. 23-25) is common in eastern cities at the present day. Three or four smaller gates occur in the walls, but have been closed up, and are now seldom or never used. The most remarkable of these is the Golden Gate in the easterm wall which overlooks the Valley of the Kidron. "It is in the centre of a projection 55 feet long and standing out 6 feet. Its portal is double, with semicircular arches profusely ornamented. The Corinthian capitals which sustain the entablature spring like corbels from the wall, and the whole entablature is bent round the arch. The exterior appearance, independently of its architecture, bears no mark of high antiquity . . . . for it bears no resemblance to the massive stones along the lower part of the wall on each side, and indeed the masonry around is sufficiently apparent" (Porter, Handbook, i. 115 f.). The style of architecture, whether the structure occurs on its original site, or has been referred to an early Roman period. [Wood-cut, p. 1325.] It is a saying of the Franks that the Mohammedans have walled up this gate because they believe that a king is to enter by it who will take possession of the city and become Lord of the whole earth (Rob. Bibl. Res. i. 323). It may be stated that the largest stones in the exterior walls, bearing incontrovertible marks of a Hebrew origin, and occupying their original place, are found near the southeast angle of the city and in the substructions of the Castle of David so called, not far from the Yifta Gate, near the centre of the western wall of the city. Some of the alternate courses at the former point measure from 17 to 18 feet in length by 3 or 4 feet in height. One of the stones there is 24 feet in length by 3 feet in height and 6 in breadth. This part of the wall is common both to the Haram and the Temple area. In the stones in the foundations of the Castle is 124 feet long and 3 feet 5 inches broad; though most of them are smaller than those at the southeast angle. The upper part of this Castle or Tower, one of the most imposing structures at Jerusalem, is comparatively modern; but the lower part exhibits a different style of workmanship and is unquestionably ancient, though whether a remnant of Herod's Hippie tower (as Robinson supposes) or not, is still disputed. [P. S. E. STORRIIUM.] The Saviour's language that "not one stone should be left on another" (Matt. xxiv. 2) is not contradicted by such facts. In the first place the expression may be a proverbial one for characterizing the overthrow as signal, the destruction as desolating, irresistible. In the next place this was spoken in reality not of the city and its walls, but of "the buildings of the temple," and in that application was fulfilled in the strictest sense.
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The city is intersected from north to south by its principal street, which is three fifths of a mile long, and runs from the Damascus Gate to Zion Gate. From this principal street, the other streets of the city, both the principal and the secondary, radiate out in all directions, generally running east and west, at right angles to it; among these is the Via Dolorosa 'along the north of the Haram, in which is the Roman archway, called Ecce Homo. The city is divided into quarters, which are occupied by the different religious sects. The boundaries of these quarters are defined by the intersection of the principal street, and that which crosses it at right angles from the Jaffa Gate to the Gate of the Haram, called Bah as-Nilb, or Gate of the Chain. The Christians occupy the western half of the city, the northern portion of which is called the Christian quarter, and contains the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; the southern portion is the Armenian quarter, having the Citadel at its northwest angle. The Mohammedan quarter occupies the northeast portion of the city, and includes the Haram el-Sherif. The Jewish quarter is on the south, between the Armenian quarter and the Haram.' (Ordinance Survey of Jerusalem, p. 9. London, 1865.)

It has been stated that the streets are not known by any particular names. A detailed report of inquiries on this subject (appended to the Ordinance Survey) shows that most of them are thus known: being distinguished by the names of persons or families, from trades carried on in them, or from the places to which the streets or alleys lead. The streets are narrow, uneven, and badly paved, for the most part with a gutter or channel in the middle for beasts of burden. Some of them, those most frequented, are darkened with mats or stone arches for the purpose of excluding the heat. The houses are built of limestone, many of them mere hovels, others more substantial, but seldom with windows to cleanse the air. The low windows guarded with iron grates give to many of them a dreary, prison-like appearance. Some of them have lattice windows toward the street; but generally, these open toward the inner courts on which the houses stand.

Population. — In proportion to the extent of the place, the population of Jerusalem is very dense. The houses in general are closely tenanted, and in some quarters they are piled upon one another, so as to extend across the streets, and make them appear almost like subterranean passages. It is difficult (as no proper system of registration exists) to fix the precise number of the inhabitants. Dr. Schultze, formerly Prussian Consul at Jerusalem, placed it in 1845 at 27,000. The following table exhibits the different classes of this population according to their nationalities and religious confessions:

| 11. Mohammedans | 5,000 |
| 11. Christians | 900 |
| (a) Greeks | 2,000 |
| (b) Roman Catholics | 350 |
| (c) Armenians | 100 |
| (d) Copts | 20 |
| (e) Syrians | 20 |
| (f) Abyssinians | 20 |
| Total | 3,350 |

11. Jews |

| (a) Turkish subjects (S phủ- ardum) | 6,600 |
| (b) Foreigners (Asikkenasim) | 1,100 |
| (c) Caralies | 7,120 |

To the foregoing we are to add the 65 or 70 persons, European Protestants or Catholics, connected with consulates or ecclesiastical establishments, and the Turkish garrison of 899 or 1,000 men, and we have then the aggregate (as stated above) of about 17,000. The number of pilgrims, greatest at Easter, varies from time to time; the maximum may be 18,000. It was about 5,000 in 1843, and about 3,000 in 1844 (Schultz, Jerusalem, Eine Vorlesung, pp. 33, 34). The estimate in the Ordinance Survey (1865) — 16,000 — shows that hardly any change has taken place in the population during the last twenty years. The statement (in this latter work) that the travelers and pilgrims at Easter swell the sum to 30,000, seems almost incredible, unless it be understood of some altogether exceptional year. Tolcher complains (Deutschblatt aus Jerusalem, p. 551) that the Turkish statistics are extremely uncertain. It is generally allowed that the Christian inhabitants slowly increase at the expense of the Mohammedans. Water Supply. — Most of the houses are furnished with cisterns in which the rain-water is collected by means of gutters during the rains from December to March. The western houses often have two or three such cisterns, so arranged that when one is full the water flows into another. "As the water which runs through the filthy streets is also collected in some of these cisterns, it can only be drunk with safety after it is filtered and freed from the numerous worms and insects which are bred in it." Some water is obtained from Jacob's Well [Ex-Rom.], whence it is brought in goatskins on donkeys and sold to the inhabitants. The ancient city was supplied with an abundance of pure water from the three Pools of Solomon near Bethlehem. The works constructed for this purpose, "in boldness of design and skill in execution, rival even the most approved system of modern engineers" (Ordinance Survey, p. 10). The Pacha of Jerusalem has recently repaired the conduit from Solomon's Pools to Jerusalem, which is now supplied from Ain Elon, and "the scaled fountain," above the upper pool.

Jews. — The Jews constitute an interesting class of the inhabitants. Very many of them are pilgrims who have come to Jerusalem to fulfill a vow and then return to the countries where they were born, or aged persons who desire to spend their
but are foreign writings. The privilege of being buried there is obliged to pay a large sum; but if any one is too poor to incur this expense, the body is taken to the slope on Mount Zion where the Tomb of David is situated. Among them are representatives from almost every land, though the Spanish, Polish, and German Jews compose the greater number. Like their brethren in other parts of Palestine, with the exception of a few in commercial places, they are wretchedly poor, and live chiefly on alms contributed by their countrymen in Europe and America. They devote most of their time to holy employments, as they are called. They frequent the synagogues, roam over the country to visit places memorable in their ancient history, and read assiduously the Old Testament and the Talmudic and Rabbinic writings. Those of them who make any pretension to learning understand the Hebrew and Rabbinic, and speak as their vernacular tongue the language of the country where they formerly lived, or whence their fathers emigrated. As would be expected, from the character of the motives which brings them to the Holy Land, they are distinguished, as a class, for their pious attachment to Judaism. The Jews at Jerusalem have several synagogues which they attend, not promiscuously, but according to their national or geographical affinities. The particular bond which unites them in this religious association is that of their birth or sojourn in the foreign land, and their speaking the same language (Comp. Acts vi. 9 ff.). For information respecting the Jews in Palestine, the reader may see especially Wilson's Land of the Bible (2 vols. Edinb. 1847) and Bosan and M'Cheyne's Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews, in 1859 (24th thousand, Edinb. 1852. The statements in these works remain substantially correct for the present time.

Burial Places. — Modern burial places surround the city on all sides. Thus, on our right as we go out of St. Stephen's Gate is a Mohammedan cemetery, which covers a great part of the eastern slope of Moriah, extending to near the southeast angle of the Haram. This cemetery, from its proximity to the sacred area, is regarded as specially sacred. The least prominent of the Moslem monuments is on the west side of the city, near the Kirbet Mamilla, or Upper Gihon, a reservoir so named still in use. The Moslem Sheikhs or Saints are buried in various parts of the city and neighborhood, especially along the western wall of the Haram. The Moslems are buried without cofins, being simply wrapped in a sheet, and are carried to the grave in a sort of wooden box, borne on the shoulders of six men. The body is preceded by a man bearing a palm branch and followed by the mourners. Prayers are offered up in the mosque whilst the body is there, and at the grave the Koran is recited, and the virtues of the deceased extolled. The outside portion of Mount Zion is occupied chiefly as a place of burial for the Christian communities, i.e., Catholics, Greeks, Armenians, and Protestants. Not far from David's Tomb there is a little cemetery which the press has been accustomed to call the burying-ground of some of the most famous of the Jewish nation who have died at Jerusalem. One of the graves is that of the late Prof. Fiske of Amherst College, whose memory is still cherished among us by so many pupils and friends. The great Jewish cemetery, as already mentioned, lies along the base and to the sides of Olivet. The white slabs which cover the graves are slightly elevated and marked with Hebrew inscriptions. It should be stated that the traditional spot is the grave of bursts it.

Churches. — It is impossible to do more than glance at this branch of the subject. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, in the northwest part of the city, stands over the reputed place of the Savior's tomb, mentioned in the history of the Passion. It is the most imposing edifice in Jerusalem, after the Mosque of Omar. It was built in 1808, on the site of a more ancient one destroyed by fire. Some monument of this kind has marked the spot ever since the time of the Empress Helen, about A. D. 326, and perhaps earlier still. It does not belong to this place to discuss the question of the genuineness of the site. For a convenient résumé of the arguments on both sides, Stanley refers to the Museum of Classical Antiquities, April, 1848. Nothing decisive has more recently been brought to light. This church is in reality not so much a single church as a cluster of churches or chapels. The church is entered by a door leading out of an open court on the south, never opened except by a member of the Moslem family. It is always open for a few hours in the morning and again in the afternoon. The open court is paved with limestone and worn as smooth as glass by the feet of pilgrims. Here the vendors of souvenirs of the Holy Land from Bethlehem expose their wares and drive a thriving trade. On the east side are the Greek convent of Abraham, the Armenian church of St. John, and the Coptic church of the Angel: on the west side are three Greek chapels, that of St. James, that of the Forty Martyrs, in which a very beautiful font, and that of St. John; at the eastern end of the south side of the court is a Greek chapel, dedicated to the Egyptian Mary, and east of the entrance a flight of steps leads to the small Latin Chapel of the Agony. The Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre is in the centre of the Rotunda, built principally of the limestone known as "Santa Croce marble." What is shown as the Tomb of our Lord is a raised bench, 2 feet high, 6 feet 4 inches long, covered on the top by a marble slab. No rock is visible at the present time. Monsignor Capt. Wilson, "but may exist below the marble slab, as in forming the level floor of the Rotunda a great quantity of rock must have been cut away, and the portion containing the tomb would naturally be left intact." The church is at present undergoing important repairs.

Near St. Stephen's Gate is the Church of St. Anne, built over a grotto, which looks like an ancient cistern. The church belongs to France, and is being almost rebuilt at great expense. It shows the scarcity of wood that the timber required in these repairs has to be imported at Yaffa, and then transported over the heavy roads to Jerusalem. The Church of St. James in the Armenian convent is one of the richest in gilding, decorations, and pictures in the city. Nearly opposite the Pool of Hezekiah is the Greek church and convent of "the Forerunner," comparatively modern and of light architecture, belonging to the usual Greek style. a The church of the Anglo Russian

---

a. We have taken these brief statements (to some extent, verbally), from the Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem, our best recent authority (1865). It may be in place to say here that Col. James, the Director of the
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ESCAPED on Mount Zion, though not large, is a most edifice, built of limestone, in the form of a cross. The preaching in this church on the Sab- bath and at other times is in German and in Eng- lish. See an interesting sketch of the origin and objects of this escapel by Gilder in Herzog’s Real-Encycl., vi. 503-505. The London Jews’ Society expends large sums of money for the benefit of the Palestine Jews, through the agency of this Jerusalem bishopr. On the rising ground west of the city stands the immense Robinson pile, a new building, which completely overshadows every other architectural feature. It combines in some degree the appearance and the uses of cathedral close, public offices, barracks, and hostelry; the flag of the Russian consolate floats over one part, while the tall cupola of the church commands the centre. There are many Russian priests and monks, and shelter is provided for the crowds of Musscovite pilgrims” (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 174, 2d ed.). All recent travellers testify that the distinc- tive oriental character of Jerusalem is rapidly fall- ing away and a European coloring taking its place.

Old Jerusalem. — It is ascertained that a labyrinth of great extent and of complicated in- tricacy exists under the present Jerusalem. It is unquestionably very ancient, but having been so recently discovered or rediscovered, belongs in that point of view to our own times, quite as much as to its own proper antiquity. Dr. Barclay has the merit of bringing this wonderful excavation to the knowledge of European and American travellers. We insert an abridged account of this discovery in the words of Dr. R. G. Barclay (in the City of the Great King, pp. 460-463, 1st ed.): —

Having provided ourselves with all the requisites for such a fascinating adventure — matches, candles, compass, tape-line, paper, and pencils — a little previous to the time of closing the gates of the city, we sat down at one of the better, to avoid exciting suspicion, and rendezvoused at Jeremiah’s Pool, near to which we secreted ourselves within a white enclosure surrounding the tomb of a departed Arab sheik, until the shades of darkness enabled us to approach unperceived, when we issued from our retreat, and, by the aid of the compass, compasses, scenting of hawks, howling of jackals, and the chirping of nocturnal insects. The mouth of the cavern being immediately below the city wall, and the houses on Beza, we proceeded cautiously in the work of removing the dirt, mortar, and stones; and, after undermining and picking awhile, a hole (commenced a day or two previous by our dog) was made, though scarcely large enough for us to worm our way serpentinely through the ten foot wall.

On scrambling through and descending the inner side of the wall, we found our way apparently obstructed by an immense mound of soft dirt, which had been thrown in, the more effectually to close up the entrance; but, after examining awhile, discovered that it had settled down in some places sufficiently to allow us to crawl out on hand and knees; which having accomplished, we found ourselves enveloped in thick darkness, that might be felt, but not penetrated by all our lights, so vast is the hall.

"For some time we were almost overcome with feelings of awe and admiration (and I must say apprehension, too, from the immense impending vaulted roof), and felt quite at a loss to decide in which direction to wend our way. There is a con- stant and in many places very rapid descent from the entrance to the termination, the distance be- tween which two points, in a nearly direct line, is 750 feet; and the cave is upwards of 4,000 feet in circumference, supported by great numbers of rude natural pillars. At the southern extremity there is a very deep and precipitous pit, in which we received a very salutary warning of caution from the dead — a human skeleton! supposed to be that of a person who, not being sufficiently supplied with lights, was precipitated headlong and broke his neck."

"We noticed bats-clinging to the ceiling in several places, in patches varying from fifty to a hundred and fifty, hanging together, which flew away at our too near approach, and for some time continued to flit and scream round and about our heads in rather disagreeable proximity. Numerous crosses marked on the wall indicated that, though unknown to Christendom of the present day, the devout Pilgrim or Crusader had been there; and a few Arabic and Hebrew inscriptions (though too much effaced to be deciphered) proved that the place was not unknown to the Jew and Arab. Indeed, the manner in which the beautiful white solid limestone rock was everywhere carved by the mason’s rough chisel into regular pillars, proved that this extensive cavern, though in part natural, was formerly used as the grand quarry of Jeru- salem... There are many intricate meandering passages leading to immense halls, as white as the driven snow, and supported by colossal pillars of irregular shape — some of them placed there by the hand of nature, to support the roof of the various grottos, others evidently left by the stone quarry in quarrying the rock to prevent the inmuddling of the city. Such reverberations I never heard before."

"What untold toil was represented by the vast piles of blocks and chippings, over which we had to clamber, in making our exploration! A melodious grandeur — at once exciting and depressing — pervaded these vast solitudes. This, without doubt, is the very magazine from which much of the Temple rock was hewn — the pit from which was taken the material for the silent growth of the Temple. How often, too, had it probably been the last place of retreat to the wretched inhabitants of this guilty city in the agonizing extremities of her various overthrows! It will probably yet form the grave of many that are living over it! for the work of disintegration and undermining is going on surely, though slowly."

More recent explorers confirm this report, and supply other information. "The roof of rock,"
... and SS. Thamsom, "is about 30 feet high, even above the huge heaps of rubbish, and is sustained by large, shapeless columns of the original rock, left for that purpose by the quarrymen, I suppose. In some places we climbed with difficulty over large masses of rock, which appear to have been shaken down from the roof, and suggest to the nervous the possibility of being ground to powder by similar masses which hang overhead. The general direction of these excavations is southeast, and about parallel with the valley which descends from the Damascus Gate. I suspect that they extended down to the Temple area, and also that it was into these caverns that many of the Jews retired when Titus took the Temple, as we read in Josephus. The whole city might be stowed away in them; and it is my opinion that a great part of the very white stone of the Temple must have been taken from these subterranean quarries" (Land and Book, ii. 491 f.).

Capt. Wilson says further: "In places the stones have been left half cut out, and the marks of the chisel and pick are as fresh as if the workmen had just left, and even the black patches made by the smoke of the lamps remain. The tools employed seem to have been much the same as those now in use, and the quarrymen to have worked in gangs of 5 or 6, each man carrying in a vertical cut as a whole 4 inches broad till he had reached the required depth. The height of the course would determine the distance of the workmen from each other; in these quarries it was found to be about 1 foot 7 inches. When the cuts had all obtained the required depth, the stones were got out by working in from the end. The cuts were apparently made with a two-handed pick, and worked down from above. In one part of the quarry is the so-called wall, which is nothing more than the leakage from the cisterns above, and the constant dripping has worn away the rock into the form of a basin. The steps left by the quarrymen for getting about can be easily traced. On the opposite side of the road is another old quarry, worked in a similar manner, but not to the same extent, to which the name of Jeremiah's Grotto has been given" (Ordnance Survey of the Holy Land, p. 191, 2d ed.), "the very niches remained out of which the great blocks had been hewn which form the Temple wall. There lay on the ground in one corner a broken monolith, which had evidently split in the process of removal, and had been left where it fell. The stone here is very soft, and must easily have been sawn, while, like some other limestones, it hardens almost to marble on exposure."

Antiquities in and around the City. — Some account has been given of these in previous sections of this article. The only point on which we propose to remark here, is that of the obscurity still resting on some of the questions connected with the ancient topography of the city and the impossibility of identifying the precise scene of many of the events of the Old and the New Testament history. Traditions, it is true, are current among the oriental Christians, which profess to give us all the information on this subject that one could desire. But, in general, such traditions are nothing more than vague conjectures; they are incapable of being traced back far enough to give them the value of historical testimony, and are often contradicted by facts known to us from the Bible, or with other traditions maintained with equal confidence. Even conclusions once admitted as facts into our manuals of geography and archaeology have been from time to time drawn into question or disproved by the results of further study and research.

But this state of our knowledge should not disappoint or surprise the reader. It admits of a ready and satisfactory explanation. "No ancient city," says Raumer, "not excepting Rome itself, has undergone (since the time of Christ) so many changes as Jerusalem. Not only houses, palaces, temples, have been demolished, rebuilt, and destroyed anew, but entire hills on which the city stood have been dug down, and valleys filled up" (Palastin, p. 253, 3d ed.). When, a few years ago, the Episcopal Church was erected on Mount Zion, it was found necessary to dig through the accumulated rubbish to the depth of 50 feet or more, in order to obtain a proper support for the foundations. In some more recent excavations the workmen struck on a church embedded 40 feet below the present surface. Capt. Wilson makes some statements on this subject so instructive that they deserve to be mentioned. "We learn from history, and from actual exploration under ground, that the Tyropoen Valley has been nearly filled up, and that there is a vast accumulation of ruins and rubbish in the broader valley known as the Valley of the Cheesemongers (Tyropoeon) near the citadel. In fact, we know that it was part of the settled policy of the conquerors of the city to obliterate, as far as possible, those features upon the strength of which the upper city and the Temple mainly depended. The natural accumulation of rubbish for the last 3,000 years has further contributed to obliterate, to a great extent, the natural features of the ground within the city" (Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem, p. 7 f.). The latest excavations by Lieut. Warren near "Robinson's Arch" have gone to a depth of 55 feet below the surface before coming to the bottom of the valley between Zion and Moriah (The Quarterly, p. 619, June, 1898, Lond.). In many places the present level of the "Via Dolorosa" is not less than 30 or 40 feet above its original level: disproving, by the way, the claim set up for the antiquity of its sites. In digging for the foundations of the house of the Prussian Deaconesses, a subterranean street of houses was found several feet below the street above it. (Survey, p. 56.)

Views of Jerusalem. — The summit of Olivet furnishes, on the whole, the best look-out in the vicinity of Jerusalem. Yet the view of the city from this point is too distinct to be very imposing; for, having few edifices that will bear inspection, it must be seen, like Damascus, at a distance and in the mass, in order to produce the best effect. The vaulted domes surrounding the roofs of the better houses, and giving to them solidity and support, serve also as ornaments, and are striking objects as

* For an account of these stairs see vol. ii. p. 971 note a, Amst. ed. B.
men from this direction. Such domes are said to be peculiar to a few towns in the south of Palestine. The want of foliage and verdure is a very noticeable defect. A few cypresses and dwarfish palms are the only trees to be discovered within the city itself. The minarets, only 8 or 10 in number, which often display elsewhere a graceful figure, are here very ordinary, and add little or nothing to the scene. On the other hand, the buildings which compose the court of the Holy Sepulchre, arrest attention at once, on account of their comparative size and elegance. But more conspicuous than all is the Mosque of Omar, which being so near at hand, on the east side of the city, can be surveyed here with great advantage. It stands near the centre of an inclosure which coincides very nearly with the court of the ancient Temple. It is built on a platform, 495 feet from east to west, and 550 from north to south, elevated about 15 feet, and paved in part with marble. It is approached on the west side by three flights of stairs, on the north by two, on the south by two, and on the east by one. The building itself is an octagon of 67 feet on a side, the walls of which are ornamented externally with variegated marbles, arranged in elegant and intricate patterns. The lower story of this structure is 46 feet high. In the upper story, at the distance of about one half of its diameter from the outer edge, rises a wall 70 feet higher, perforated towards the top, with a series of low windows. Above this wall rises a dome of great beauty, 40 feet high, surmounted by a gilt crescent. The entire altitude, therefore, including the platform, is 170 feet. The dome is covered with lead, and the roof of the first story with tiles of glazed porcelain. The Mosque has four doors, which face the cardinal points, guarded by handsome porches. The Mohammedans regard it as their holiest sanctuary, and do not step into it without removing their shoes. The ample court which surrounds the Mosque, as seen from Olivet, appears as a grass-plat, shaded with a few trees, and intersected with walks.

When about half way up this mount, the traveller will see for himself, apparently, off against the level of Jerusalem. In accordance with this, the Evangelist represents the Saviour as being "over against the Temple"—as he sat on the Mount of Olives, and foretold the doom of the devoted city (Mark xiii. 3). Hence the disciples, as they listened to him at that moment, had the massive "buildings of the Temple" in full view before them across the valley of the Kedron, to which they had just called his attention with so much pride, and of which they were told that soon "not one stone would be left on another."

Visitors to Jerusalem by the way of Yifta (Coppa) and Wady Ayl, usually obtain their first sight of the city from the northwest. Even from this side the view is not unimpressive. The walls with their battlements,—the entire circuit of which lies at once beneath the eye,—the tall form of Olivet; the distant hills of Moab in dim perspective; the turrets of the church of the Sepulchre; the lofty limbs of the Mosque of Omar; the Castle of David, so antique and massive,—all come suddenly into view, and produce a startling effect.

Yet, as Dr. Robinson remarks, the traveller may do better to take the camel-road from Ramleh (Jerusalem; or, rather, the road lying still further north by the way of Beth-horon. In this way he will pass near to Lydda, Ginzu, Lower and Upper Beth-horon, and Gilson; he will see Romah and Gilbon near at hand on his left; and he may pause on Sequeas to gaze on the city from one of the finest points of view" (Later Res. iii. 160). Stanley prefers the approach from the Jericho road, "No human being could be disappointed who first saw Jerusalem from the east. The beauty consists in this, that you thus burst at once on the two great ravines which cut the city off from the surrounding table-land, and that then only you have a complete view of the Mosque of Omar" (S. of P. p. 167, Amer. ed.). Mr. Tristram coincides in this impression. "Let the pilgrim endeavor to enter from the east, the favorite approach of our Lord, the path of his last and triumphal entry. It is a glorious burst, as the traveller rounds the shoulder of Mount Olivet, and the Haram wall starts up before him from the deep gorge of the Kedron, with its domes and crescents sparkling in the sunlight— a royal city. On that very spot He once paused and gazed on the same bold cliffs supporting a far more glorious pile, and when He beheld the city He wept over it" (Land of Israel, p. 173 f. 2d ed.). The writer was so fortunate as to have this view of Jerusalem, and would add that no one has seen Jerusalem who has not had this view.

II.

JERUSA'LAHM [possessed or possession]: [Tepouwāta: [Vat. Epauros]; Alex. Ἱερουσαλήμ; Jeru.] daughter of Zadok, queen of Uzziah, and mother of Jotham king of Judah (2 K. xv. 35). In Chronicles the name is given under the altered form of—

JERUSA'LAHM [as above]: [Tepouwāta: [Vat. -σαρα; Jerusalem], 2 Chr. xxvii. 1. See the preceding article.

JESHA'IAH [3 syl.], i. e. Jeshahiah: [Iriaia: [Vat. Iraaba; Alex. Ierashia: Ἱερασία]; 1. Son of Hanneliah, brother of Pelatiah, and grandson of Zerubbabel (1 Chr. iii. 21). But according to the LXX. and the Vulgate, he was the son of Pelatiah. For an explanation of this genealogy, and the difficulties connected with it, see Lord A. Hervey's Genealogies of our Lord, ch. iv. § v.

2. (Heb. יִשְׂחַיָּהוּ), i. e. Jeshahiah: [Iriaia: Alex. Ierashia: [P. Ierashia: Ἱερασία]; A Benjamite, whose descendants were among those chosen by lot to reside in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. xi. 7).

JESHA'IAH [3 syl.]. 1. (Heb. יִשְׂחַיָּהוּ; salutation of Jehovah): [Iriaia: [Vat. Sinas]; in 1 Chr. xxv. 3, and Ieriaia: [Vat. -σαρα] in ver. 15; in the former the Alex. Ms. has Ieriaia kal Sceali, and in the latter Ieriaia: [comp. Ieraia: Ἱερασία]; the Vulg. has now supplied by surface drainage. Some are of modern date, but in others the months of old calendars can be seen. The splendid photographic views of various parts of the city, and other objects, could greatly to the value of this publication.
Jeshanan

One of the six sons of Jeduthun, set apart for the musical service of the Temple, under the leadership of their father, the inspired minstrel: he was the chief of the eighth division of the singers. The Hebrew name is identical with that of the prophet Isaiah.

2. (Isorai; [Var.] Alex. Ossosa: Isoura.) A Levite in the reign of David, eldest son of Hezir, a descendant of Amram through Moses (1 Chr. xxvi. 25). He is called Issorai (Isoura) in 1 Chr. xxi. 21, in A. V., though the Hebrew is merely the shortened form of the name. Jehuel, one of his ancestors, appears among the Hemanites in 1 Chr. xxiv. 2, and is said in Targ. on 1 Chr. xxvi. 24 to be the same with Jonathan the son of Gerhshom, the priest of the idols of the Danites, who afterwards returned to the fear of Jehovah.

3. (וֹרָשָׁא: Isorai; [Var. Iosora] Alex. Hsasa: Isoura.) The son of Athaliah and chief of the name of the house of the Ben{ sons} Elam who returned with Ezra (Ezr. viii. 7). In 1 Esr. viii. 33 he is called Josias.

Jeshanah (יוֹרָשָׁא [ancient]; יֹרָש: Yorash; [Vat. Kara:] Alex. Avai; Joseph: Y'orash; Jasour, a town which, with its dependent villages (Heb. and Alex. LXX. - daughters "), was one of the three taken from Jeroboam by Abijah (1 Chr. xiii. 19). The other two were Bethel and Ephraim, and Jeshanah is named between them. A place of the same name was the scene of an encounter between Herod and Pappus, the general of Antigonus's army, related by Josephus with curious details (Ant. xiv. 15, § 12), which however convey no indication of its position. It is not mentioned in the Othography, unless we accept the conjecture of Reck (Palaestina, p. 861) that "Jethalah, urbs antiqua Judææ," is at once a corruption and a translation of the name Jeshana, which signifies "old." Nor has it been identified in modern times, save by Schwarz (p. 158), who places it at "Al-Sanim, a village two miles W. of Bethel," but undiscoverable in any map which the writer has consulted.

Jesharelah (יוֹרָשָׁא נַח, NACH [upright toward God]; but see First!): Yereshal; [Alex.] Yossef: Israel.) head of the seventh of the 24 wards into which the musicians of the Levites were divided (1 Chr. xxv. 14). [Heman; Jedethun.] He belonged to the house of Asphah, and had 12 of his house under him. At ver. 2 his name is written Assarelah, with an initial N instead of J; in the LXX. Erin. A. C. H.

Jeshabeab (יוֹרָשָׁא בֵּא, בֵּא [father's sent or abode]: Yereshba; [Alex. Yosseba:] Comp. 'Isaafa-EB: Ersba,) head of the 14th course of priests (1 Chr. xxiv. 13). [Jeholath.] A. C. H.

Jeshur (יוֹרָשָׁא A shortened; [Var.] Alex. Ioshera: Yosher), one of the sons of Saba the son of Heinon by his wife Azubah (1 Chr. ii. 18). In two of Kennicott's MSS. it is written יֵשׁוּר, Jethur, from the preceding verse, and in one MS. the two names are combined. The Peshito Syriac has Oshir, the same form in which Josher is represented in 2 Sam. i. 18.

Jeshimom (יוֹרָשָׁא מֹמ, the weaned: in [Vat.] Alex. Iosora: Joser.) in Num. 4:24: Joel (xii. 8), 1 Kgs. vii. 54: "Jeshonim," a name which occurs in Num. xx. 20 and xxiii. 28, in designating the position of Pisgah and Peor: both described as "facing the [יוֹרָש הַמֹּמָה] the Jeshimmon." Not knowing more than the general locality of either Peor or Pisgah, this gives us no clue to the situation of Jeshimon. But it is elsewhere used in a similar manner with reference to the position of two places very distant from both the hill of Hachilah, "on the south of," or "facing the Jeshimon." (1 Sam. xxiiii. 19, xxvi. 1, 3), and the wilderness of Maon, also south of it (xxiii. 24). Zigh (xxiii. 15) and Maon are known at the present day. They lie a few miles south of Hebron, so that the district strictly north of them is the hill-country of Judah. But a line drawn between Maon and the probable position of Peor — on the high country opposite Jericho — passes over the dreary, barren waste of the hills lying immediately on the west of the Dead Sea. To this district the name, if interpreted as a Hebrew word, would be not inapplicable. It would also suit as to position, as it would be full in view from an elevated point on the highlands of Moab, and not far from north of Maon and Zigh. On the other hand, the use of the word ha-Ardalah, in 1 Sam. xxiiii. 24, must not be overlooked, meaning, as that elsewhere does, the sunk district of the Jordan and Dead Sea, the modern Ghor. Beth-Jeshimoth too, which by its name ought to have some connection with Jeshimon, would appear to have been on the lower level, somewhere near the mouth of the Jordan. [Beth-Jeshimoth.] Perhaps it is not safe to lay much stress on the Hebrew sense of the name. The passages in which it is first mentioned are indisputably of very early date, and it is quite possible that it is an archaic name found and adopted by the Ismaelites.

* Mr. Tristram (Land of Israel, p. 540, 2d ed.) supposes Jeshimon to be used for "the barren plain of the Ghor," about the mouth of the Jordan. Assuming this, he makes it one of his proofs, that the term Ben-baka range "over against Jericho" (Deut. xxiii. 4), ascended by him, is the Nebo or Pisgah of Moses. [Nero. Amer. ed.] The article is always prefixed in the Hebrew, with the exception of a few poetical passages (Deut. xxiii. 10; Is. lviii. 7, lxviii. 40, civ. 14, civ. 4; and Isa. xlix. 19, 20). It is really questionable whether the word should not be taken as appellative rather than a proper name. In the former case the particular desert must be inferred from the context, and may be a different one at different times. Lieut. Warren reports that after special inquiry on the ground he was unable to find any trace of the name of Beth-Jeshimoth (see above) in the vicinity of the mouth of the Jordan. He speaks, however, of a ruin at the northeast of the Dead Sea called Seawineh, as if possibly the lost site may have been there (Report, etc., 1867-95, p. 13)...

Jeshshai (יוֹרָשָׁא הַשָּׁי, the spring of one old): [Var.] Alex. Iosorai: Joser. one of the ancestors of the Gadites who dwelt in Gilead, and whose genealogies were made out in the days of Jotham king of Judah (1 Chr. v. 14). In the Peshito Syriac the latter part of the verse is omitted.
JESHOHAIAH [4 syll.] (גְּשֹׁהַיָּהְי) [boved down by Jehovah]: 'Iaroyia: Ishahatia), a chief of one of the families of that branch of the Simeonites, which was descended from Shimeai, and was more numerous than the rest of the tribe (1 Chr. iv. 36). He was concerned in the raid upon the Hamites in the reign of Hezekiah.

JESHPUA [ Heb. Jesha'a] (גְּשֹׁפּוּא) [Jehovith helps, or saves]: 'Iaroyia: Jesue, [Jesus,] and Josc], a later Hebrew contraction for Joshua, or rather Jehoshua. (JesHosHa.)

1. [Jesu.] Joshua, the son of Nun, is called Jehoshua in one passage (Neh. viii. 17). [JesuHA.]

2. [Jesus.] A priest in the reign of David, to whom the ninth course fell by lot (1 Chr. xxiv. 11). He is called Jehoshua in the A. V. One branch of the house, namely, the children of Jedediah, returned from Babylon (Ezr. l. 36; but see JEHOSHAIAH.)

3. [Jesu.] One of the Levites in the reign of Hezekiah, after the reformation of worship, placed in trust in the cities of the priests in their classes, to distribute to their brethren the offerings of the people (2 Chr. xxxii. 15).

4. [Jesu.] Son of Jehozadak, first high-priest of the third series, namely, of those after the Babylonish Captivity, and ancestor of the fourteen high-priests his successors down to Joshua or Jason, and Onias or Menelaus, inclusive. [HIGH-PRIEST.] Joshua, like his contemporary Zerubbabel, was probably born in Babylon, whither his father Jehozadak had been taken captive while young (1 Chr. vi. 13, A. V.). He came up from Babylon in the first of Cyrus with Zerubbabel, and took a leading part with him in the rebuilding of the Temple, and the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth. Everything we read of him indicates a man of earnest piety, patriotism, and courage. One of less faith and resolution would never have surmounted all the difficulties and opposition he had to contend with. His first care on arriving at Jerusalem was to rebuild the altar, and restore the daily sacrifice, which had been suspended for some fifty years. He then, in conjunction with Zerubbabel, hastened to collect materials for rebuilding the Temple, and was able to lay the foundation of it as early as the second month of the second year of Cyrus, the first month of the second year, according to the Babylonian reckoning, - an interval of about fourteen years. In that year, n. c. 529, at the prophecying of Haggai and Zechariah (Ezr. v. 1, vi. 11; Hagga. i. 1, 12, 14, ii. 1-9; Zechar. i.-viii.), the work was resumed by Joshua and Zerubbabel with redoubled vigor, and was happily completed on the third day of the month Adar (= March), in the sixth of Darius. The dedication of the Temple, and the celebration of the Pasch, in the next month, were kept with great solemnity and rejoicing (Ezr. vi. 15-22), and especially

a The 7th, after the Babylonian reckoning, according to Pfeiffer.

b The connection with Hani, Hasbollah (or Hash-

"twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel," were offered as a sin-offering for all Israel. Jehoshua's zeal in the work is exemplified by the Son of Sirach (Eccles. xiii. 12). Besides the great importance of Jehoshua as a historical character, from the critical times in which he lived, and the great work which he accomplished, his name Jesus, his restoration of the Temple, his office as high-priest, and especially the two prophecies concerning him in Zech. iii. and vi. 9-15, point him out as an eminent type of Christ. [HIGH-PRIEST.] Nothing is known of Jehoshua later than the seventh year of Darius, with which the narrative of Ezr. vii.-vi. closes. Josephus, who says the Temple was seven years in building, and places the dedication of it in the ninth of Darius, contributes no information whatever concerning him: his history here, with the exception of the 9th sect. of b. vi. ch. iv., being merely a paraphrase of Ezra and 1 Esdras, especially the latter. [ZERUBBAHEL.] Jehoshua had probably conversed often with Daniel and Ezekiel, and may or may not have known Jehoseachin at Babylon in his youth. He probably died at Jerusalem. It is written Jehoshua or Joshua in Zech. iii. 1, 3, &c.; Hagge. i. 1, 12, &c.

5. [In Ezr. ii. 40, Vat. 1groue; Neh. xii. 8, Alex. 1groue: Jesus, Jesus, once.] Head of a Levitical house, one of those which returned from the Babylonish Captivity, and took an active part under Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The name is used to designate either the whole family or the successive chiefs of it (Ezr. ii. 40, iii. 9; Neh. iii. 10, viii. 7, ix. 4, 5, xii. 8, &c.). Joshua, and Kadmiel, with whom he is frequently associated, were both "sons of Hodiavius" (called Judah, Ezr. iii. 9), but Joshua's more immediate ancestor was Azaniah (Neh. x. 9). In Neh. xii. 24 "Jeshua the son of Kadmiel" is a manifest corruption of the text. The LXX. read ξεινις και Καδμιμ, 

6. [Jesus.] A branch of the family of Pahath-Moab, one of the chief families, probably, of the tribe of Judah (Neh. x. 14, xi. 11, &c.; Ezr. x. 30). His descendants were the most numerous of all the families which returned with Zerubbabel. The verse is obscure, and might be translated, "The children of Pahath-Moab, for (i.e. representing) the children of Joshua and Josiah:" so that Pahath-Moab would be the head of the family. A. C. H.

JESHTUA [ Heb. Jesha'a] (גְּשֹׁתְיוּא) [see above]: [Igroue: Jesue], one of the towns re-inhabited by the people of Judah after the return from captivity (Neh. x. 25). Being mentioned with Mefahah, Beer-sheba, etc., it was apparently in the extreme south. It does not, however, occur in the original lists of Judah and Simeon (Josh. xv. 20, xxxi.), and there is no name in these lists of which this would be probably a corruption. It is not mentioned elsewhere.

G.

JESHTUH [ Heb. Jesha'hah] (גְּשֹׁתְיוּוּא), Igroue: Jesus), a priest in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxiv. 11), the same as JEHOSUA, No. 2.

JESHURUN, and once by mistake in A. V
JESURUN, Is. xiv. 2 (ע"ז"זד) [see infran]; ב אוגוסטוס, once with the addition of 'ישראל', which the Arabic of the Lond. Polyglot adopts to the exclusion of the former: dictius, redactisimus, a symbolical name for Israel in Deut. xxiii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 20; Is. xiv. 2, for which various etymologies have been suggested. Of its application to Israel there seems to be no division of opinion. The Targum and the Peshitta Syriac uniformly render Jeshurun by 'Israel.' Kiuchi (on Is. xiv. 2) derives it from the root יְשָׁר, yashar, 'to be right' or 'upright,' because Israel was 'upright among the nations;' as בִּשְׁרָיו, yesharim, 'the upright' (Num. xxiii. 10; Ps. cxvi. 1) is a poetical allusion of the chosen people, who did that which was right (רִבְנָיו, hay-yashar) in the eyes of Jehovah, in contradistinction from the idolatrous heathen who did that which was preeminently the evil (נְשָׁרִי, hâ-r'i), and worshipped false gods. This see to have been the view adopted by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion — who, according to the account of their version given by Jerome (on Is. xiv. 3), must have had קִדוֹשׁ or קִדוֹשָׁתָם — and by the Vulgate in three passages. Malvenda (quoted by Poole's Synopsis, Deut. xxxiii. 15), taking the same root, applies it ironically to application to Israel. For the like reason, on the authority of the above-mentioned Father, the book of Genesis was called 'the book of the just' (אֲדֹנָי), as relating to the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. The termination ק is either intensive, as the Vulgate takes it, or an affectionate diminutive (אֲרוֹם), Hittig, and Furst; '*Liebend,' Hendewerk, and Hansen. Simionis (Lex. Hebr. s. v., and Arc. Form. Nom. p. 582) connects Jeshurun with the Arabic root יִשָּׁר, yasrân, which in the second conj. signifies 'to prosper,' and in the 4th 'to be wealthy,' and is thus cognate with the Hebrew יֵשָׁר, yashar, which in Paul signifies 'to be blessed.' With the intensive termination Jeshurun would then denote Israel as supremely happy or prosperous, and to this significiation it must be allowed in the context in Deut. xxxii. 15 points. Michaelis (Synopsis, ad Lex. Heb.) considers it as a diminutive of Israel, and would read יִשָּׁרְיָהוּ, yisrâ- yâhû, contracted from יִשָּׁרְיָהוּ, yisre'lahû. Such too was the opinion of Grotius and Vitringa, and of the author of the Veneto-Gk. version; who renders it 'ישראלים.' For this theory, though supported by the weight of Gesenius' authority, it is scarcely necessary to say there is not the smallest foundation, either in analogy or probability. In the application of the name Jeshurun to Israel, we may discover that fondness for a play upon words of which there are so many examples, and which might be allowed to have some influence in the selection of the appellation. But to derive the one from the other is a fancy unworthy of a scholar. Two other etymologies of the name may be noticed as showing what length that conjecture may go when not regulated by any definite principles.

The first of these, which is due for Foster (quoted by Glassius, Phil. Sacr. lib. iv. tr. 2), connects it with יְשָׁר, yishar, 'an ox,' in consequence of the allusion in the context of Deut. xxxii. 13; the other with יְשָׁרָה, yish'rah, 'to behold,' because Israel beheld the presence of God.

W. A. W.

JESIAH (יהשע, i. e. Yissiahu [whom Jehovah lendeth]): יִשְׁיָאָו [Vat. FA.-vii.]; Alex. יִשְׁיָא (Jesio). 1. A Korhite, one of the mighty men, 'helpers of the battle,' who joined David's standard at Ziklag during his flight from Saul (1 Chr. xii. 6).

2. (לִשְׁיָא): יִשְׁיָא; [Vat. IESIA]; Alex. IESIA.) The second son of Uziel, the son of Kohath (1 Chr. xxii. 20). He is the same as Jeshiah, whose representative was Zechariah (1 Chr. xxiv. 25); but our translators in the present instance followed the Vulg., as they have too often done in the case of proper names.

JESIMIEL (יהשימיאל, [whom God sets up or places]): יִשְׁיָמֵיא [Vat. omits]: IESIMA), a Simeonite, descended from the prolific family of Shimei, and a prince of his own branch of the tribe, whom he leads against the Medes and Hamites in the reign of Hezkiah (1 Chr. iv. 36).

JESSE (ישע, i. e. Isha [perh. strong, Ges., or ijit, i. e. of God, Dietr.]; אֵישֵי, Joseph. IESAIAS): יִשְׁיָא: In the margin of 1 Chr. x. 14, our translators have given the Vulgate form, the father of David, and thus the immediate progenitor of the whole line of the kings of Judah, and ultimately of Christ. He is the only one of his name who appears in the Sacred records. Jesse was the son of Obed, who again was the fruit of the union of Boaz and Ruth. For Jesse was the only foreign blood that ran in his veins; for his great-grandmother was no less a person than Rahab the Canaanitish of Jericho (Matt. i. 5). Jesse's genealogy in is twice given in full in the Old Testament, namely, Ruth iv. 18-22, and 1 Chr. ii. 5-12. We there see that, long before David had rendered his family illustrious, it belonged to the greatest house of Judah, that of Perez, through Hezron his eldest son. One of the links in the descent was Nahshon (N. T. Naasoon), chief man of the tribe at the critical time of the Exodus. In the N. T. the genealogy is also twice given (Matt. i. 3-5; Luke iii. 32-34).

He is commonly designated as 'Jesse the Bethlehemite' (1 Sam. xvi. 1, 18). So he is called by his son David, then fresh from home (xvii. 58); but his full title is 'the Ephrathite of Bethlehem Judah' (xvii. 12). The double expression and the use of the antique word Ephrathite perhaps imply that he was one of the oldest families in the place. He is an 'old man' when we first meet with him (1 Sam. xvii. 12), with eight sons (xvi. 10, xvii. 12), residing at Bethlehem (xvi. 4, 5). It would appear, however, from the terms of xvi. 4, 5, and of Josephus (Ant. vi. 8, § 1), that Jesse was not one of the 'elders' of the town. The few slight glimpses we can catch of him are soon recalled. According to

windows of English churches. One of the finest is at Dorchester, Oxon. The tree springs from Jesse, who is recumbent at the bottom of the window, and contains 25 members of the line, culminating in our Lord
an ancient Jewish tradition, recorded in the Targum on 2 Sam. xxi. 19, he was a weaver of the vails of the sanctuary, but as there is no contradiction, so there is no corroboration of this in the Bible, and it is possible that it was suggested by the occurrence of the word *veqana’* "weaver" in connection with a member of a family. [J.A.A.E. ORI.EG.] Jesse's wealth seems to have consisted of a flock of sheep and goats (1 Sam. ii. 2, A.V., "sheep"), which were under the care of David (xvi. 11, xvi. 34, 35). Of the produce of this flock we find him on two occasions sending the simple presents which in those days the highest persons were wont to accept—slices of milk cheese to the captain of the division of the army in whose hands were serving (xvii. 18), and a kid to Saul (xvi. 29); with the accomplishment in each case of parched corn from the fields of Boaz, leaves of the bread from which Bethlehem took its very name, and wine from the vineyards which still curish the terraces of the hill below the village. When David's rupture with Saul had finally driven him from the court, and he was in the cave of Adullam, "his brethren and all his father's house" joined him (xxi. 2). His "brother" (probably Eliah) is mentioned on a former occasion (xx. 25) as taking the lead in the family. This is no more than we should expect from Jesse's great age. David's anxiety at the same period to find a safe refuge for his parents from the probable vengeance of Saul is also quite in accordance with their helpless condition. He took his father and his mother into the country of Moab, and deposited them with the king, and there they disappear from our view in the records of Scripture. But another old Jewish tradition (Rabbiith Seder, 1 Sam., 256, col. 2) states that after David had quitted the hold, his parents and brothers were put to death by the king of Moab, so that there remained, besides David, but one brother, who took refuge with Nahash, king of the Genezammim. To the wife of Jesse we are not told. His eight sons will be found displayed under David, i. 552. The family contained in addition two female members, Zerubiah and Abigail, but it is uncertain whether these were Jesse's daughters, for though they are called the sisters of his sons (1 Chr. ii. 16), yet Abigail is said to have been the daughter of Nahash (2 Sam. xviii. 25). Of this two explanations have been proposed. (1.) The Jewish— that Nahash was another name for Jesse (Jerome, Q. Hebr., on 2 Sam. xviii. 25). (2.) Professor Stanley's—that Jesse's wife had been formerly wife or concubine to Nahash, possibly the king of the Ammonites (David, i. 552).

An English reader can hardly fail to remark how often Jesse is mentioned long after the name of David had become famous enough to supersede that of his obscure and humble parent. While David was a struggling outlaw, it was natural that to friend and foe—to Saul, Ibeth, and Nabul, no less than to the captains of Judah and Benjamin— he should be merely the "son of Jesse" (1 Sam. xvi. 13; comp. xxiv. 16, xxv. 10; I Chr. xii. 18); but that Jesse's name should be brought forward in records of so late a date as I Chr. xxix. 26, and Ps. lxxxi. 20, long after the establishment of David's own house, is certainly worthy of notice. Especially it is to be observed that it is in his name—the "shout out of the stump of Jesse... the root of Jesse which should stand as an ensign to the people" (Is. xi. 1; xli. 8) that Jesse announces the most splendid of his promises, intended to rouse and cheer the heart of the nation at the time of its deepest despondency.

G.

**JESUS THE SON OF SIRACH**

In the phraseology here referred to, the reader will recognize the taste of the oriental mind, which delights in a sort of poetic parenthesis. Hence the frequent phrase, "Son of David," "Seed of David," etc., as applied to Christ. The son is often designated by the father's name, as above, where the father is known only through such association of his name as in the address to Rahab: "Thou son of Abin Zam" (Judg. v. 12), and the Saviour's appeal to Peter "Simon, son of Jonas" (John xx. 15).
but

Saviour, or simply the Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus, § 1). The same passage speaks of him as a native of Jerusalem (Eccles. L. c.); and the internal character of the book confirms its Palestinian origin. The name Jesus was of frequent occurrence, and was often represented by the Greek Jason. In the apocryphal list of the LXXII commissions sent by Eleazar to Pottery it occurs twice (Arist. Hist. ap. Hody, De text. p. vii.); but there is not the slightest ground for connecting the author of Ecclesiastics with either of the persons there mentioned. The various conjectures which have been made as to the position of the son of Sirach from the contents of his book; as, for instance, that he was a priest (from vii. 29 ff., xiv., xlix., I), or a physician (from xxxviii. I ff.), are equally unfounded.

Among the later Jews the "son of Sirach" was celebrated under the name of Ben Sira as a writer of proverbs, and some of those which have been preserved offer a close resemblance to passages in Ecclesiastics [Ecclesiasticus, § 4, vol. i. p. 651, note A] but in the course of time a later compilation was substituted for the original work of Ben Sira (Zunz, Gottesd. Vertr. d. Juden, p. 100 ff.), and tradition has preserved no authentic details of his person or his life.

The chronological difficulties which have been raised as to the date of the Son of Sirach have been already noticed [Ecclesiasticus, § 4], and do not call for further discussion.

According to the first prologue to the book of Ecclesiastics, taken from the Synopsis of the Pseudo-Athanasius (iv. p. 377, ed. Migne), the translator of the book bore the same name as the author of it. If this conjecture were true, a genealogy of the following form would result: 1. Sirach. 2. Jesus, son (Either) of Sirach (author of the book). 3. Sirach. 4. Jesus, son of Sirach (translator of the book). It is, however, most likely that the last chapter, "The prayer of Jesus the son of Sirach," gave occasion to this conjecture. The prayer was attributed to the translator, and then the title of succession followed necessarily from the title attached to it.

B. F. W.

JÉSUS [Ιησους], called JUSTUS [iust], a Christian who was with St. Paul at Rome, and joined him in sending salutations to the Colossians. He was one of the fellow-workers who were a comfort to the Apostle (Col. iv. 11). In the Acts Synod. Jan. iv. 67, he is commemorated as bishop of Eleutheropolis.

W. T. B.

* This Jesus or Justus cannot be identified with the Justus at Corinth (Acts xviii. 7). The one here mentioned was a Jewish Christian (one of the circumcision), Col. iv. 11), but the other a Gentile who had been a Jewish proselyte (συμβάλλοντος τον θεον) before he embraced the Gospel. [Justus.]

II.

JÉSUS CHRIST. The name Jesus (Ἰησους) signifies Saviour. Its origin is explained above, and it seems to have been not an uncommon name among the Jews. It is assigned in the New Testament (1) to our Lord Jesus Christ, who "saves His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21); also (2) to Joshua, the successor of Moses, who brought the Israelites into the land of promise (Num. xxvii. 18; Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8); and (3) to Jesus named Justus, a converted Jew, associated with St. Paul (Col. iv. 11).

The name of Christ (Χριστός from χρίω, I anoint) signifies Anointed. Priests were anointed amongst the Jews, as their inauguration to their office (1 Chr. xvi. 22; Ps. ev. 15), and kings also (2 Sam. i. 24; Eccles. xvi. 19). In the New Testament the name Christ is used as equivalent to Messiah (Greek Μισσαή; Hebrew בֵּית Y). John i. 41, the name given to the long promised Prophet and King whom the Jews had been taught by their prophets to expect; and therefore δέ ευαγγέλιον (Acts xix. 4; Matt. xi. 3). The use of this name as applied to the Lord has always a reference to the promises of the Prophets. In Matt. i. 4, xi. 2, it is assumed that the Christ when He should come would live and act in a certain way, described by the Prophets. So Matt. xxii. 42, xxiii. 10, xxiv. 5, 23; Mark xii. 33, xiii. 21; Luke iii. 13, xx. 41; John vii. 27, 31, 41, 42, xii. 31, in all which places there is a reference to the Messiah as delineated by the Prophets. That they had foretold that Christ should suffer appears Luke xxiv. 26, 46. The name of Jesus is the proper name of the Lord, and that of Christ is added to identify Him with the promised Messiah. Other names are sometimes added to the names Jesus Christ, or Christ Jesus: thus "Lord" (frequently), "a King" (added as a kind of explanation of the word Christ, Luke xiiii. 2), "King of Israel" (Mark xv. 32), Son of David (Mark xii. 35, Luke xx. 41), chosen of God (Luke xiiii. 35).

Remarkable are such expressions as "the Christ of God" (Luke ii. 26, ix. 20; Rev. xi. 12, xii. 10); and the phrase "in Christ," which occurs about 78 times in the Epistles of St. Paul, and is almost peculiar to them. But the germ of it is to be found in the words of our Lord Himself, "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me" (John xv. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10). The idea that all Christian life is not merely an imitation and following of the Lord, but a living and constant union with Him, causes the Apostle to use such expressions as "fallen asleep in Christ" (1 Cor. xv. 18), "I knew a man in Christ" (2 Cor. xii. 2), "I speak the truth in Christ" (1 Tim. ii. 7), and many others. (See Schleiermacher's Lectures on the Christian Religion; Fritzsche's On St. John's Gospel; De Wette's Commentary; Schmitt's Greek Concordance, etc.)

The Life, the Person, and the Work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ occupy the whole of the New Testament. Of this threefold subject the present article includes the first part, namely, the Life and Teaching; the Person of our Lord will be treated under the article SON OF GOD; and His Work will naturally fall under the word SAVIOUR. Toward the close of the reign of Herod Great, arrived that "fullness of time" which God in His inscrutable wisdom had appointed for the sending of His Son; and Jesus was born at Bethlehem, to redeem a sinful and ruined world. According to the received chronology, which is in fact of Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th century, this event occurred in the year of Rome 754. But modern scholars, with hardly an exception, believe that this calculation places the nativity some years too late: although they differ as to the amount of error. Herod the Great died, according to Josephus, in the thirty-seventh year after he was appointed king (Ant. xvii. 8, § 1; B. J. i. 33, § 8). His elevation coincides with the consularship of Cn. Domitius Calvus and C. Asinius Pollio, and the
determines the date A. u. c. 714 (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 14, § 5). There is reason to think that in such calculation Josephus reckons the years from the month Nisus to the same month; and also that the Nativity took place in the beginning of the thirty-seventh year, or just before the Passover (Joseph. Ant. xvi. 9, § 3); if then thirty-six complete years are added they give the year of Herod's death A. u. c. 750 (see Note on Chronology at the end of this article). As Jesus was born during the life of Herod, it follows from these data that the Nativity took place some time before the month of April 750, and if it took place only a few months before Herod's death, then its date would be four years earlier than the Dionysian reckoning (Wieseler).

Three other chronological data occur in the Gospels, but the arguments founded on them are not conclusive. 1. The Baptism of Jesus was followed by a Passover (John ii. 13), at which certain Jews mention that the restoration of their Temple had been in progress for forty-six years (ii. 20), beyond which time the Temple was not yet known (Ant. xv. 9, § 4); this makes this year of age " (Luke iii. 23). As the date of the Temple-restoration can be ascertained, it has been argued from these facts also that the nativity took place at the beginning of A. u. c. 750. But it is sometimes argued that the words that determine our Lord's age are not exact enough to serve as the basis for such a calculation. 2. The appearance of the star to the wise men has been thought likely, by the aid of astronomy, to determine the date. But the opinion that the star in the East was a remarkable conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign Pisces, is now rejected. Besides the difficulty of reconciling it with the sacred narrative (Matt. ii. 9) it would throw back the birth of our Lord to A. u. c. 747, which is too early. 3. Zacharias was "a priest of the course of Abia" (Luke i. 5), and he was engaged in the duties of his course when the birth of John the Baptist was foretold to him; and it has been thought possible to calculate, from the place which the course of Abia held in the cycle, the precise time of the Saviour's birth. All these data are discussed below (p. 1391).

In treating of the Life of Jesus, a perfect record of the events would be no more than a reproduction of the four Gospels, and a discussion of those events would swell to the compass of a voluminous commentary. Neither of these would be appropriate here, and in the present article a brief sketch only of the Life can be attempted, drawn up with a view to the two remaining articles, on the Son of God and Saviour.

The Man who was to redeem all men and do for the human race what no one could do for his brother, was not born into the world as others are. The salutation addressed by the Angel to Mary His mother, "Hail! Thou that art highly favored," was the prelude to a new act of divine creation; the first Adam, that sinned, was not born but created; the second Adam, that restored, was born indeed, but in supernatural fashion. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God " (Luke i. 35). Mary received the announcement of a miracle, the full import of which she could not have understood, with the submission of one who knew that the message came from God; and the Angel departed from her. At first, her betrothed husband, when he heard from her what had taken place, doubted her, but a supernatural communication convinced him of her purity and he took her to be his wife. Not only was the appearance of the Birth of Jesus made the subject of supernatural communications, but that of the Baptism the forerunner also. Thus before the birth of either of these actually taken place, a small knot of persons had been prepared to expect the fulfillment of the divine promises in the Holy One that should be born of Mary (Luke i.).

The prophet Micah had foretold (v. 2) that the future king should be born in Bethlehem of Judaea, in the place where his house had its origin; but Mary dwelt in Nazareth. Augustus, however, had ordered a general census of the Roman empire, and although Judaea, not being a province of the empire, would not necessarily come under such an order, it was included, probably because the intention was already conceived of reducing it after a time to the condition of a province (see Note on Chronology). That such a census was made we can safely conclude from a statement of Tertullian (Apology, ii. 12) that application to Palestine it should be made with reference to Jewish feelings and prejudices, being carried out no doubt by Herod the Jewish king, was quite natural; and so Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem, the city of David, to be taxed. From the well-known and much-ennuessed passage in St. Luke, the year 8-20 (Luke ii. 2) it appears that the taxing was not completed till the time of Quirinius (Cyrenius), some years later; and how far it was carried now, cannot be determined; all that we learn is that it brought Joseph, who was of the house of David, from his home to Bethlehem, where the Lord was born. As there was no room in the inn, a manger was the cradle in which Christ the Lord was laid. But signs were not wanting of the greatness of the event that seemed so unimportant. Lowly shepherds were the witnesses of the wonder that accompanied the lowly Saviour's birth; an angel proclaimed to them "good tidings of great joy;" and then the exceeding joy that was in heaven amongst the angels about this mystery of love broke through the silence of night with the words — "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men " (Luke ii. 8-20). We need not suppose that these simple men were cherishing in their hearts the expectation of the Messiah which others had not been so much interested in. They were chosen from the humblest, as were our Lord's companions afterwards, in order to show that God "thath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty " (1 Cor. i. 26-31), and that the poor and meek could apprehend the message of salvation to which kings and priests could turn a deaf ear.

The subject of the Genealogy of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, is discussed fully in another article. [See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.]

The child Jesus is circumcised in due time, is brought to the Temple, and the mother makes the offering for her purification. That offering wanted its peculiar meaning in this case, which was an act of new creation, and not a birth after the common order of our fallen nature. But the seed of the new kingdom was to grow undiscernibly as yet; no exemption was claimed by the "highly favored" mother, and no portent intervened. She made her humble offering like any other Jewish mother, and would have gone her way unnoticed; but here too God suffered not His beloved Son to be without
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witness, and Simeon and Anna, taught from God that the object of their earnest longings was before them, prophesied of His divine work: the one rejoicing that his eyes had seen the salvation of God, and the other speaking of Him "to all that looked for redemption in Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 29-38).

Thus recognized amongst His own people, the Saviour was not without witness amongst the heathen. "Wise men from the East" — that is, Persian magi of the Zend religion, in which the idea of a Zoroash or Redeemer was clearly known — guided miraculously by a star or meteor created for the purpose, came and sought out the Saviour to pay him homage. We have said that in the year 474 occurred a remarkable combination of the planets Jupiter and Saturn, and this is supposed to be the sign by which the wise men knew that the birth of some great one had taken place. But, as has been said, the date does not agree with this view, and the account of the Evangelist describes a single star moving before them and guiding their steps. We must suppose that God saw good to speak to the magi in their own way: they were seeking light from the study of the stars, but only physical light could be found, and He guided them to the Source of spiritual light, to the cradle of His Son, by a star miraculously made to appear to them, and to speak intelligibly to them through their preconceptions. The offerings which they brought have been regarded as symbolical: the gold was a tribute to a king, the frankincense was for the use of a priest, and the myrrh for a body preparing for the tomb —

"Aurea nascendi fideantur munera regi,
Thura dedere Dom, myrrhae tribuere sepultu."

says Sedulius: but in a more general view these were at any rate the offerings made by worshippers, and in that light must the magi be regarded. The events connected with the birth of our Lord are all significant, and here some of the wisest of the heathen knew before the Redeemer as the first-fruits of the Gentiles, and as a sign that his dominion was to be not merely Jewish, but as wide as the whole world. (See Matt. ii. 1-12; Münzer, Der Stern der Weisen, Copenhagen, 1827; the Commentaries of Alford, Williams, Olshausen, and Hefenber, where the opinions as to the nature of the "star" are discussed.)

A little child made the great Herod quake upon his throne. When he knew that the magi were come to hail their King and Lord, and did not stop at his palace, but passed on to a humbler roof, and when he found that they would not return to betray this child to him, he put to death all the children in Bethlehem that were under two years old. The crime was great; but the number of the victims was less than the numbers like Bethlehem were small enough to escape special record among the wicked acts of Herod from Josephus and other historians, as it had no political interest. A confused indication of it, however, is found in Macrobius (Saturn. ii. 4).

Joseph, warned by a dream, flees to Egypt with the young child, beyond the reach of Herod's arm. This flight of our Lord from his own land to the land of darkness and idolatry — a land associated even to a proverb with all that was hostile to God and his people, impresses on us the reality of his humiliation. Herod's cup was well nigh full: and the doom that soon overtook him could have arrested him in his bloody attempt; but Jesus, in accepting humanity, accepted all its incidents. He was saved, not by the intervention of God, but by the obedience of Joseph; and from the storms of persecution He had to use the common means of escape (Matt. ii. 13-23; Thomas' Kepulis, ii. 13, and Commentaries). A time passed in less than a year, Jesus returned with his parents to their own land, and went to Nazareth, where they abode.

Except as to one event the Evangelists are silent upon the succeeding years of our Lord's life down to the commencement of his ministry. When He was twelve years old He was found in the temple, hearing the doctors and asking them questions (Luke ii. 49-52). We are shown this one fact that we may know that at the time when the Jews considered childhood to be passing into youth, Jesus was already aware of his mission, and consciously preparing for it, although years elapsed before its actual commencement. This fact at once confirms and illustrates such a general expression as "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." (Luke i. 52.) His public ministry did not begin with a sudden impulse, but was prepared for by his whole life. The consciousness of his divine nature and power grew and ripened and strengthened until the time of his showing unto Israel.

Thirty years had elapsed from the birth of our Lord to the opening of his ministry. In that time great changes had come over the chosen people. Herod the Great had united under him almost all the original kingdom of David; after the death of that prince it was dismembered for ever. Archelaus succeeded to the kingdom of Judaea, under the title of Ethnarch; Herod Antipas became tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and Philip tetrarch of Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, Batanea, and Pæmus. The Emperor Augustus promised Archelaus the title of king; if he should prove worthy; but in the tenth year of his reign (u. c. 750) he was deprived in deference to the hostile feelings of the Jews, was banished to Vienne in Gaul, and from that time his dominions passed under the direct power of Rome, being annexed to Syria, and governed by a procurator. No king nor ethnarch held Judaea afterwards, if we except the three years when it was under Agrippa I. Marks are not wanting of the irritation kept up in the minds of the Jews by the sight of a foreigner exercising acts of power over the people whom David once ruled. The publicans (portilouses) who collected tribute for the Roman empire were everywhere detested; and as a marked class is likely to be a degraded one, the Jews saw everywhere the most despised among the people exacting from them all, and more than all (Luke iii. 13), that the foreign tyrant required. Constant complaints were made by the people to the office of high priest, perhaps from a necessary policy. Josephus says that there were twenty-eight high-priests from the time of Herod to the burning of the Temple (Ant. xx. 10). The sect of Judas the Gaulonite, which protested against paying tribute to Caesar, and against bowing the neck to an alien yoke, expressed a conviction which all Jews shared. The sense of oppression and wrong would tend to shape all the hopes of a Messiah, so far as they still existed, to the conception of a warrior who should deliver them from a hateful political bondage.

It was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius the Emperor, reckoning from his joint rule with Augustus (Jan. u. c. 765), and not from his sole rule (Aug
This makes a complete conception of the temptation impossible for minds wherein temptation is always associated with the possibility of sin. But whilst we must be content with an incomplete conception, we must avoid the wrong conceptions that are often substituted for it. Some suppose the account before us to describe what takes place in a vision or ecstasy of our Lord; so that both the temptation and its answer arise from within. Others think that the temptation was suggested from within, but in a state, not of sleep or ecstasy, but of complete consciousness. Others consider this narrative to have been a parable of our Lord, of which He has told a story, as if told by himself; but the account sets aside the historical testimony of the Gospels: the temptation as there described arose not from the sinless mind of the Son of God, where indeed thoughts of evil could not have harbored, but from Satan, the enemy of the human race. Nor can it be supposed that this account is a mere parable, unless we assume that Matthew and Luke have wholly misunderstood their Master's meaning. The three temptations are addressed to the three forms in which the disease of sin makes its appearance on the soul—to the sense of sin, and the love of praise, and the desire of gain (1 John iii. 16). But there is one element common to them all—they are attempts to call up a willful and wayward spirit in contrast to a patient self-denying one. In the first temptation the Redeemer is an hungered, and when the Devil bids Him, if He be the Son of God, command that the stones may be made bread, there would seem to be no great sin in this use of divine power to overcome the pressing human want. Our Lord's answer is required to show us where the essence of the temptation lay. He takes the words of Moses to the children of Israel (Deut. viii. 3), which mean, not that men must dispense with bread and feed only on the study of the divine word, but that our meat and drink, our food and raiment, are all the work of the Creator of food; and that a sense of dependence on God is the duty of man. He tells the tempter that as the sons of Israel standing in the wilderness were forced to humble themselves and to wait upon the hand of God for the bread from heaven which He gave them, so the Son of Man, fasting in the wilderness from hunger, will be humble and will wait upon His Father in heaven for the word that shall bring Him food, and will not be fast to deliver Himself from that dependent state, but will wait patiently for the gifts of His goodness. In the second temptation, it is not probable that they left the wilderness, but that Satan was allowed to suggest to our Lord's mind the place, and the marvel that could be wrought there. They stood, as has been suggested, on the lofty porch that overlooked the Valley of Rephaim, where the steep side of a valley was added to the height of the Temple (Joseph. Ant. xvi. 11, § 5), and made a depth that the eye could scarcely have borne to look down upon. "Cast thyself down,"—perform in the Holy City, in a public place, a wonder that will at once make all men confess that none but the Son of God could perform it. A passage from the 93rd Psalm is quoted to give a color to...
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the argument. Our Lord replies by an allusion to another text that carries us back again to the same wandering in the wilderness. He shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted Him in Mas'sah (Deut. vi. 16). Their conduct is more fully described by the Psalmist as a tempting of God: They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust; yea, they spoke against God: they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Behold he smote the rock that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed. Can he give bread also? Can he provide flesh for his people? (Ps. lxviii.) Just parallel was the temptation here. God has protected Thee so far, brought Thee up, put his seal upon Thee by manifest proofs of his favor. Can He do this also? Can He send the angels to buoy Thee up in Thy descent? Can He make the air thick to sustain, and the earth soft to receive Thee? The appropriate answer is, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. In the third temptation it is not asserted that there is any mountain from which the eyes of common men can see the world and its kingdoms at once displayed; it was with the mental vision of One who knew all things that these kingdoms and their glory were seen. And Satan has now begun to discover, if he knew not from the beginning, that One is here who can become the King of kings and Lord of lords. All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me. In St. Luke the words are fuller: All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whosoever I will I give it: but these words are the lie of the tempter, which he uses to mislead. Thou art come to be great — to be a King on the earth; but I am strong; and will resist Thee. Thou shalt be imprisoned and slain; some of them shall fall away through fear; others shall forsake Thy cause, loving this present world. Cast in Thy lot with me; let Thy kingdom be an earthly kingdom, only the greatest of all — a kingdom such as the Jews seek to see established on the throne of David. Worship me by living as the children of this world live, and so honoring me in Thy life: then shall all the nations of the world be gathered together and shall see this and shall know that this speaker is the Son of God. He that hath the power and the spirit to guide the destinies of the nations was no longer speaking with Jesus. The question here puts a new point upon the matter. He followed right in foreshadowing such trials to Him; but though clouds and darkness hung over the path of his ministry He must work the works of Him that sent Him, and not another work: He must worship God and none other. Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve. As regards the order of the temptations, there are internal marks that the account of Matthew assigns them their historical order: St. Luke transposes the two last, for which various reasons are suggested by commentators (Matt. iv. 1-11; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13).

Deserting for a time the historical order, we shall find that the records of this first portion of his ministry, from the temptation to the transfiguration, consist mainly (1) of miracles, which prove his divine commission; (2) of discourses and parables on the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven; (3) of incidents showing the behavior of various persons when brought into contact with our Lord. The two former may require some general remarks, the last will unfold themselves with the narrative.

1. The Miracles. — The power of working miracles was granted to many under the Old Covenant: Moses (Ex. iii. 20, vii.-xi.) delivered the people of Israel from Egypt by means of them; and Josue following in his steps, enjoyed the same power (Matt. xii. 22) for the completion of his work (Josh. iii. 13-16). Samuel (Judg. xv. 19), Elijah (I K. xvii. 10, 12), and Elisha (2 K. ii.-vi.) possessed the same gift. The prophets foretold that the Messiah, of whom Moses was the type, would show signs and wonders as he had done. Isaiah, in describing his kingdom, says Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing (Is. xxxv. 5, 6). According to the same prophet, the Christ was called to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house (Is. lix. 7). And all who looked for the coming of the Messiah expected that the power of miracles would be one of the tokens of his constitution. When John the Baptist, in his prison, heard of the works of Jesus, he sent his disciples to inquire, Art Thou He that should come (ψευδάτος = the Messiah), or do we look for another? Our Lord, in answer to this, only points to his miracles, leaving to John the inference from them, that no one could do such works except the promised One. When our Lord cured a blind and dumb demoniac, the people, struck with the miracle, said, This is the Son of God (xv. 28), and when they had seen the signs he did, and the things that were heard out of the mouth of the madman, they fell down, and worshiped him (xii. 21). On another like occasion it was asked, When Christ cometh will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done? (John vii. 31). So that the expectation that Messiah would work miracles existed amongst the people, and was founded on the language of prophecy. Our Lord's miracles are described in the New Testament by several names: they are signs (σημάτα), wonders (παράπτωμα), works (παράπτωμα), and mighty works (σημαίνεσις), according to the point of view from which they are regarded. They are indeed astonishing works, wrought as signs of the might and presence of God; and they are powers or mighty works because they are such as no power short of the divine could have effected. But if the object had been merely to work wonders, the cure of the blind and dumb in silence would be sufficient. A miracle is performed in the presence of the author of the miracle and the beholders; it is not seen by their eyes or comprehended by their minds. It is therefore a fair question whether the whole of the miracles of our Lord, convenient as they have been, have not been the best means of producing the effect, since many of them were wrought for the good of obscure people, before witnesses chiefly of the humble and uneducated class, and in the course of the ordinary life of our Lord, which lay not amongst those who made it their special business to inquire into the claims of a prophet. When requests were made for a more striking sign than those which He had wrought for a sign from heaven (Luke xi. 16), it was refused. When the tempter suggested that He should cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple before all men, the temptation was rejected. The miracles of our Lord were to be, not wonders merely, but signs: and not merely signs of preternatural power, but of the scope and character of his ministry, and of the divine nature of his Person. This will be evident from an examination of those which are more particularly described in the Gospels. Nearly forty cases of this kind appear; but that they are only examples taken out of a very great number, the Evangelists frequently remind us (John ii. 23; Matt. viii. 16 and paral.; iv. 23; xii. 13 and paral.; Luke vi. 19; Matt. xi. 5; xii. 38; ix. 36; xiv. 14, 39; xv. 30; xix. 2; xxi. 14). These cases
might be classified. There are three instances of restoration to life, each under peculiar conditions: the daughter of Jairus was lateily dead; the widow's son at Nain was being carried out to the grave; and Lazarus had been four days dead, and was returning to corruption (Matt. xviii. 18; Luke xi. 12; John xi. 1, etc.). There are about six cases of demoniac possession, each with its own circumstances: one in the synagogue at Caper-

num, where the unclean spirit bore witness to Jesus as "the holy one of God" (Mark i. 24); a second, that of the man who dwelt among the tombs in the country of the Gadarenes, whose state is so forcibly described by St. Mark (v. 2); and who also bore witness to Him as "the Son of the Most High God;" a third, the case of a dumb man (Matt. ix. 32); a fourth, that of a youth who was brought to Him as He came down from the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 15), and whom the disciples had vainly tried to heal; a fifth, that of another dumb man, whom the Jews thought He had healed "through Belzebub the prince of the devils" (Luke xi. 15); and a sixth, that of the Syrian-Capernaum girl whose mother's faith was so tremendous (Matt. xvii. 22). There are about seventeen recorded cases of the cure of bodily sickness, including fever, leprosy, palsy, inveterate weakness, the unnamed lumb, the issue of blood of twelve years' standing, dropsey, blindness, deafness, and dumbness (John iv. 47; Matt. vii. 2, 14, ix. 2; John v. 5; Matt. xii. 10, viii. 3, ix. 20, 27; Mark viii. 22; John ix. 1; Luke xiii. 10, xvii. 11, xviii. 35, xxii. 51). These three groups of miracles all pertained to the cure, either by setting aside natural laws and conditions — now in passing unseen through a hostile crowd (Luke iv. 30); now in procuring miraculous draughts of fishes, when the fisher's skill had failed (Luke v. 4; John xxi. 6); now in stilling a tempest (Matt. viii. 26); now in walking to his disciples on the sea (Matt. xiv. 25); now in the transformation of his comeliness by a heavenly light and glory (Matt. xiv. 1); and again in seeking and finding the shield for the cus-

tomary tribute to the Temple in the fish's mouth (Matt. xvii. 27). In a third class of these mira-

cles, we find our Lord overawing the wills of men: as when He twice cleared the Temple of the traders (John ii. 13; Matt. xxii. 12); and when his look staggered the officers that came to take Him (John xviii. 6). And in a fourth subdivision will stand one miracle only, where his power was used for destruction — the case of the barren fig-tree (Matt. xxv. 19). The destruction of the herd of swine does not properly rank here; it was a permitted act of the devils which He cast out, and is no more to be held to the account of the Redeemer than are all the sicknesses and sufferings in the hand of the Jews which He permitted to waste and destroy, having, as He showed by his miracles, abundant power to prevent them. All the miracles of this latter class show our Lord to be one who wields the power of God. No one can suspend the laws of nature save He who made them; when bread is wonderfully multiplied, and the fickle sea becomes a firm floor to walk on, the God of the universe is working the change, directly or through his deputy. Very remarkable, as a claim to divine power, is the mode in which Jesus justified acts of healing on the Sabbath — "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John v. 17): which means, "As God the Father, even on the Sabbath-day, keeps all the laws of the universe at work, making the planets roll, and the grass grow, and the animal pulses beat, so do I my work: I stand above the law of the Sabbath, as He does." a

On reviewing all the recorded miracles, we see at once that they are signs of the nature of Christ's Person and mission. None of them are done merely to astonish: and hardly any of them, even of those which prove his power more than his love, but tend directly towards the good of men in some way or other. They show how active and unwearied was his love; they also show the diver-

sity of its operation. Every degree of human need — from Lazarus now returning to dust — through the palsy that has seized on brain and nerves, and is almost death — through the leprosy which, appearing on the skin, was really a subtle poison that had tainted every drop of blood in the veins — up to the injury to the particular hand in which bread is received succor from the powerful word of Christ; and to wrest his buried friend from corruption and the worm was neither more nor less difficult than to heal a withered hand or restore to its place an ear that had been cut off. And this intimate con-

nection of the miracles with the work of Christ will explain the fact that faith was in many cases required as a condition for their performance. According to the common definition of a miracle, one would seem to be a capable witness of its performance: yet Jesus sometimes required from working wonders before the unbelieving (Mark vi. 5, 6), and sometimes did the work that was asked of him because of the faith of them that asked it (Mark vii. 27). The miracles were intended to attract the witnesses of them to become followers of Jesus and members of the kingdom of heaven. Where faith was already so far fixed on Him as to believe that He could do miracles, there was the fit preparation for a faith in higher and heavenly things. If they knew that He could heal the body, they only required teaching to enlarge their view of him into that of a healer of the diseased spirit, and a giver of true life to those that are dead in trespasses and sins. On the other hand, where men's minds were in a state of bristling and ac-

tagonism against Him, to display miracles before them would but increase their condemnation. a If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not believed; but now I have they both seen and hated both Me and my

\[a\] The Saviour's miracles are —

1. Of love: In raising the dead.

2. Of power: In curing mental disease.

3. Of healing the body.

I. In creating.

II. In destroying.

III. In setting aside the ordinary laws of being.

IV. In overthrowing the opposing wills of men.

V. In the account of the text, the miracles that took place after the Transfiguration have been excluded, for the sake of completeness.
Father" (John xv. 24). This result was inevitable: in order to offer salvation to those who are to be saved, the offer must be heard by some of those who will reject it. Miracles then have two pur-
poses: the proximate and ultimate purpose of doing a work of love to them that need it, and the higher purpose of revealing Christ in his own Per-
son and nature as the Son of God and Saviour of men. Hence the rejection of the demand for a sign from heaven — for some great celestial phe-

omenon which all should see and none could dispute. He refused to give such a sign to the "assembly" that asked it: and once He offered them a sign, but not a sign of the kind of miracle He as to his burial and resurrection: thus refus-
ing them the kind of sign which they required. So again, in answer to a similar demand, He said, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" — alluding to his death and resurrection. It is as though He had said, "All the miracles that I have been working are only intended to call attention to the one great miracle of My presence on earth; for the humble servant, that is the kind of miracle I will work. If you wish for a greater sign, I refer you to the great miracle about to be wrought in Me — that of My resurrection." The Lord's words do not mean that there shall be no sign; He is working wonders daily: but that He will not travel out of the plan He has proposed for Himself. A sign in the sun and moon and stars would prove that the power of God was there; but it would not teach men to understand the mission of God Incarnate, of the loving and suffering friend and brother of men. The miracles which He wrought are those best suited to this purpose; and those who had faith, though but in small measure, were the fittest to behold them. They knew Him but a little; but even to think of Him as a Prophet who was able to heal their infirmity was a germ of faith sufficient to make them fit hearers of His doc-

trine and spectators of His deeds. But those gained nothing from the Divine work who, unable to display the evidence of their eyes and ears, took refuge in the last argument of malice, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the prince of the devils."

What is a miracle? A miracle must be either something done in contravention of all law, or it is a transgression of all natural laws, whether known now or to be known hereafter, on account of some higher law whose operation interferes with them. Only the last of these defini-
tions could apply to the Christian miracles. God has chosen to govern the world by laws, having impressed on the face of nature in characters not to be mistaken the great truth that He rules the universe by law and order, would not adopt in the kingdom of grace a different plan from that which in the kingdom of nature He has pursued. If the seen universe requires a scheme of order, and the spiritual world is governed without a scheme (so to speak), by caprice, then the God of Nature appears to contradict the God of Grace. Spinoza has not failed to make the most of this argument; but he fails not the true Christian idea of a miracle, but one which he substitutes for it (Tract. Theol. Polit. 6). Nor can the Christian miracles be re-
garded as cases in which the wonder depends on the anticipation only of some law that is not now understood, but shall be so hereafter. In the first place many of them go beyond, in the amount of their operation, all the wildest hopes of the scientific discoverer. In the second place, the very concep-
tion of a miracle is vitiated by such an explanation. All distinction in kind between the man who is somehow the agent of his own knowledge, and the worker of miracles, would be taken away; and the miracles of one age, as the steam-engine, the telegraph-wire, become the tools and toys of the next. It remains then that a miracle is to be regarded as the overruling of some physical law by some higher law that is brought in. We are invited in the Gospels to regard the miracles as not as the work of the devil, but of Jesus of Nazareth. They are identified with the work of redemption. There are even cautions against teach-
ing them separately — against severing them from their connection with his work. Eye-witnesses of His miracles were strictly charged to make no report of them to others (Matt. ix. 30; Mark v. 43, vii. 36). And yet when John the Baptist sent his dis-
picents to ascertain whether the Messiah were indeed come in the flesh, the answer he sent back was the very thing we have been forbidden to other — a report of miracles. The explanation of this seeming con-
tradiction is that wherever a report of the signs and wonders was likely to be conveyed without a right conception of the Person of Christ and the kind of doctrine which He taught, there He suffered not the report to be carried. Now had the purpose been to reveal his divine nature only, this caution would not have been needed, nor would faith have been a needful preliminary for the apprehension of miracles, nor would the temptations of Satan in the wilderness have been the cunning snares they were intended to be, nor would it have been neces-
sary to refuse the convincing sign from heaven to the Jews that asked it. But the part of his work to which attention was to be directed in connection with the miracles, was the mystery of our redeem-
tion by One who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 5-8). Very few are the miracles in which divine power is exerc-
ed without a manifest reference to the purpose of assisting men. He works for the most part as the Power of God in a state of humiliation for the good of men. Not insignificant here are the cases in which He condescends to use means, wholly inadequate indeed in any other hands than his; but still they are a token that He has descended, into the region where means are employed, from that in which even the spoken word can control the subservient agents of nature. He laid his hand upon the patient (Matt. viii. 3, 15, ix. 22, xx. 34; Luke vii. 14; xiii. 51). He anointed the eyes of the blind with clay (John ix. 6). He put his finger into the ear and touched the tongue of the deaf and dumb sufferer in Decapolis (Mark vii. 33, 34). He treated the blind man at Bethesda in like fashion (Mark viii. 23). Even where He fed the five thousand and the four, He did not create bread out of nothing, which would have been as easy for Him, but much bread out of little: and He looked up and blessed the meal, and said, the man would do (Matt. xiv. 19; John vi. 11; Matt. xv. 36). At the grave of Lazarus He lifted up his eyes and gave thanks that the Father had heard
Him (John x. 41, 42), and this great miracle is
accompanied by tears and groanings, that show how
One so mighty to save has truly become a man
with human soul and sympathies. The worker of
the miracles is God become Man; and as signs of
his Person and work are they to be measured.
Hence, when the question of the credibility of
miracles is discussed, it ought to be preceded by
the question, Is redemption from the sin of Adam
a probable thing? Is it probable that there are
spiritual laws as well as natural, regulating the
relations between us and the Father of our spirits?
Is it probable that, such laws existing, the needs
of men and the goodness of God would lead to
an expression of them, complete or partial, by means
of revelation? If these questions are all decided
in the affirmative, then Hume's argument against
miracles is already half overthrown. 'No testi-
momy,' says Hume, 'is sufficient to establish a
miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind
that its falsehood would be more miraculous than
the fact which it endeavors to establish; and even
in that case there is a mutual destruction of argu-
ments, and the superior only gives us an assurance
suitable to that degree of force which remains after
deducing the inferior' (Essays, vol. ii. p. 130).
If the Christian miracles are parts of a scheme
which bears other marks of a divine origin, they
prove the existence of a set of spiritual laws with
which Christianity is connected, and of which it is
the expression; and then the difficulty of believing
them disappears. They are not 'against nature,'
but above it; they are the new caprices of Prov-
ience breaking in upon ages of order, but they are
glimpses of the divine spiritual cosmos permitted
to be seen amidst the laws of the natural world, of
which they take precedence, just as in the physical
world one law can supersede another. And as to
the testimony for them let Paley speak: 'Twelve
men, whose probity and good sense I had
long known, should seriously and circumstantially
relate to me an account of a miracle wrought before
their eyes, and in which it was impossible they
should be deceived: if the governor of the country,
hearing a rumor of this account, should call those
men into his presence, and offer them a short pro-
posal, either to confess the imposture or submit to
be put to death, and if they should peremptorily
with one voice to acknowledge that there existed any
falsehood or imposture in the case: if this threat
were communicated to them separately, yet with
no different effect; if it was at last executed, if I
myself saw them one after another consenting to
be racked, burnt, or strangled, rather than give up
the truth of their account: . . . there exists not
a skeptic in the world who would believe them,
or who would defend such incredulity' (Evidence,
Introduction, p. 6). In the theory of a 'mutual
destruction' of arguments so that the belief in
miracles would represent exactly the balance be-
 tween the evidence for and against them, Hume
contradicts the commonest religions, and indeed
worldly, experience; he confounds the state of de-
dereliction and examination with that of conviction.
When the world, the people, who despise the
great central miracle of the resurrection, was allowed
to touch the Saviour's wounded side, and in an
access of undoubting faith exclaimed, 'My Lord,
and my God!' who does not see that at that
moment all the former doubts were wiped out,
were as though they had never been? How could
be carry about those doubts or any recollection
of them, to be a set-off against the complete con-
cfusion that had succeeded them? It is so with
the Christian life in every case; faith, which is 'the
substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things
not seen,' could not continue to weigh and balance
evidence for and against the truth: the conviction
either rises to a perfect moral certainty, or it con-
tinues tainted and worthless as a principle of ac-
tion.

The lapse of time may somewhat alter the aspect
of the evidence for miracles, but it does not weaken
it. It is more difficult (so to speak) to cross-
examine witnesses who delivered their testimony
ages ago; but another kind of evidence has been
their gathering strength in successive ages. The
miracles are all consequences and incidents of one
great miracle, the Incarnation; and if the Incarnation
is found true, the rest become highly probable. But
this very doctrine has been thoroughly proved
through all these ages. Nations have adopted it,
and they are the greatest nations of the world.
Men have lived and died in it, have given up their
lives to preach it; have found that it did not dis-
appoint them, but held true under them to the
last. The existence of Christianity itself has be-
come an evidence. It is a phenomenon easy to
understand if we grant the miracle of the Incarna-
tion, but is an effect without an adequate cause if
that be denied.

Miracles then are offered us in the Gospels, not
as startling violations of the order of nature, but as
consequences of the revelation of His self made
by Jesus Christ for man's salvation, and as such they
are not violations of order at all, but interferences
of the spiritual order with the natural. They
are abundantly witnessed by earnest and competent
men, who did not aim at any earthly reward for
their teaching; and they are prodigious, together
with his pure life and holy doctrine, that Jesus was
the Son of God. (See Dean Trench On the Miracles,
an important work: [Moyley, Boyington Lectures,
1865]; Baumgarten, Leben Jesu; Paley's Evi-
dences; Butler's Analogy; Hase, Leben Jesu; with
the various Commentaries on the New Testament.)

2. The Parables.—In considering the Lord's
teaching we turn first to the parables. In all ages
the aid of the imagination has been sought to
present the moral of a truth, and that in various
ways: in the parable, where some story of ordinary
doings is made to convey a spiritual meaning,
beyond what the narrative itself contains, and without
any assertion that the narrative does or does not
present an actual occurrence, in the fable, where a
story, for the most part an impossible one, of
talking beast and reasoning bird, is made the vehicle
of a taught or abstract lesson of worldly wis-
dom; in the allegory, which is a story with a moral
or spiritual meaning, in which the lesson taught is
so prominent as almost wholly to supersede the
story that clothes it, and the names and actions
and they are so chosen that no interlocutor shall be
required for the application: and lastly, in the proverb,
which is often only a parable or a fable condensed
into a few pithy words ([Parable] [Ezek. xlii.
32; Prov. xiv. 23; xix. 11, 17, 28; Prov. i.
22, 29; Job. xii. 24, 25; xiii. 15]; and other
[Parable] [Ezek. xii. 23, 32; Prov. i.
22, 29; xii. 15]; and other Commentaries: Hase, Leben Jesu,
§ 67, 4th ed.; Neander, Leben Jesu, p. 588, fll.).
Nearly fifty parables are preserved in the Gospels,
and they are only selected from a larger number
(Mark iv. 33). Each Evangelist, even St. Mark,
has preserved some that are peculiar to himself
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St. John never uses the word *parable*, but that of *proverb* (παραφιά), which the other Evangelists nowhere employ. In reference to this mode of teaching, our Lord tells the disciples, "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but to others in parables, that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (Luke vii. 10); and some have hastily concluded from this that the parable — the clearest of all modes of teaching — was employed to conceal knowledge from those who were not susceptible of it, and that this was its chief purpose. But it was chosen not for this negative object, but for its positive advantages in the instruction of the disciples. The nature of the kingdom of heaven was not understood even by disciples; hard even to them were the sayings that described it, and the hearing of them caused many to go back and walk no more with Him (John vi. 65). If there was any mode of teaching better suited than another to the purpose of preserving truths for the memory that were not yet accepted by the heart — for keeping the seed safe till the time should arrive for the quickening Spirit to come down and give it growth — that mode would be the best suited to the peculiar position of the disciples. And any means of translating an abstract thought into sensible language has ever been the object of poet and teacher in all conditions of life. It was the best means of catching the souls of the visible world for the deeper acts of thought has been the clearest and most successful expositor. The parable affords just such an instrument as was required. Who could banish from his mind, when once understood, the image of the house built on the sand, as the symbol of the faithless soul unable to stand by the truth in the day of temptation? To whom does not the parable of the prodigal son bring back the thought of God's merciful kindness towards the erring? But without such striking images it would have been impossible (to use mere human language) to make known to the disciples in their half enlightened state the mysteries of faith in the Son of God as a principle of life, of repentance from sin, and of an assurance of peace and welcome from the God of mercy. Eastern teachers have made this mode of instruction familiar; the originality of the parables lay not in the method of the method, but in the parables and new truths which the stories taught so aptly. And Jesus had another purpose in selecting this form of instruction: He foresaw that many would reject Him, and on them He would not lay a heavier burden than they needs must bear. He did not offer them daily and hourly, in their plainest form, the grand truths of sin and atonement, of judgment and heaven and hell, and in so doing multiply occasions of blasphemy. "Those that were without," heard the parable; but it was an aimless story to them if they sought no moral purpose under it, and a dark saying, passing comprehension, if they did so seek. When the Lord gathered round Him those that were willing to be his, and explained to them at length the parable and its application (Matt. xii. 19-21), than the light thus thrown on it was not easy to extinguish in their memory. And even to the apostles, who with all the means of advantage there was no doubt a certain difference; some listened with indifference, and some with unbelieving and resisting minds; and of both minds some remained in their aversion, some or less active, from the Son of God unto the end, and some were converted after He was risen. To these we may suppose that the parables which had rested in their memories as vivid pictures, yet still a dead letter, so far as moral import is concerned, because by the Holy Spirit, whose business it was to teach men all things and to bring all things to their remembrance (John xiv. 26), a quick and powerful light of truth, lighting up the dark places with a brightness never again to fade from their eyes. The parable unapplied is a dark saying; the parable explained is the clearest of all teaching. When language is used in Holy scripture which would seem to treat the parables as means of concealment rather than of instruction, it must be taken to refer to the unexplained parable — to the cypress without the key — the symbol without the interpretation.

Besides the parables, the more direct teaching of our Lord is conveyed in many discourses, dispersed through the Gospels; of which three may be here selected as examples, the sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii.-xiv.), the discourse after the feeding of the five thousand (John vi. 22-65), and the final discourse and prayer which preceded the Passion (John xvi.-xvii.). These are selected principally because they mark three distinct periods in the ministry of Jesus, the opening of it, the principal change in the tone of its teaching, and the solemn close.

Notwithstanding the endeavor to establish that the sermon on the Mount of St. Matthew is different from the sermon on the plain of St. Luke, the evidence for their being one and the same discourse greatly preponderates. If so, then its historical position must be fixed from St. Luke; and its earlier place in St. Matthew's Gospel must be owing to the Evangelist's wish to commence the account of the ministry of Jesus with a summary of his teaching; an intention further illustrated by the mode in which the Evangelist has wrought in with his report of the discourse several sayings which St. Luke connects with the various facts which on different occasions drew them forth (comp. Luke xiv. 33, xi. 17, xii. 38, 59, xvi. 18, with places in Matt. v.; also Luke xi. 1-4, xii. 33, 34, xi. 34-36, xvi. 13, xii. 22-31, with places in Matt. vi.; also Luke xi. 9-13, xiii. 24, 25-27, with places in Matt. vii.). Yet this is done without violence to the connection and structure of the discourse. The love of the Teacher in the whole and new words present as the Messiah, the Anointed Prophet of the chosen people, the successor of Moses, sets at the head of his ministry the giving of the Christian law with its bearing on the Jewish. From Luke we learn that Jesus had gone up into a mountain to pray, that on the morning following He made up the number of his twelve Apostles, and solemnly appointed them, and then descending He stood upon a level place and spake to his disciples. These words of St. Matthew's text in the parables and in these passages, and the fact that they are present as the Messiah, the Anointed Prophet of the chosen people, the successor of Moses, sets at the head of his ministry the giving of the Christian law with its bearing on the Jewish. From Luke we learn that Jesus had gone up into a mountain to pray, that on the morning following He made up the number of his twelve Apostles, and solemnly appointed them, and then descending He stood upon a level place (ουραβαί απο θεον στηρι χθονικα του θεον κοινωνικα τον και ανωμοιον Λουκα 17), not necessarily at the bottom of the mountain, but where the multitude could stand round and hear, and so he taught them in a solemn address the laws and constitution of his new kingdom, the kingdom of Heaven. He tells them who are meet to be citizens of that heavenly polity, and in so doing renews almost every quarter on which the world sets a value. And the spirit that is in these discourses that of the law and the prophets, that of faith and of hope, that of charity and of mercy, and of the meek, those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, the merciful, the pure, and the peace-makers, are all "blessed," are all possessed of the temper which will assert well with that heavenly kingdom, in contrast to the proud, the confident, the great and successful, whom the world honors.
example, who, when He might have summed more than twelve legions of Angels to his aid, allowed the Jews to revile and slay Him. And yet it is not possible at once to wipe out from our social arrangements the principle of retribution. The robber who takes a coat must not be encouraged to seize the cloak also; to give to every one that asks all that he asks would be an encouragement to sloth and shameless impiety. But yet the awakened conscience will find out a hundred ways in which the spirit of this precept may be carried out, even in our imperfect social state; and the power of this loving policy will be felt by those who attempt it. Finally, our Lord teaches us the art of his divine law by words full of sublime wisdom. To the crampèd and confined love of the Rabbis, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy," He opposes this noble rule — "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v. 44, 45, 48.) To this part of the sermon, which St. Luke has not preserved, but which St. Matthew, writing as it were with his face turned towards his Jewish countrymen, could not preternat, succeed precepts on absolving; on prayer, on forgiveness, on fasting, on trust in God's providence, and on tolerance; all of them tuned to one of two notes: that a man's whole nature must be offered to God, and that it is man's duty to do to others as he would have them do to him. An earnest appeal on the difficulty of a godly life, and the worthlessness of mere profession, cast in the form of a parable, concludes this wonderful discourse. The differences between the reports of the two Evangelists are many. In the former Gospel the sermon occupies one hundred and seven verses: in the latter, thirty. The longer report includes the exposition of the relation of the Gospel to the Law: it also draws together, as we have seen, some passages which St. Luke reports elsewhere and in another connection; and where the two contain the same matter, that of Luke is somewhat more compressed. But in taking the one for the other, the difference of purpose and the need of the context is to be borne in mind: the morality of the Gospel is to be fully set forth at the beginning of our Lord's ministry, and especially in its bearing on the Law as usually received by the Jews, for whose use especially this Gospel was designed. And when this discourse is compared with the later examples to which we shall presently refer, the fact comes out more distinctly, that we have here the Code of the Christian Lawgiver, rather than the whole Gospel; that the standard of Christian duty is here fixed, but the means for raising men to the level where the observance of such a law is at all possible are not yet pointed out. The hearers learned how Christians would act and think, and to what degree of moral purity they would aspire, in the state of salvation; but how that state was to be purchased for them, or conveyed over to them, is not yet pointed out.

The next example of the teaching of Jesus must be taken from a later epoch in his ministry. It is probable that the great discourse in John vi. took place about the time of the Transfiguration, just before which He began to reveal to the disciples the
of his sufferings (Matt. xvi. and parallels), which was the special and frequent theme of his teaching until the end. The effect of his personal work on the disciples was doubtless the subject. He had taught them that He was the Christ, and had given their law, wider and deeper far than that of Moses. But the objection to every law applies more strongly the purer and higher the law is; and "how to perform that which I will" is a question that grows more difficult to answer as the standard of obedience is raised. It is that question which our Lord proceeds to answer here. The teaching of the Teacher, which had lately taken place; and from this miracle He preaches yet a greater, namely, that all spiritual life is imparted to the disciples from Him, and that they must feed on Him that their souls may live. He can feed them with something more than manna, even with Himself; "for the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world" (John vi. 29-40). The Jews murmur at this hard doctrine, and He warns them that it is a kind of test of those who have been with Him: "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him." He repeats that He is the bread of life; and they murmur yet more (vers. 41-52). He presses it on them still more strongly: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whose extath my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me" (vv. 33-57). After this discourse many of the disciples went back and walked no more with Him. They could not conceive how salvation could depend on a condition so strange, new, even so revolting. However we may blame them for their want of confidence in their Teacher, it is not to be imputed to them as a fault that they found a doctrine, which in itself is difficult, and here was clothed in dark and obscure expressions, beyond the grasp of their understanding at that time. For that doctrine was, that Christ had taken our fleshly nature, to suffer in it, and to shed his blood. The feeding on the five thousand had lately given an impression of his atoning death are imparted find it to be their spiritual food and life, and the condition of their resurrection to life everlasting.

Whether this passage refers, and in what degree, to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is a question on which commentators have been much divided, but two observations should in some degree guide our interpretation: the one, that if the pre-natural reference of the discourse had been to the Lord's Supper, it would have been uttered at the institution of that rite, and not before, at a time when the disciples could not possibly make application of it to a sacrament of which they had never then heard; the other, that the form of speech in this discourse comes so near that which is used in instituting the Lord's Supper, that it is impossible to exclude all reference to that Sacrament. The Redeemer had been, when he was with them, the body which should suffer on the Cross, and to the blood which shall be poured out. This great sacrifice is not only to be looked on, but to be believed; and not only believed, but appropriated to the believer, to become part of his very heart and life. Faith, here as elsewhere, is the means of apprehending it, but when it is once hid hold of, it will be as much a part of the believer as the food that nourishes the body but can be acquired only through the passages in the other Evangelists, in which our Lord about this very time prepares them for his sufferings, He connects with the announcement a warning to the disciples that all who would come after Him must show the fruit of his death in their lives (Matt. xvi., Mark viii., Luke ix.). And this new principle, infused into them by the life and death of the Redeemer, by his taking our flesh and suffering in it (for neither of these is excluded), is to believers the seed of eternal life. The believer "hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 54). Now the words of Jesus in instituting the Lord's Supper come very near to the expressions in this discourse: "This is my body which is given for you (ἦλθεν ἐμοί). . . . This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Luke xxii. 19, 20). That the Lord's Supper is a means of applying to us through faith the fruits of the incarnation and the atonement of Christ, is generally admitted; and if so, the discourse before us will apply to that sacrament, not certainly to the exclusion of other means of appropriating the saving death of Christ, but still with great force, inasmuch as the Lord's Supper is the most striking symbol of the application to us of the Lord's body. Here in a bold figure the disciples are told that they must eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; whilst in the sacrament the same figure becomes an act. Here the language is meant to be general; and there it finds its most striking special application, but not its only one. And the uttering of these words at an epoch that preceded by some months the first celebration of the Lord's Supper was probably intended to preclude that special and limited application of it which would narrow it down to the sacrament only, and out of which much false and even idolatrous teaching has grown. (Compare Commentaries of Allford, Lücke, Meyer, Stier, Heubner, Williams, Tholuck, and others, on this passage.) It will still be asked how we are to account for the startling form in which this most profound Gospel-truth was put before persons to whom it was likely to prove an offense. The answer is not difficult. Many of the disciples had come to have this idea of his ministry, to see his miracles, perhaps to derive some fruit from them, to talk about Him, and to repeat his sayings, who were quite unfit to go on as his followers to the end. There was a wide difference between the two doctrines, that Jesus was the Christ, and that the Christ must hang upon the tree, as to their effects on regenerate and worldly minds. For the latter they were not prepared; though many of them could possibly accept the former. Now this discourse belongs to the time of transition from the easier to the harder doctrine. And we may suppose that it was meant to sift the disciples, that the good grain might remain in the garner and the chaff be scattered to the wind. Hence the hard and startling form in which it was cast; not indeed that this figure of eating and drinking in reference to spiritual things was unknown to the early Christians, but that the foot, Schürer, and Wetstein, have shown the contrary. But hard it doubtless was; and if the condition of discipleship had been that they should then and there understand what they heard, their turning back at this time would have been meri-
But even on the twelve Jesus imposes no such condition. He only asks them, "Will ye also go away?" If a beloved teacher says something which overthrows the previous notions of the taught, and shocks their prejudices, then whether they will continue by his side to hear him explain further, or whether, or else dismiss him at once, will depend on the amount of their confidence in him. Many of the disciples went back and walked no more with Jesus, because their conviction that He was the Messiah had no real foundation. The rest remained with him for the reason so beautifully expressed by Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." (John vi. 68, 69).

The sin of the faint-hearted followers who now deserted Him was not that they found this difficult; but that finding it difficult they had not confidence enough to wait for light. The third example of our Lord's discourses which may be selected is that which closes his ministry—"Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Himself in Himself; and shall straightway glorify Him" (John xiii. 31, 32).

This great discourse, recorded only by St. John, extends from the thirteenth to the end of the seventeenth chapter. It hardly admits of analysis. It announces the Saviour's departure in the fulfillment of his mission; it imposes the "new commandment" on the disciples of a special love towards each other which should be the outward token to the world of their Christian profession; it consoles them with the promise of the Comforter who should be to them instead of the Saviour; it tells them all that He should do for them, teaching them, reminding them, reproving the world and guiding the disciples into all truth. It offers them, instead of the bodily presence of their beloved Master, free access to the throne of his Father, and spiritual blessings such as they had not known before. Finally, it culminates in that prayer (chap. xvi.) by which the High-priest as it were consecrates Himself the victim; and so doing, prays for those who shall hold fast and keep the benefits of that sacrifice, offered for the whole world, whether his disciples already, or to be brought to Him thereafter by the ministry of Apostles. He wills that they shall be with Him and behold his glory. He recognizes the righteousness of the Father in the plan of salvation, and in the result produced to the disciples; in whom that highest and purest love wherewith the Father loved the Son shall be present, and with and in that love the Son Himself shall be present with them. "With this elevated thought," says Oblique, "the Redeemer concludes his prayer for the disciples, and in them for the Church through all ages. He has compressed into the last moments given Him for intercourse with his own the most sublime and glorious sentiments ever uttered by human lips. Hardly has the sound of the last word died away when Jesus passes with his disciples over the brook Kidron to Gethsemane; and the bitter conflict draws on. The seed of the new world must be sown in death that thence life may spring up. These three discourses are examples of the Saviour's teaching—of its progressive character from the opening of his ministry to the close. The first exhibits his practical precepts as Lawyer of his people; the second, an exposition of the need of his sacrifice, but addressed to the world without, and intended to try them rather than to attract; and the third, where Christ, the Lawgiver and the High-priest, stands before God as the Son of God, and speaks to Him of his utmost counsels, as one who had been His before from the beginning. They will serve as illustrations of the course of his destiny whilst others will be mentioned in the narrative as it proceeds.

The Scene of the Lord's Ministry. — As to the scene of the ministry of Christ, no less than as to its duration, the three Evangelists seem at first sight to be at variance with the fourth. Matthew, Mark, and Luke record only our Lord's doings in Galilee; but if we put aside a few days before the passion, we find that they never mention his visiting Jerusalem. John, on the other hand, whilst he records some acts in Galilee, devotes the chief part of his Gospel to the transactions in Judaea. But when the supplemental character of John's Gospel is borne in mind there is little difficulty in explaining this. The three Evangelists do not profess to give a chronology of the ministry, but rather a picture of it: notes of those events least frequent in the narrative, and yet of essential importance. And they chiefly confine themselves to Galilee, where the Redeemer's chief acts were done; they might naturally omit to mention the feasts, which being passed by our Lord at Jerusalem, added nothing to the materials for his Galilean ministry. John, on the other hand, writing later, and giving an account of the Redeemer's life which is still less complete as a history (for more than one half of the fourth Gospel is occupied with the last three months of the ministry, and seven chapters out of twenty-one are filled with the account of the few days of the passion), vindicates his historical claim by supplying several precise notices of time: in the occurrences after the baptism of Jesus, days and even hours are specified (i. 24, 35, 39, 43, ii. 1); the first miracle is mentioned, and the time at which it was wrought (i. 1-11). He mentions not only the Passovers (iii. 22; vi. 4; xii. 1, and perhaps v. 1), but also the feast of Tabernacles (vii. 2) and of Dedication (x. 22); and it is ordered that the Evangelist who goes over the least part of the ground of our Lord's ministry is yet the same who fixes for us its duration, and enables us to arrange the facts the more exactly in their historical places. It is true that the three Gospels record chiefly the occurrences in Galilee; but there is evidence in them that labors were wrought in Judaea. Frequent teaching in Jerusalem is implied in the Lord's lamentation over the lost city (Matt. xxiii. 37). The appearance in Galilee of seraphs and Pharisess and others from Jerusalem (Matt. iv. 25, xv. 1) would be best explained on the supposition that their enmity had been excited against Him during visits to Jerusalem. The intimacy with the family of Lazarus (Luke, x. 38 ff.), and the attachment of Joseph of Arimathea to the Lord (Matt. xxvii. 57), would imply, most probably, frequent visits to Jerusalem. But why was Galilee chosen as the principal scene of the ministry? The question is not easy to answer. The prophet would resort to the Temple of God: the King of the Jews would go to his own royal city; the Teaching of the chosen people would preach in the midst of them. But their hostility prevented it. The Saviour, who, accepting all the infinities of "the form of a servant," which He had taken, fled in his childhood to Egypt, betakes Himself to Gal-
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wonders in the various places to which He came? This would be more likely if the journeys were hurried and partial: but all three are spoken of as though they were the very opposite. It is, to say the least, easier to suppose that the "feast" (John v. 1) was a Passover, dividing the time into two, and throwing two of these circuits into the second year of the ministry; provided there be nothing to make this interpretation improbable in itself. The words are, "After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." These two facts are meant as cause and effect; the feast caused the visit. If so, it was probably one of the three feasts at which the Jews were expected to appear before God at Jerusalem. Was it the Passover, the Pentecost, or the Feast of Tabernacles? In the preceding chapter the Passover has been spoken of as the "feast" (ver. 43); and if another feast were meant here the name of it would have been added, as in vii. 2, x. 22. The omission of the article is not decisive, for it occurs in other cases where the Passover is certainly intended (Matt. xxvii. 15; Mark xv. 6); nor is it clear that the Passover was called the feast, as the most eminent, although the Feast of Tabernacles was sometimes so described. All that the omission could prove would be that the Evangelist did not think it needful to describe the feast more precisely. The words in John iv. 35, "There are yet four months and then cometh the harvest," would agree with this, for the barley harvest began on the 16th Nisan, and reckoning back four months would bring this conversation to the beginning of December, i. e. the middle of Kislev. If it be granted that our Lord is here merely quoting a common form of speech (Allford), still it is more likely that He would use one appropriate to the time at which He was speaking. And if these words were uttered in December, the next of the three great feasts occurring would be the Passover. The shortness of the interval between v. 1 and vi. 4, would afford an objection, if it were not for the scantiness of historical details in the early part of the ministry in St. John: from the other Evangelists it appears that two great journeys might have to be included between these verses. Upon the whole, though there is nothing that amounts to proof, it is probable that there were four Passovers, and consequently that our Lord's ministry lasted somewhat more than three years, the "beginning of miracles" (John i.) having been wrought before the first Passover. On data of calculation that have already been mentioned, the year of the first of these Passovers was c. c. 780, and the Baptism of our Lord took place either in the beginning of that year or the end of the year preceding. The ministry of John the Baptist began in c. c. 779. (See Commentaries on John v. 1, especially Kunkel and Lietzke. Also Winer, Reallexikon der Geschichtswissenschaft, II. Jesus Christ; Griseveld, Discorations, vol. i. Diss. 4, vol. ii. Diss. 22.) After this sketch of the means, the scene, and the duration of the Saviour's ministry, the historical order of the events may be followed without interruption.

Our Lord has now passed through the ordeal of temptation, and his ministry is begun. At Bethsaida, wherein he returns, there were two facts drawn towards him: Andrew and another, probably John, the sole narrator of the fact, see Jesus,
and hear the Baptist's testimony concerning Him. Andrew brings Simon Peter to see Him also; and He receives from the Lord the name of Cephas. Then Philip and Nathanael are brought into contact with our Lord. All these reappear as Apostles, if Nathanael be, as has often been supposed, the same as the Nathanael whom the Lord questioned, but the time of their calling to that office was not yet. But that their minds, even at this early time, were wrought upon by the expectation of the Messiah appears by the confession of Nathanael: "Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel." (John i. 50-51.) The two disciples last named saw Him as He was about to set out for Galilee, on the third day of his sojourn at Bethelam. The third day after this interview Jesus is at Cana in Galilee, and works his first miracle, by making the water wine (John i. 29, 35, 43; ii. 1). All these particulars are supplied from the fourth Gospel, and come in between the 11th and 12th verses of the 4th chapter of St. Matthew. They show that our Lord left Galilee expressly to be baptized and to suffer temptation, and returned to his own country when these were accomplished. He now becats Himself to Capernaum and begins to work there for the space of many days," sets out for Jerusalem to the Passover, which was to be the beginning of his ministry in Judaea (John ii. 12, 13).

The cleansing of the Temple is associated by St. John with this first Passover (ii. 12-22), and a similar cleansing is assigned to the last Passover by the other Evangelists. These two cannot be confounded without throwing discredit on the historical character of one narrative or the other; the notes of time are too precise. But a host of interpreters have pointed out the probability that an action symbolical of the power and authority of Messiah should be twice performed, at the opening of the ministry and at its close. The expulsion of the traders was not likely to produce a permanent effect, and at the end of three years Jesus found the tumult and the traffic defiling the court of the Temple as they had done when He visited it before. Besides the difference of time, the narrative of St. John is by no means identical with those of the others; he mentions that Jesus made a scourge of small cords (φραγέλλων εκ σχονίων, ii. 15) as a symbol — we need not prove that it could be no more — of his power to punish; that here He ensured them for making the Temple "a house of merchandise;" whilst at the last cleansing it was pronounced "a den of thieves," with a distinct reference to the two passages of Isaiah and Jeremiah (Is. lv. 7; Jer. vii. 11). Writers like Strauss would persuade us that "tact and good sense" would prevent the Redeemer from attempting such a violent measure at the beginning of his ministry, before his authority was admitted. The aptness and the greatness of the occasion have no weight with such critics. The usual sacrifice of the law of Jehovah, and the usual half-shekel paid for tribute to the Temple, the very means that were appointed by God to remind them that they were a consecrated people, were made an excuse for secularizing even the Temple; and in its holy precincts all the business of the world went on. It was a time when "the zeal of God's house" might well supersede the "tact" on which the German philosopher lays stress; and Jesus failed in the zeal, nor did the accusing consciences of the traders fail to justify it, for at the rebuke of one man they retreated from the scene of their gains. Their hearts told them even though they had been long immered in hardening traffic, that the house of God could belong to none other but God; and when a Prophet claimed it for Him, conscience deprived them of the usufruct of the law. The fact is, that Simon the Zealot to whom these words were spoken petitioned Him to see if a sign or proof of his right to exercise this authority. He answered them by a promise of a sign by which He would hereafter confirm his mission, "Destroy this Temple and in three days I will raise it up." (John ii. 19,) alluding, as the Evangelist explains, to his resurrection. But why is the name of the building before them applied by our Lord so darkly to Himself? There is doubtless a hidden reference to the Temple as a type of the Church, which Christ by his death and resurrection would found and raise up. He who has cleared of buyers and sellers the courts of a perishable Temple made with hands, will prove hereafter that He is the Founder of an eternal Temple made without hands, and your destroying it shall be the cause. The reply was indeed obscure; but it was meant as a refusal of their demands, and to the disciples afterwards it became abundantly clear. At the time of the Passion this saying was brought against Him, in a perverted form — "At the last came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days." (Matt. xxvi. 61.) They hardly knew perhaps how utterly false a small alteration in the tale had made it. They wanted to mould him up as one who dared to think of the destruction of the Temple; and to change "destroy" into "I can destroy," might seem no great violence to do to the truth. But those words contained not a mere circumstance but the very essence of the saying, "you are the destroyers of the Temple; you that were polluting it now by turning it into a market-place shall destroy it, and also your city, by staining its stones with my blood." Jesus came not to destroy the Temple but to change it. He who should destroy the law had to complete it (Matt. v. 17). Two syllables changed their testimony into a lie.

The visit of Nicodemus to Jesus took place about this first Passover. It implies that our Lord had done more at Jerusalem than is recorded of Him even by John; since we have here a Master of Israel (John iii. 10), a member of the Sanhedrim (John vii. 50), expressing his belief in Him, although too timid at this time to make an open profession. The object of the visit, though not directly stated, is still clear: he was one of the better Pharisees, who were expecting the kingdom of Messiah, and having seen the miracles that Jesus did, he came to inquire more fully about these signs of its approach. This indicates the connection between the remark of Nicodemus and the Lord's reply: "You recognize these miracles as signs of the kingdom of God; verily I say unto you, no one can truly see and know the kingdom of God, unless he be born again (φανερωθῇ, from above); see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., in loc., vol. iv.). The visitor boasted the blood of Abraham, and expected to stand high in the new kingdom in virtue of that birthright. He did not wish to surrender it, and set his hopes upon some other birth (comp. Matt. iii. 9); and therefore something of willingness in the question of "How can a man be born when he is old?" (ver. 4). Our Lord again insists on the necessity of the
renewed heart, in him who would be admitted to the kingdom of heaven. The new birth is real though it is unseen, like the wind which blows lither and thither the eye cannot catch it save in its effects. Even so the Spirit sways the heart towards good, carries it away towards heaven, brings over the soul at one time the cloud, at another the sunny weather. The sound of Him is heard in the soul, now as the eager east wind bringing pain and remorse; now breathing over it the soft breath of consolation. In all this He is as powerful as the wind; and as unseen is the mode of His action. For the new birth of the Holy Ghost, without which none can come to God, faith in the Son of God is needed (ver. 18); and as implied in that, the renouncing of those evil deeds that blind the eyes to the truth (vv. 19, 20).

It has been well said that this discourse contains the whole Gospel in epistle; there is the kingdom of grace into which God will receive those who have offended Him, the new truth which God the Holy Spirit will write in all those who seek the kingdom, and God the Son crucified and slain that all who would be saved may look on Him when He is lifted up, and find health thereby. The three Persons of the Trinity are all before us carrying out the scheme of man's salvation. If it be asked how Nicodemus, so timid and half-hearted as yet, was allowed to hear thus early in the ministry what our Lord kept back even from his disciples till near the end of it, the answer must be, that, wise as it was to keep back from the general body of the hearers the doctrine of the Crucifixion, the Physician of souls would treat each case with the medicine that it most required. Nicodemus was an inquiring spirit, ready to believe all the Gospel, but for his Jewish prejudices and his social position. He was one whom even the shadow of the Cross would not estrange; and the Lord knew it, and laid open to him all the scheme of salvation. Not in vain. The tradition, indeed, may not be thoroughly certain, which reports his open conversion and his baptism by Peter and John (Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 171).

But three years after this conversation, when all the disciples have been scattered by the death of Jesus, he comes forward with Joseph of Arimathaea, at no little risk, although with a kind of secrecy still, to perform the last offices for the Master to whom his soul cleaves (John xix. 39).

After a journey at Jerusalem of uncertain duration, Jesus went to the Jordan with his disciples; and they there baptized in his name. The Baptist was now at Eon near Salim; and the jealousy of his disciples against Jesus drew from John an avowal of his position, which is remarkable for its humility (John iii. 27–30). "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven. Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I am, I say not, the Christ, but that I have been sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease." The speaker is one who has bitherto enjoyed the highest honor and popularity, a prophet exulted by all the people. Before the Sun of Righteousness his reflected light is turning pale; it shall soon be extinguished. Yet no word of reluctance, or of attempt to cling to a name and the glory of the day. If his pride has forsook him (see the parallel in John xii. 26–28). Joseph of Arimathaea asks, "If He be the King of Israel, let Him now come and save Himself." It had been the same before; when the Sanhedrim sent to inquire about him he claimed to be no more than "the voice of One crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esias" (John i. 23); there was one "who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose" (i. 27). Strauss thinks this height of self-renunciation beautiful, but impossible (Leben Jesu, ii. 4, § 49); but what divine influence had worked in the Baptist's spirit, adorning that once rugged nature with the grace of humility, we do not admit that Dr. Strauss is in a position to measure.

How long this sojourn in Judaea lasted is uncertain. But in order to reconcile John iv. 1 with Matt. iv. 12, we must suppose that it was much longer than the "twenty-six or twenty-seven" days, to which the learned Mr. Greswell upon mere conjecture would limit it. From the two passages together it would seem that John was after a short time cast into prison (Matt.), and that Jesus, seeing that the emnity directed against the Baptist would now assult Him, because of the increasing success of his ministry (John), resolved to withdraw from its reach.

In the way to Galilee Jesus passed by the shortest route, through Samaria. This country, peopled by men from five districts, whom the king of Assyria had planted there in the time of Hoshea (2 K. xxiv. 24, c.), and by the residue of the ten tribes that was left behind from the Captivity, had once abounded in idolatry, though latterly faithful in the true God had gained ground. The Samaritans even claimed to share with the people of Judaea the restoration of the Temple at Jerusalem, and were refused (Eara iv. 1–5). In the time of our Lord they were hated by the Jews even more than if they had been Gentiles. Their corrupt worship was a shadow of the true; their temple on Gerizim was a rival to that which adored the hill of Zion. "He that eats bread from the hand of a Samaritan," says a Jewish writer, "is as one that eats swine's flesh." Yet even in Samaria were souls to be saved;
and Jesus would not shake off even that dust from his feet. He came in his journey to Sichem, which the Jews in mockery had changed to Sychar, to indicate that its people were despised (Lightfoot), or that they followed idols (Acts 7:44). In ensued which with that Jesus, the Leopard, addressed the men of Sichem and showed them the ways of truths as well as falsehood, and was made known everywhere. He returned the same day to Simon’s house, and healed the mother-in-law of Simon, who was sick of a fever. At sunset, the multitude, now fully aroused by what they had heard, brought their sick to Simon’s door to get them healed. He did not refuse his service, and healed them all (Mark i. 29–34). He now, after showing down on Capharnaum so many cures, turned his thoughts to the rest of Galilee, where the rest of sheep were scattered: “Let us go into the next towns (κατοικοδομεῖν) that I may preach there also, for therefore came I forth” (Mark i. 38). The journey through Galilee, on which He now entered, must have been a general circuit of that country. His object was to call on the Galileans to repent and believe the Gospel. This could only be done completely by taking such a journey that his teaching might be accessible to all in turn at some point or other. Josephus mentions that there were two hundred and four towns and villages in Galilee (Tab. 45): therefore such a circuit as should in any real sense embrace the whole of Galilee would require some months for its performance. “The course of the present circuit,” says Mr. Grosse (Dissertations, vol. ii. 292), “we may conjecture, was, upon the whole, as follows: First, along the western side of the Jordan, northward, which would disseminate the fame of Jesus in Decapolis; secondly, along the confines of the tetrarchy of Philip, westward, which would make Him known throughout Syria: thirdly, by the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, southward; and, lastly, along the verge of Samaria, and the western region of the Lake of Galilee—the nearest points to Judea proper and Antipas, a miracle which was witnessed by many, of the course of this circuit, besides the works of mercy spoken of by the Evangelists (Matt. iv. 23–25; Mark i. 32–34; Luke iv. 40–41). He had probably called to Him more of his Apostles. Four at least were his companions from the beginning of it. The rest (except perhaps Judas Iscariot) were Galileans, and it is not improbable that they were found by their Master during this circuit. Philip of Bethsaida and Nathanael were among the rest, and were prepared to become his disciples by an earlier interview. On this circuit occurred the first case of the healing of a leper: it is selected for record by the Evangelists, because of the in crudeness of the allment. So great was the dread of this disorder — so strict the precautions against its infection—that even the raising of Lazarus’ daughter from the dead, which was perhaps the second occurred at Capernaum, at the end of this circuit, would hardly impress the beholders more profoundly.

Second Visit of the Ministry.— Jesus went up to Jerusalem to “a feast of the Jews,” which we have shown (p. 1359) to have been probably the Passover. At the pool Bethesda (= house of mercy), which was near the Sheep Gate (Neh. iii. 1
on the northeast side of the Temple, Jesus saw many infirm persons waiting their turn for the healing virtues of the water. (John v. 1-18. On the genuineness of the fourth verse, see Scholz, N. T.; Tischendorf, N. T.; and Lukee, in loc. It is preserved in the first and second MSS, and in Sin. J.; it is singularly disturbed with variations in the MSS. that insert it, and it abounds in words which do not occur again in this Gospel.) Among them was a man who had had an infirmity thirty-eight years: Jesus made him whole by a word, bidding him take up his bed and walk. The miracle was done on the Sabbath; and the Jews, by which name in St. John's Gospel we are to understand the Jewish authorities, were indignant against Jesus, rebuked the man for carrying his bed. It was a labor, and as such forbidden (Jer. xxvi. 21). The answer of the man was too logical to be refuted:

"He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed and walk" (v. 11). If He had not authority for the latter, whence came his power to do the former? Their anger was now directed against Jesus for healing on the Sabbath, even for healing the infirm, which is not the right to put Him to death. They based their objection on our Lord's justification of Himself, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (v. 17), there is an unequivocal claim to the Divine nature. God the Father never rests: if sleep could visit his eyelids for an instant; if his hand could droop for a moment's rest, the universe would collapse in ruin. He rested on the seventh day from the creation of new beings; but from the maintenance of those that exist He never rests. His love streameth forth on every day alike; as do the impartial beams from the sun that he has placed in the heavens. The Jews rightly understood the saying: none but God could utter it; none could quote God's example, as setting Him over and above God's law, save One who was God Himself. They sought the more to kill Him. He expounded to them more fully his relation to the Father. He works with the strength of the Father and according to his will. He can do all that the Father does. He can raise men out of bodily and out of spiritual death; and He can judge all men. John bore witness to Him: the works that He does bear even stronger witness. The reason that the Jews do not believe is their want of discernment of the meaning of the Scriptures; and that comes from their worldliness, their desire of honor from one another, and a desire to bring condemnation; even out of their Law they can be condemned, since they believe not even Moses, who foretold that Christ should come (John v. 19-47).

Another discussion about the Sabbath arose from the disciples plucking the ears of corn as they went through the fields (Matt. xii. 1-8). The time of this is somewhat uncertain: some would place it a year later, just after the third Passover (Lamman); but its place is much more probably here (Newcome, Robinson, etc.). The needy were permitted by the Law (Deut. xxiii. 25) to pluck the ears of corn with their hand, even without waiting for the owner's permission. The disciples must have been living a hard and poor life to resort to such means of sustenance. But the Pharisees would not allow that it was lawful on the Sabbath-day. Jesus reminds them that David, whose example they are not likely to challenge, ate the sacrificial bread in the tabernacle, which it was not lawful to eat. The priests might partake of it, but not a stranger (Ex. xxix. 33; Lev. xxiv. 5, 9). David, on the principle that mercy was better than sacrifice ( Hos. vi. 6). took it and gave to the young men that were with him that they might not perish for hunger. In order further to show that a literal mechanical observance of the law of the Sabbath would lead to absurdities, Jesus reminds them that this was perpetually set aside on account of another: "The priests profane the Sabbath and are blameless" (Matt. xii. 5). The work of sacrifice, the placing of the shewbread, go on on the Sabbath, and bidur even on that day may be done by priests, and may please God. It was the root of the Pharisees' fault that they thought sacrifice better than mercy, ritual exactness more than love: if ye had known what this meant, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath-day" (Matt. xii. 7, 8). These last words are inseparable from the meaning of our Lord's answer. In pleading the example of David, the king and prophet, and of the priests in the Temple, the Lord tacitly implies the greatness of his own position. He is indeed the new Priest, and the King; and one of these, the argument would have been not merely incomplete, but misleading. It is undeniable that the law of the Sabbath was very strict. Against labors as small as that of winnowing the corn a severe penalty was set. Our Lord quotes cases where the law is superseded or set aside, because He is One who has power to do the same. And the rise of a new law is implied in those words which St. Mark alone has recorded: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The law upon the Sabbath was made in love to men, to preserve for them a due measure of rest, to keep room for the worship of God. The Son of Man has power to readjust this law, if its work is done, or if men are fit to receive a higher.

This may have taken place on the way from Jerusalem after the Passover. On another Sabbath, probably at Capernaum, to which Jesus had returned, the Pharisees gave a far more striking proof of the way in which their hard and narrow and unloving interpretation would turn the beneficence of the Law into a blighting oppression. Our Lord entered into the synagogue, and found there a man with a withered hand—some poor artisan, perhaps, whose handiwork was his means of life. Jesus was about to heal him—which would have back life to the sufferer—who would give joy to every beholder who had one touch of pity in his heart. The Pharisees interposed: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day?" Their doctors would have allowed them to pull a sheep out of a pit: but they will not have a man rescued from the depth of misery. Rarely is that loving Teacher wroth, but here his anger, mixed with grief, showed itself: He looked round about upon them with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts, and answered their evils by healing the man (Matt. xii. 9-14; Mark iii. 1-6; Luke vi. 6-11).

In placing the ordination or calling of the Twelve Apostles just before the Sermon on the Mount, we are under the guidance of St. Luke (vi. 13, 17). But this more solemn separation for their work by no means marks the time of their first approach to Jesus. Scattered notices prove that some of them at least were drawn gradually to the Lord, so that it would be difficult to identify the moment when they earned the name of disciples. In the case of St. Peter, five degrees or stages might be traced.
The twelve Apostles were certainly poor and unlearned men; it is probable that the rest were of the same kind. Four of them were fishermen, not indeed the poorest of their class; and a fifth was a "publican," one of the "pitytters," or tax-gatherers, who collected the taxes exacted by Romans of higher rank. Andrew, who is mentioned with Peter, is less conspicuous in the history than he, but he enjoyed free access to his Master, and seems to have been more intimate with him than the rest (John vi. 8, xii. 22, with Mark xiii. 3). But James and John, who are sometimes placed above him in the list, were especially distinguished. They were fishermen, and James the son of Zebedee, and his brother, had been with their father, the fishermen, when the Twelve were called (John i. 21). The Zealot party is said probably from his belonging to the sect of Zealots, who, from Num. xxv. 7, 8, took it on themselves to punish crimes against the law. If the name Iscirot (= man of Cario = Kerith) refers the birth of the traitor to Kanoz in Judah (Josh. xiv. 25), then it would appear that the traitor alone was of Judaeo origin, and the eleven faithful ones were despised Galileans.

From henceforth the education of the Twelve Apostles will be one of the principal features of the Lord's ministry. First He instructs them then He takes them with Him as companions of His wayfaring; then He sends them forth to teach and heal for Him. The Sermon on the Mount, although it is meant for all the disciples, seems to have a special reference to the chosen Twelve (Matt. v. 11 ff.). Its principal features have been sketched already; but they will miss their full meaning if it is forgotten that they are the first teaching that the Apostles were called on to listen to after their appointment.

About the time it was that John the Baptist, long a forerunner with little hope of release, sent his disciples to Jesus with the question, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" In all the Gospels there is no more touching incident. Those who maintain that it was done solely for the sake of the disciples, and that John himself needed no answer to support his faith, show as little knowledge of the human mind as exactness in explaining the words of the account. The great privilege of John's life was that he was appointed to recognize and bear witness to the Messiah (John i. 31). After languishing a year in a dungeon, after learning that even yet Jesus had made no steps towards the establishment of his kingdom of the Jews, and that his following consisted of only twelve poor Galileans, doubts began to cloud over his spirit. Was the kingdom of Messias such as he had thought? Was Jesus not the Messiah, but some forerunner of that Deliverer, as he himself had been? There is no unbelief; he does not suppose that Jesus has deceived: when the doubts arise, it is to Jesus that he submits them. But it was not without great depression and perplexity that he put the question, "Art thou He that should come?" The scope of the answer given lies in its
reading John to the grounds of his former confidence. The very miracles are being wrought that were to be the signs of the kingdom of heaven; and therefore that kingdom is come (Is. xxv. 5, in Luke viii. 6, 7). There is more of grave encouragement than of rebuke in the words, "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me" (Matt. xi. 6). They bids the Forerunner to have a good heart, and to hope and believe to the end. He has allowed sorrow, and the apparent triumph of wickedness, which is a harder trial, to trouble his view of the divine plan; let him remember that it is blessed to attain that state of confidence with which these things cannot disturb; and let the signs which Jesus now exhibits suit him to the end (Matt. xi. 1–6; Luke vii. 18–23).

The testimony to John which our Lord graciously adds is intended to restate him in that place in the minds of his own disciples which he had occupied before this mission of doubt. John is not a weak waverer; not a luxurious courtier, attaching himself to the new dispensation from worldly motives: but a prophet, and more than a prophet, for the prophets spoke of Jesus afar off, but John stood before the Messiah, and with his hand pointed Him out. He came in the spirit and power of Elijah (Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5), to prepare for the kingdom of heaven. And yet, great as he was, the least of those in the kingdom of heaven when it is completely planted should enjoy a higher degree of religious illumination than he (Matt. xii. 7–11; Luke vii. 24–28).

We now commence the second circuit of Galilee (Luke viii. 1–3), to which belong the parables in Matt. xiii., the visit of our Lord’s mother and brethren (Luke viii. 19–21), and the account of his reception at Nazareth (Mark vi. 1–6).

During this time the twelve have journeyed with Him. But now a third circuit in Galilee is recorded, which probably occurred during the last three months of this year (Matt. ix. 35–38); and during this circuit, after reminding them how great is the harvest and how pressing the need of laborers, He carries the training of the disciples one step further by sending them forth by themselves to teach (Matt. x., xii.). Such a mission is not to be considered as identical in character with the mission of the Apostles, the Twelve. It was limited to the Jews; the Samaritans and heathen were excluded: but this arose, not from any narrowness in the limits of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15), but from the limited knowledge and abilities of the Apostles. They were sent to proclaim to the Jews that "the kingdom of heaven," which their prophets taught them to look for, was at hand (Matt. x. 7); but they were unsuited for the task of explaining to Jews the true nature of that kingdom, and still more to Gentiles who had received no preparation for any such doctrine. The preaching of the Apostles whilst Jesus was yet on earth was only ancillary to his and a preparation of the way for Him. It was probably of the simplest character. "As ye go, preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Power was given them to confirm it by signs and wonders; and the purpose of it was to show the minds of those who heard it into an inquiring state, so that they might seek and find the Lord Himself. But whilst their instructions as to the matter of their preaching were thus brief and simple, the cautions, warnings, and encouragements as to their own condition were far more full.

They were to do their work without anxiety for their welfare. No provision was to be made for their journey; in the house that first received them in any city they were to abide, no seeking of the best. Dangers would befell them, for they were sent forth "as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Matt. x. 16); but they were not to allow this to disturb their thoughts. The same God who wrought their miracles for them would protect them; and those who confessed the name of Christ before men would be confided by Christ before the Father as his disciples. These precepts for the Apostles even went somewhat beyond what their present mission required; it does not appear that they were at this time delivered up to councils, or scourged in synagogues. But in training their feeble wings for their first flight the same rules and cautions were given which would be needed even when they soared the highest in their zeal and devotion to their crucified Master. There is no difficulty here, if we remember that this sending never was rather a training of the Apostles than a means of converting the Galilean people.

They went forth two and two; and our Lord continued his own circuit (Matt. xi. 1), with what companions does not appear. By this time the heaven of the Lord’s teaching had begun powerfully to work among the people. Herod, we read, "was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John was risen from the dead, and of some that Elijah had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again" (Luke ix. 7, 8). The false apprehensions about the Messiah, that he should be a temporal ruler, were so deep-rooted, that whilst all the rumors concurred in assigning a high place to Jesus as a prophet, none went beyond to recognize Him as the King of Israel—the Saviour of his people and the world.

After a journey of perhaps two months’ duration the twelve returned to Jesus, and give an account of their ministry. The third Parable was now drawing near; but the Lord did not go up to it, because his time was not come for submitting to the malice of the Jews against Him; because his ministry in Galilee was not completed; and especially, because He wished to continue the training of the Apostles for their work, now one of the chief objects of his ministry. He wished to confine the observation of the Twelve individually upon their work, and, we may suppose, to add to the instruction they had already received from Him (Mark vi. 30, 31). He therefore went with them from the neighborhood of Capernaum to a mountain on the eastern shore of the Sea of Tiberias, near Bethesda Julia, not far from the head of the sea. Great multitudes pursued them; and here the Lord, moved to compassion by the hunger and weariness of the people, sought for them one of his most remarkable miracles. Out of five barley leaves and two small fishes, He produced food for five thousand men besides women and children. The act was one of creation, and therefore was both an assertion and a proof of divine power; and the discourse which followed it, recorded by John only, was an important step in the training of the Apostles, for it hinted to them for the first time the nature of that to which they would be bound by the blood of Christ, that is, his Passion, must become the means of man’s salvation. This view of the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven which they had been teaching, could not have been understood; but it would prepare those who still clave to Jesus to expect the hard facts that were to follow
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Jesus had wrought, the discourse itself has already been examined (p. 1336). After the miracle, but before the comment on it was delivered, the disciples crossed the sea from Bethsaida Julias to Bethsaida of Galilee, and Jesus retired alone to a mountain to commune with the Father. They were tarrying at the sea, for the wind was contrary, when, as the night drew towards morning, they saw Jesus walking to them on the sea, having passed the whole night on the mountain. They were amazed and terrified. He came into the ship and the wind ceased. They worshipped Him at this new proof of divine power—"Of a truth thou art the Son of God!" (Matt. xiv. 33). The storm had been another trial of their faith (comp. Matt. viii. 23-26), not in a present Master, as on a former occasion, but in an absent one. But the words of St. Mark intimate that even the feeling of the five thousand had not built up their faith in Him,—"for they considered not the miracle of the loaves: for their heart was hardened!" (vi. 52). Peter, however, as St. Matthew relates, with his usual zeal wishing to show that he really possessed that faith in Jesus, which perhaps in the height of the storm had been somewhat forgotten, requests Jesus to bid him come to Him upon the water. When he made the effort, his faith began to fail, and he cried out for deliverance, "O Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee in the water!" Peter was a of the same kind; there was a faith full of zeal and eagerness, but it was not constant. He believed that he could walk on the waters if Jesus bade him; but the roar of the waves appalled him, and he sank from the same cause that made him deny his Lord afterwards.

When they reached the shore of Gennesaret the whole people showed their faith in Him as a Healer of disease (Mark vi. 53-56); and he performed very many miracles on land. Nothing could surpass the eagerness with which they sought Him. Yet on the next day the great discourse just alluded to was uttered, and from that time many of his disciples went back and walked more with Him (Jude xii. 24-27).

Third Year of the Ministry. — It is recorded that Jesus had not coming to the feast, Sacrifices and Pharisees from Jerusalem went down to see Him at Capernaum (Matt. xv. 1). They found fault with his disciples for breaking the tradition about purifying, and eating with unwashed hands. It is not necessary to suppose that they came to lie in wait for Jesus. The objection was one which they would naturally raise. Our Lord, in his answer, tries to show them how far external rule, claiming to be religious, may lead men away from the true spirit of the Gospel. "Ye say, whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, it is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be true;" (Matt. x. 3, 6). They admitted the obligation of the fifth commandment's rebate, "O Lord, thou hast made a means of evading it, by enabling a son to say to his father and mother who sought his help that he had made his property a gift to the Temple, which took precedence of his obligation. We might apply to a people where such a miserable evasion could find place, the words of Isaiah (xxix. 13)—"If this people draw not nigh unto me with their mouth, and honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Leaving the neighborhood of Capernaum our Lord now travels to the northwest of Galilee, to the region of Tyre and Sidon. The time is not strictly determined, but it was probably the early summer of this year. It does not appear that He retired into this heathen country for the purpose of ministering; more probably it was a retreat from the machinations of the Jews. A woman of the country, of Greek education (Matt. xi. 21), came to entreat Him to be healed of her daughter, who was tormented with an evil spirit. The Lord at first repelled her by saying that He was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but not so was her maternal love to be baffled. She besought Him again and was again repelled; the bread of the children was not to be given to dogs. Still persisting, she besought him, even as one of the dogs so desired; "the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from the Master's table." Faith so sincere was not to be resisted. Her daughter was made whole (Matt. xv. 21-28; Mark vii. 24-30).

Returning thence He passed round by the north of the sea of Galilee to the region of Decapolis on its eastern side (Mark vii. 31-57). In this district He performed many miracles; and especially the restoration of a deaf man who had an impediment in his speech, remarkable for the seeming effort with which He wrought it. To these succeeded the feeding of the four thousand with the seven loaves (Matt. xv. 32). He now crossed the Lake to Magdala, where the Pharisees and Sadducees asked and were refused a "sign;" some great wonder wrought expressly for them to prove that He was the Christ. He answers them as He had answered a similar request before: "the sign of the prophet Jonas was all that they should have. His resurrection after a death of three days should be the great sign, and yet in another sense no sign should be given them, for they should neither see it nor believe it. The unnatural alliance between Pharisees and Sadducees is worthy of remark. The zealots of tradition, and the political partisans of Herod, were in open enmity of the Sadducees;" in Matt. xvi. 6 = "leaven of Herod," Mark viii. 15) joined together for once with a common object of hatred. After they had departed, Jesus crossed the lake with his disciples, and, combining perhaps for the use of the disciples the remembrance of the feeding of the four thousand with that of the conversation they had just heard, warned them to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod." (Mark vi. 14) So little however were the disciples prepared for this, that they took it for a rebuke for having brought only one loaf with them. They had forgotten the five thousand and the four thousand, or they would have known that where He was, natural bread could not fail them. It was needful to explain to them that the leaven of the Pharisees was the doctrine of those who had been shorn of their moral hold by traditions which, aiming to propagate religion, really overlaid and destroyed it, and the leaven of the Sadducees was the doctrine of those who, under the show of superficial enlightenment, denied the foundations of the fear of God by denying a future state. At Bethsaida Julias, Jesus restored sight to a blind man; and here, as in a former case, the form and preparation which He adopted are to be remarked. As though the human Saviour has
wrestle with and painfully overcome the sufferings of His people. He takes him by the hand, and leads him out of the town, and spits on his eyes and asks him if he sees aught. At first the sense is restored imperfectly; and Jesus lays his hand again upon him and the cure is complete (Mark viii. 22-26).

The ministry in Galilee is now drawing to its close. Through the length and breadth of that country Jesus has proclaimed the kingdom of Christ, and has shown by mighty works that He is the Christ that was to come. He begins to ask the disciples what are the results of all his labors. "Whom say the people that I am?" (Luke i. 18). It is true that the answer shows that they took Him for a prophet. But we are obliged to admit that the rejection of Jesus by the Galileans had been as complete as his preaching to them had been universal. Here and there a few may have received the seeds that shall afterwards be quickened to their conversion. But the great mass had heard without earnestness the preached word, and forgotten it without regret. "Wherewithal shall I liken this generation?" says Christ. "It is like unto children sitting in the market, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented" (Matt. xi. 16, 17). This is a picture of a wayward people without an earnest thought. As children, from want of any real purpose, cannot agree in their play, so the Galileans quarrel with every form of religious teaching. The message of John and that of Jesus they did not attend to; but they could discuss the question whether one was right in fasting and the other in eating and drinking. He denounces woe to the cities where He had wrought the most, to Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, for their strange insensibility, using the strongest expressions. "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee have been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." (Matt. x. 24, 25). Such awful language could only be talked of a country chosen by God to be a representative of a nation from amidst the world, and in truth nothing was wanting to aggravate that rejection. The lengthened journeys through the land, the miracles, far more than are recorded in detail, had brought the Gospel home to all the people. Capernaum was the focus of his ministry. Through Chorazin and Bethsaida He had no doubt passed with crowds behind Him, drawn together by wonder that they had seen, and by the hope of others to follow them. Many thousands had actually been benefited by the miracles; and yet of all these there were only twelve that really clave to Him, and one of them was Judas the traitor. With this rejection an epoch of the history is connected. He begins to unfold now the doctrine of his Passion more fully. First inquiring who the people said that He was, He then put the same question to the Apostles themselves. Simon Peter, the ready spokesman of the rest, answers, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It might almost seem that such a manifest inference from the wonders they had witnessed was too obvious to deserve praise, did not the sight of a whole country which had witnessed the same wonders, and despised them, prove how thoroughly callous the Jewish heart was. "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18-20). We compare the language applied to Capernaum for its want of faith with that addressed to Peter and the Apostles, and we see how wide is the gulf between those who believe and those who do not. Jesus now in the plainest language tells them what is to be the mode of his departure from the world: "how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (Matt. xvi. 21). Peter, who had spoken as the representative of all the Apostles before, in confessing Jesus as the Christ, now speaks for the rest in offering to our Lord the commonplace consolations of the children of this world to a friend beset by danger. The danger they think will be averted: such an end cannot befall one so great. The Lord, "when he had turned about and looked on his disciples" (Mark), to show how connected with Peter's earlier thoughts, and so to prepare them all, addresses Peter as the tempter — "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou hast an offense unto me." These words open up to us the fact that this period of the ministry was a time of special trial and temptation to the sinless Son of God. "Escape from sufferings and death! Do not drink the cup prepared of Thy Father: it is too bitter; it is not deserved." Such was the whisper of the Prince of this World at that time to our Lord; and Peter has been unwittingly taking it into his mouth. The doctrine of a suffering Messiah, so plainly exhibited in the prophets, had reeled from sight in the current religion of that time. The announcement of it to the disciples was at once new and shocking. By repelling it, even when offered by the Lord Himself, they fell into a deeper sin than they could have conceived. The chief of them was called "Satan," because he was unscrupulously pleading on Satan's side (Matt. xvi. 21-23).

Turning now to the whole body of those who followed Him (Mark, Luke), He published the Christian doctrine of self-denial. The Apostles had just shown that they took the natural view of suffering, that it was an evil to be shunned. They shrank from conflict, and pain, and death, as it is natural men should. But Jesus teaches that, in comparison with the higher life, the life of the soul, the life of the body is valueless. And as the renewed life of the Christian implies his dying to his old wishes and desires, suffering, which causes the death of earthly hopes and wishes, may be a good. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. xvi.) From this part of the history to the end we shall not lose sight of the sufferings of the Lord. The Cross is darkly seen at the end of our path; and we shall ever draw nearer to that mysterious implement of human salvation (Matt. xvi. 21-28, Mark viii. 31-38; Luke xx. 22-27).
The Transfiguration, which took place just a week after this conversation, is to be understood in connection with it. The minds of the twelve were greatly disturbed at what they had heard. The Messiah was to perish by the wrath of men. The Master whom they served was to be taken away from them. Now, if ever, they needed support for their perplexed spirits, and this their loving Master failed not to give them. He takes with Him three chosen disciples, Peter, James, and John, who formed as it were a smaller circle nearer to Jesus than that of the rest, into a high mountain apart by themselves. There are no means of determining the position of the mountain; although Caesarea Philippi was the scene of the former conversations, it does not follow that this occurred on the eastern side of the lake, for the intervening week would have given time enough for a long journey thence.

There is no authority for the tradition which identifies this mountain with Mount Tabor, although it may be true. [HERMON; TARON.] The three disciples were taken up with Him, who should afterwards be the three witnesses of his agony in the garden of Gethsemane; those who saw his glory in the holy mount would be sustained by the remembrance of it when they beheld his lowest humiliation. The highest and the lowest in the multitude preclude all doubt as to its historical character. It is no myth, nor vision; but a sober account of a miracle. When Jesus had come up into the mountain He was praying, and as He prayed, a great change came over Him. "His face did shine as the sun (Matt.); and His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them" (Mark). Beside Him appeared Moses and Elijah, the greatest and most illustrious of the prophets; and they spoke of his departure, as though it was something recognized both by Law and prophets. The three disciples were at first asleep with weariness; and when they woke they saw the glorious scene. As Moses and Elijah were departing (Luke), Peter, wishing to arrest them, uttered these strange words, "Lord, it is good for us to be here, and let us make three tabernacles, one for Thee, and one for Moses, and one for Eli- jah." They were the words of one astonished and somewhat afraid, yet of one who felt a strange peace in this explicit testimony from the Father that Jesus was his. It was good for them to be there, he felt, where no Pharisees could set traps for them, where neither Pilate nor Herod could take Jesus by force. Just as he spoke a cloud came over them, and the voice of the Heavenly Father attested once more his Son — "This is my beloved Son; hear Him." There has been much discussion on the purport of this great wonder. But this much seems highly probable. First, as it was connected with the prayer of Jesus, to which it was no doubt an answer, it is to be regarded as a kind of inauguration of Him in his new office as the High-priest who should make atonement for the sins of the people with his own blood. The mystery of his trials and temptations lies too deep for speculation: but He received strength against human infirmity — against the prospect of sufferings so terrible — in this his glorification. Secondly, as the witnesses of this scene were the same three disciples who were with the Master in the garden of Gethsemane it may be assumed that the one was intended to prepare them for the other, and that they were to be borne up under the spectacle of his humiliation by the remembrance that they had been eye-witnesses of his majesty (2 Pet. 1:16-18).

As they came down from the mountain He charged them to keep secret what they had seen till after the Resurrection; which shows that this miracle took place for his use and for theirs, rather than for the rest of the disciples. This led to questions about the meaning of his rising again from the dead, and in the course of it, and arising out of it, occurred the question, "Why then (a question which refers to some preceding conversation) say the scribes that Elias must first come?" They had been assured by what they had just seen that the time of the kingdom of God was now come; and the objection brought by the Scribes, that before the Messiah Elijah must reappear, seemed hard to reconcile with their new conviction. Our Lord answers them that the Scribes have rightly understood the prophecies that Elijah would first come (Mal. iv. 5, 6), but have wanted the discernment to see that this prophecy was already fulfilled.

"Elias has come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatever they listed." In John the Baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elijah, were the Scriptures fulfilled (Matt. xviii. 1-13; Mark ix. 2-13; Luke x. 28-36).

The Transfiguration, which was a scene of talking place which formed the strongest contrast to the glory and the peace which they had witnessed, and which seemed to justify Peter's remark, "It is good for us to be here." A poor youth, hungry and possessed by a devil — for here as elsewhere the possession is superadded to some known form of that bodily and mental evil which came in at first with sin and Satan — was brought to the disciples who were not with Jesus, to be cured. They could not prevail; and when Jesus appeared amongst them the agonized and disappointed father appealed to Him, with a kind of complaint of the impotence of the disciples. "O faithless and perverse generation!" said our Lord; "how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you?" The rebuke is not to the disciples, but to all, the father included; for the father interfered with the miracles that were in them all.

St. Mark's account, the most complete, describes the paroxysm that took place in the lad on our Lord's ordering him to be brought; and also records the remarkable saying, which well described the father's state, "Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief." What the disciples had failed to do, Jesus did at a word. He then explained to them that their want of faith in their own power to heal, and in his promises to bestow the power upon them, was the cause of their inability (Matt. xviii. 14-21; Mark ix. 14-29; Luke ix. 37-43).

Once more did Jesus foretell his sufferings on their way back to Capernaum: but "they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask Him" (Mark ix. 30-32).

But a vague impression seems to have been produced on them that his kingdom was now very near. It broke forth in the shape of a dispute amongst them as to which should rank the highest in the kingdom when it should come. Taking a little child, He told them that, in his kingdom, not ambition, but a childlike humility, would entitle to the highest place (Matt. xviii. 1-5; Mark ix. 33-37; Luke ix. 46-48). The humility of the Christian is so closely connected with consideration for the souls of others, that the transition to a warning against causing offense (Matt., Mark), which
The history of the woman taken in adultery belongs to this time. But it must be premised that several MSS. of highest authority omit this passage, and that in those which insert it the text is singularly disturbed (see Liefke, in loc., and Tischendorf, Gr. Text., ed. vii.). The remark of Augustine is perhaps not far from the truth, that this story formed a genuine portion of the apostolic teaching, but that mistaken people excluded it from their copies of the written gospel, thinking it might be reverted into a license to women to sin (Ad Pollent. ii. ch. 7). That it was thus kept apart, without the safeguards which Christian vigilance exercised over the rest of the text, and was only admitted later, would at once account for its absence from the MSS. and for the various forms assumed by the text where it is given. But the history gives no ground for such apprehensions. The law of Moses gave the power to stone women taken in adultery. But Jewish morals were sunk very low, like Jewish faith; and the punishment could not be inflicted on a sinner by those who had sinned in the same kind: "Etenim non est ferundus accusator qui quod in altero vitium reprehendit, in eo quo reprehenditur" (Cicero, c. Ferrum, III.). Thus the punishment had passed out of use. But they thought, by proposing this case to our Lord, to induce Him to modify the law for women, lest they might accuse Him of profaneness; or to sentence the guilty wretch to die, and so become obnoxious to the charge of cruelty. From such temptations Jesus was always able to escape. He threw back the decision upon them: He told them that the man who was free from that sin might cast the first stone at her. Conscience told them that this was unanswerable, and one by one they stole away, leaving the guilty woman alone before One who was indeed her Judge. It has been supposed that the words "Neither do I condemn thee" convey an absolute pardon for the sin of which she had just been guilty. But they refer, as has long since been pointed out, to the doom of stoning only. "As they have not punished thee, neither do I: go, and let this danger warn thee to sin no more" (John viii. 1-11).

The explanations (John viii. 12-59) show in a strong light the perversity of the Jews in misunderstanding our Lord's words. They refuse to see any spiritual meaning in them, and drag them as it were by force down to a low and carnal interpretation. Our Lord's remark explains the cause of this, "Why do ye not understand my speech (way of speaking)? Even because ye cannot hear my word (ver. 49). His mode of expression was strange to them, because they were neither able nor willing to understand the real purport of his teaching. To this place belongs the account, given by John alone, of the healing of one who was born blind, and the consequences of it (John i. 41-41, x. 1-21). The poor patient was excommunicated for refusing to undervalue the agency of Jesus in restoring him. He believed on Jesus; whilst the Pharisees were only made the worse for what they had witnessed. Well might Jesus exclaim, "For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind" (ix. 39). The well-known parable of the good shepherd is an answer to the calumnies of the Pharisees, that He was an impostor and breaker of the law, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day" (ix. 16).

We now approach a difficult portion of the sacred
history. The note of time given us by John immediately afterwards is the Feast of the Dedication, which was celebrated on the 25th of Kislev, answering nearly to December. According to this Evangelist our Lord does not appear to have returned to Galilee between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of Dedication, but to have passed the time in and near Jerusalem. Matthew and Mark do not allude to the Feast of Tabernacles. Luke appears to do so in ix. 51; but the words there used would imply that this was the last journey to Jerusalem. Now in St. Luke's Gospel a large section, from ix. 51 to xviii. 14, seems to belong to the time preceding the departure from Galilee: and the question is how is this to be arranged, so that it shall harmonize with the narrative of St. John? In most Harmonies a return of our Lord to Galilee has been assumed, in order to find a place for this part of Luke's Gospel. "But the manner," says the English editor of Robinson's Harmony, "in which it has been arranged, after all, is exceedingly various. Some, as Le Clerc, Harn. Evang. p. 294, insert nearly the whole during this supposed journey. Others, as Lightfoot, assign to this journey only what precedes Luke xii. 38 and refer the remainder to our Lord's sojourn beyond Jordan, John x. 40 (Chrys. Temp. xvi. p. 153). Greweil (Dissert. xxi. vol. ii.) maintains that the transactions in Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, all belong to the journey from Ephraim (through Samaria, Galilee, and Perea) to Jerusalem, which he dates in the interval of four months between the Feast of Dedication and our Lord's last Passover. Wieseler (Chron. Synops. p. 328) makes a somewhat different arrangement, according to which Luke xii. 38 refers to the period from Christ's journey from Galilee to the Feast of Tabernacles, till after the Feast of Dedication (parallel to John vii. 10—x. 42). Luke xii. 22—xvii. 10 refers to the interval between that time and our Lord's stay at Ephraim (parallel to John xi. 1-54); and Luke xvii. 11—xviii. 14 relates to the journey from Ephraim to Jerusalem, through Samaria, Galilee, and Perea." (Robinson's Harmony, English ed. p. 92). If the Table of the Harmony of the Gospels given above is referred to [Gos. xvi.], it will be found that this great division of St. Luke (x. 17—xviii. 14) is inserted entirely between John x. 21 and 22; not that this appeared certainly correct, but that there are no points of contact with the other Gospels to assist us in breaking it up. That this division contains partly or chiefly reminiscences of occurrences in Galilee prior to the Feast of Tabernacles, is untenable. A journey of some kind is implied in the course of it (see xiii. 22, and beyond this we shall hardly venture to go. It is quite possible, as Wieseler supposes, that part of it should be placed before, and part after the Feast of Dedication. Notwithstanding the uncertainty, it is as the history of this period of the Redeemer's career that the Gospel of St. Luke presents its chief distinction to us. Some of the most striking parables, preserved only by this Evangelist, belong to this period. The parables of the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the unjust steward, the rich man and Lazarus, and the Pharisee and publican, all peculiar to this Gospel, belong to the present section. The instructive account of Mary and Martha, on which so many have taken a wrong view of Martha's conduct, reminds us that there are two ways of serving the truth, that of active exertion, and that of contemplation. The preference is given to Mary's meditation, because Martha's labor belonged to household cares, and was only indirectly religious. The miracle of the ten lepers belongs to this portion of the narrative. Besides these, scattered sayings that occur in St. Matthew are here repeated in a new connection. Here too belongs the return of the seventy disciples, but we know not precisely where they rejoined the Lord (Luke x. 17-20). They had been full of triumph, because they found even the devils subject to them through the weight of Christ's word. In anticipation of the victory which was now begun, against the powers of darkness, Jesus replies, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." He sought, however, to humble their triumphant spirit, so near akin to spiritual pride; "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven."

The account of the bringing of young children to Jesus mates again the three Evangelists. Here, as often, St. Mark gives the most minute account of what occurred. After the announcement that the disposition of little children was the most meet for the kingdom of God, "He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them and blessed them." The childlike spirit, which in nothing depends upon its own capacity, but seeks not how to contrast with the haughty Pharisaism with its boast of learning and wisdom; and Jesus tells them that the former is the passport to his kingdom (Matt. xix. 13-15; Mark x. 13-16; Luke xviii. 15-17).

The question of the ruler, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" was one conceived wholly in the spirit of Judaism. The ruler asked not how he should be delivered from sin, but how his will, already free to righteousness, might select the best and most meritorious line of conduct. The words, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God," were meant first to draw him down to a humbler view of his own state; the title good is easy to give, but hard to justify, except when applied to the One who is all good. Jesus by no means repudiates the title as applied to Himself, but only as applied on any other ground than that of a reference to his true divine nature. Then the Lord opened out to him all the moral law, which in its full and complete sense no man has observed; but the ruler answered, perhaps sincerely, that he had observed it all from his youth up. Duties however there might be which had not come within the range of his thoughts; and as the demand had reference to his own special case, our Lord gives the special advice to sell all his possessions and to give to the poor. Then for the first time did the man discover that his devotion to God and his yearning after the eternal life were not so perfect as he had thought; and he went away sorrowful, unable to bear this sacrifice. And Jesus told the disciples how hard it was for those who had riches to enter into the kingdom of God. To be rich was not by any means a disqualification, but the feeding on the material world in the most ready, now contrasts, with somewhat too much emphasis, the mode in which the disciples had left all for Him, with the conduct of this rich ruler. Our Lord, spring him the rebuke which he might have expected, tells them that those who have made any sacrifice shall have it richly repaid even in this life in the shape of a consolation and comfort, which even persecutions cannot take away (Mark x. 17-34; Luke xvii. 18-30). Words of warning close the narrative, "Many that are first shall be
last and the last shall be first,” lest the disciples should be thinking too much of the sacrifices, not so very great, that they had made. And in St. Matthew only, the well-known parable of the laborers in the vineyard is added to illustrate the same lesson. Whatever else the parable may contain of reference to the calling of Jews and Gentiles, the first lesson Christ was to give was one of caution to the Apostles against thinking too much of their early calling and arduous labors. They would see many, who, in comparison with themselves, were as the laborers called at the eleventh hour, who should be accepted of God as well as they. But not merit, not self-sacrifice, but the pure love of God and his mere bounty, conferred salvation on either of them: “Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?” (Matt. xx. 1–16).

On the way to Jerusalem through Peræa, to the Feast of Dedication, Jesus again puts before the minds of the twelve what they are never to forget, the sufferings that await Him. They “understood none of these things” (Luke), for they could not reconcile this foreboding of suffering with the signs and announcements of the coming of his kingdom (Matt. xx. 17–19; Mark x. 32–34; Luke xviii. 31–34). In consequence of this new, though dark, intimation of the coming of the kingdom, Salome, with her youngest son, James, then a child,46 besought “to bespeak the two places of highest honor in the kingdom. Jesus tells them that they know not what they ask; that the places of honor in the kingdom shall be bestowed, not by Jesus in answer to a chance request, but upon those for whom they are prepared by the Father. As sin ever provokes sin, the ambition of the ten was now aroused, and they began to be much displeased with James and John. Jesus once more recalls the principle that the childlike disposition is that which He approves. “Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. xx. 28–33; Mark x. 35–45).

The healing of the two blind men at Jericho is chiefly remarkable among the miracles from the difficulty which has arisen in harmonizing the accounts. Matthew speaks of two blind men, and of the occasion as the departure from Jericho; Mark of one, whom he names, and of their arrival at Jericho; and Luke agrees with him. This point has received much discussion; but the view of Lightfoot finds favor with many eminent expositors, that there were two blind men, and both were healed under similar circumstances, except that Bartimæus was on one side of the city, and was healed by Jesus as he entered, and the other was healed on the other side as they departed (see Greswell, Diss. xx. ii.; Wieseler, Chron. Syn. p. 392; Matt. xx. 26–34; Mark x. 46–52; Luke xviii. 35–43). [BARTHEMUS, Amer. ed.]

The calling of Zacchæus has more than a mere personal interest. He was a publican, one of a class despised and despoiled by the Jews. But he was one who sought to serve God; he gave largely to the poor, and restored fourfold when he had injured any man. Justice and love were the law of his life. From such did Jesus wish to call his disciples, whether they were publicans or not. “This day is salvation come to this house, for that he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost” (Luke xix. 1–10).

We have reached now the Feast of Dedication; but, as has been said, the exact place of the events in St. Luke about this part of the ministry has not been conclusively determined. After being present at the feast, Jesus returned to Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John had formerly baptized, and abode there. The place which the beginning of his ministry had consecrated, was now to be adorned with his presence as it drew towards its close, and the scene of John’s activity was now to witness the presence of the Saviour whom he had so faithfully proclaimed (John x. 32–42). The Lord intended by this choice to recall to the minds of many the good which John had done them, and also, it may be, to prevent an undue exaltation of John in the minds of some who had heard him only. “Many,” we read, “resorted to Him, and said, John did no miracle, but all things that John spoke of this man were true. And many believed on Him there” (vv. 41, 42).

How long He remained here does not appear. It was probably for some weeks. The sore need of a family in Bethany, who were what men call the poor, is referred to (John xii.), and Jesus, who saw Lazarus was sick, and his sisters sent word of it to Jesus, whose power they well knew, Jesus answered that the sickness was not unto death, but for the glory of God, and of the Son of God. This had reference to the miracle about to be wrought; even though he died, not his death but his restoration to life was the purpose of the sickness. But Jesus made a trial to the faith of the sisters to find the words of their friend apparently falsified. Jesus abode for two days where He was, and then proposed to the disciples to return. The rage of the Jews against him filled the disciples with alarm; and Thomas, whose mind least always to the despising side, and saw nothing in the expedition but certain death to all of them, said, “Let us also go that we may die with Him.” It was not till Lazarus had been four days in the grave that the Saviour appeared on the scene. The practical energy of Martha, and the retiring character of Mary, show themselves here, as once before. It was Martha who met Him, and addressed to Him words of sorrowful reproach. Jesus prob ed her faith deeply, and found that even in this extremity of sorrow it would not fall her. Mary now joined them, summoned by her sister; and she too reproached the Lord for the delay. Jesus does not resist the contagion of their sorrow, and as a Man He weeps true human tears by the side of the grave of a friend. But with the power of God He breaks the fetters of brass in which Lazarus was held by death, and at His word the man whom corruption had already begun to do its work came forth alive and whole (John xi. 38–45). It might seem difficult to account for the omission of this, perhaps the most signal of all the miracles of Jesus, by the synoptical Evangelists. No doubt it was intentional; and the wish not to direct attention, and perhaps persecution, to Lazarus in his lifetime may go far to account for it. But it stands well in the pages of John, whose privilege it has been to announce the highest truths connected with the divine nature of Jesus, and who is now also permitted to show Him touched with sympathy for a sorrowing family with whom he lived in intimacy.
A miracle so public, for Bethany was close to Jerusalem, and the family of Lazarus well known to many people in the mother-city, could not escape the notice of the Sanhedrin. A meeting of this Council was called without loss of time, and the matter discussed, not without symptoms of alarm, for the members believed that a popular outbreak, with Jesus at its head, was impending, and that it would excite the jealousy of the Romans and lead to the taking away of their place and nation." Caiphas the high-priest gave it as his opinion that it was expedient for them that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish. The Evangelist adds that these words bore a prophetic meaning, of which the speaker was unconscious: "This spake he not of himself, but being high-priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation." That a bad and worldly man may prophesy the case of Babylon proves (Num. xxiii.); and the Jews, as Schottgen shows, believed that prophecy might also be unconscious. But the connection of the gift of prophecy with the office of the high-priest offers a difficulty. It has been said that though this gift is never in Scripture assigned to the high-priest as such, yet the popular belief at this time was that he did enjoy it. There is, however, except this passage, of any such belief; and the Evangelist would not appeal to it except it were true, and if it were true, then the O. T. would contain some allusion to it. The endeavors to escape from the difficulty by changes of punctuation are not to be thought of. The meaning of the passage seems to be this: The Jews were about to commit a crime, the real results of which they did not know; and Pilate overruled the words of one of them to make him declare the reality of the transaction, but unconsciously; and as Caiphas was the high-priest, the highest minister of God, and therefore the most conspicuous in the sin, it was natural to expect that he and not another would be the channel of the prophecy. The connection between his office and the prophecy was not a necessary one: but if a prophecy was to be uttered, it was expected that the highest-priest, who offered for the people, should be the person compelled to utter it. The death of Jesus was now resolved on, and He fled to Ephraim for a few days, because his hour was not yet come (John xi. 45-57).

We now approach the final stage of the history, and every word and act tend towards the great act of suffering. The hatred of the Pharisees, now converted into a settled purpose of murder, the
them, and straightway he will send them." With these facts, impressed as for the service of a King, He was to enter into Jerusalem. The disciples spread upon the ass their rags clad choaks for Him to sit on. And then, crying aloud before Him, in the words of the 118th Psalm, " Hosanna, Save now! blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." This Messiaanic psalm they applied to Him, from a belief, sincere for the moment, that He was the Messiah. It was a striking, and to the Pharisees an alarming sight; but it only serves in the end to show the feeble hearts of the Jewish people. The same lips that cried Hosanna will be long before He passes by. Meantime, however, all thoughts were carried back to the promises of a Messiah. The very act of riding in upon an ass revived an old prophecy of Zechariah (ix. 9). Words of prophecy out of a palm sprang unconsciously to their lips. All the city was moved. Blind and lame came to the Temple when He arrived there and were healed. The augurs consulted, the barren fig-tree had already died. But all these demonstrations did not deceive the divine insight of Christ. He wept over the city that was hailing Him as its King, and said, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes" (Luke). He goes on to prophesy the destruction of the city, just as it afterwards came to pass. After working miracles in the Temple He returned to Bethany. The 10th of Nisan was the day for the separation of the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 3). Jesus, the Lamb of God, entered Jerusalem and the Temple on this day, and although none but He knew that He was the Paschal Lamb, the coincidence is not undesigned (Matt. xxi. 1-11, 14-17; Mark xi. 1-11; Luke xix. 29-44; John xii. 12-19).

Monday the 11th of Nisan (April 3rd).—The next day Jesus returned to Jerusalem, again to take advantage of the mood of the people to instruct them. On the way He approached one of the many fig-trees which grew in that quarter (Bethphage = a house of figs ), and found that it was full of foliage, but without fruit. He said, " No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever:" and the fig-tree withered away. This was no doubt a work of destruction, and as such was unlawful. But He desired to understand the mind of those who stumbled at the destruction of a tree, which seems to have ceased to bear, by the word of God the Son, yet are not offended at the famine or the pestilence wrought by God the Father. The right of the Son must rest on the same ground as that of the Father. And this was not a wanton destruction; it was a type and a warning. He had been made the subject of a parable (Luke xii. 5); and here it is made a visible type of the destruction of the Jewish people. He had come to them seeking fruit, and now it was time to pronounce their doom as a nation — there should be no fruit on them for ever (Matt. xxi. 18, 19; Mark xi. 12-14). Proceeding now to the Temple, He cleared its court of the crowd of traders that gathered there. He had performed the same act at the beginning of his ministry, and now at the close He repeats it, for the house of prayer was as much a den of thieves as ever. With zeal for God's house his ministry began, with the same it ended (see p 1369; Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15-19; Luke xix. 45-48). In the evening He returned again to Bethany.
that terrible denunciation of woe to the Thiriasse, with which we are familiar (Matt. xxiii. 1-39). If we compare it with our Lord's account of his own position in reference to the Law, in the Sermon on the Mount, we see that the principles there laid down are everywhere violated by the Thiriasse. Their dissembling was ostentation: their distinctions about oaths led to falsehood and profaneness; they were exact about the small observances and neglected the weightier ones of the Law; they adorned the tombs of the prophets, saying that if they had lived in the time of their fathers they would not have sinned; and yet they were about to fill up the measure of their fathers' sins by slaying the greatest of the prophets, and persecuting and slaying his followers. After an indignant denunciation of the hypocrites who, with a show of religion, had thus contrived to stifle the true spirit of religion and were in reality its chief persecutors, He apostrophizes Jerusalem in words full of compassion, yet carrying with them a sentence of doom: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. xxi.).

Another great discourse belongs to this day, which, more than any other, presents Jesus as the great Prophet of His people. On leaving the Temple His disciples drew attention to the beauty of its structure, its "goodly stones and gifts," their remarks probably arising from the threats of destruction which had so lately been uttered by Jesus. His Master answered that not one stone of the noble pile should be left upon another. When they reached the Mount of Olives the disciples, or rather the first four (Mark), speaking for the rest, asked Him when this destruction should be accomplished. To understand the answer it must be borne in mind that Jesus warned them that He was not giving them an historical account such as would enable them to anticipate the events. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But the day and hour of His coming no man knoweth, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." Accordingly, two events, analogous in character but widely sundered by time, are so treated in the prophecy that it is almost impossible to disentangle them. The destruction of Jerusalem and the day of judgment — the national and the universal days of account — are spoken of together or alternately without hint of the great interval of time that elapsed between them. Thus it may seem that a most important fact is omitted; but the highest work of prophecy is not to fix times and seasons, but to disclose the divine significance of events. What was most important to them to know was that the destruction of Jerusalem followed upon the probation and rejection of her people, and that the crucifixion and that destruction were connected as cause and effect (Matt. xxvii.; Mark xv.; Luke xxiii.).

The conclusion which Jesus drew from his own awful warning was, that they were not to attempt to fix the date of his return: "Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh." The lesson of the parable of the Ten Virgins is the same; the Christian soul is to be ever in a state of vigilance and preparation (Matt. xxvi. 33-35). And the parable of the Ten Virgins is, here repeated in a modified form, teaches how precious to souls are the uses of time (Matt. xxv. 1-13). In concluding this momentous discourse, our Lord puts aside the destruction of Jerusalem, and displays to our eyes the picture of the final judgment. There will He Himself be present, and will separate all the vast family of mankind into two classes, and shall appraise the works of each class as works done to Himself, present in the world though invisible; and men shall see, some with terror and some with joy, that their life here was spent either for Him or against Him, and that the day of the Lord is near. By the approximation for them by Him, and not by choice, and the reward and punishment shall be apportioned to each (Matt. xxv. 31-46).

With these weighty words ends the third day; and whether we consider the importance of His recorded teaching, or the amount of opposition and of sorrow presented to His mind, it was one of the greatest days of all His earthly ministries. The general tendency of His ministry is to contain a retrospect of His ministry and of the strange reception of Him by His people, may well be read as if they came in here. (xv.)

*Wednesday the 13th of Nisan (April 5th).— This day was passed in retirement with the Apostles. Satan had put it into the mind of one of them to betray Him; and Judas Iscariot made a covenant to betray Him to the chief priests for thirty pieces of silver. The character of Judas, and the degrees by which he reached the abyss of guilt in which he was at last destroyed, deserve much attention. There is no reason to doubt that when he was chosen by Jesus He possessed, like the rest, the capacity of being saved, and was endowed with gifts which might have made him an able minister of the New Testament. But the innate wickedness and covetousness were not purged out from him. His practical talents made him a kind of steward of the slender resources of that society, and no doubt he conceived the wish to use the same gifts on a larger field, which the realization of "the kingdom of Heaven" would open out before him. These practical gifts were his ruin. Between him and the rest there could be no comparison: his motives were worldly, and theirs were not. They loved the Saviour more as they knew Him better. Judas, living under the constant tacit rebuke of a most holy example, grew to hate the Lord; for nothing, perhaps, more strongly draws out evil instincts than the enforced contact with goodness. And when he knew that his Master did not trust him, was not deceived by him, his hatred grew more intense. But this did not break out in overt act until Jesus began to foretell his own crucifixion and death. If these were to happen, all his hopes that he had built on following the Lord would be dashed down. If they should crucify the Master they would not spare the servants; and, in place of a heavenly kingdom, he could find contempt, persecution, and probably death. It was high time, therefore, to the powers that seemed most likely to prevail in the end; and he opened a negotiation with the high-priests in secret, in order that, if his Master were to fall, he might be the instrument, and so make friends among the triumphant persecutors. And yet, strange contradiction, he did not wholly cease to believe in Jesus; possibly he thought that he would so act that he might be safe either
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xxvi. If Jesus was the Prophet and Mighty One that he had once thought, then the attempt to take Him might force Him to put forth all his resources and to assume the kingdom to which He laid claim, and then the agent in the treason, even if discovered, might plead that he foresaw the result: if He were unable to save Himself and his disciples, then it was well for Judas to betake himself to those who were stronger. The bribe of money, not very considerable, could not have been the chief motive; but as two vicious appetites could be gratified instead of one, the thirty pieces of silver became a part of the temptation. The treason was successful, and the money paid; but not one moment’s pleasure did those silver pieces purchase for their wretched possessor, not for a moment did he reap any fruit from his detestable guilt. After the crucifixion, the avenging belief that Jesus was what He professed to be rushed back in full force upon his mind. He went to those who had hired him; they derided his remorse. He cast away the accursed silver pieces, defiled with the ‘innocent blood’ of the Son of God, and went and hanged himself (Matt. xxvii. 14-16; Mark xiv. 10-11; Luke xxii. 1-6).—

Thursday the 14th of Nisan (April 6th).—On the “first day of unleavened bread,” when the Jews were wont to put away all leaven of their houses, Jesus, after the feast (Heb. on March 8, 12), the disciples asked their Master where they were to eat the Passover. He directed Peter and John to go into Jerusalem, and to follow a man whom they should see bearing a pitcher of water, and to demand of him, in their Master’s name, the use of the guest-chamber in his house for this purpose. All happened as Jesus had told them, and in the evening they assembled to celebrate, for the last time, the paschal meal. The sequence of the events is not quite clear from a comparison of the Evangelists; but the difficulty arises with St. Luke, and there is external evidence that he is not following the chronological order (Wieseler, Chron. Syn., p. 399). The order seems to be as follows. When they had taken their places at table and the supper had begun, Jesus gave them the first cup to divide among themselves (Mark xiv. 26). It was customary to drink at the paschal supper four cups of wine mixed with water; and this answered to the first of them. There now arose a contention among the disciples which of them should be the greatest; perhaps in connection with the places which they had taken at this feast (Luke). After a solemn warning against pride and ambition Jesus performed an act which, as one of the last of his life, must ever have been remembered by the witnesses as a great lesson of humility. He rose from the table, poured water into a basin, girded himself with a towel, and proceeded to wash the disciples’ feet (John). It was an office for slaves to perform, and from Him, knowing as He did, “that the Father had given all things into his hand, and that He was come from God and went to God,” it was an unspoken Angelic service. But his love for them was infinite, and if there were any way to teach them the humility which as yet they had not learned, He would not fail to adopt it. Peter, with his usual readiness, was the first to refuse to accept such menial ser-

vice—“Lord, dost thou wash my feet?” When he was told that this act was significant of the greater act of humiliation by which Jesus saved his disciples and united them to Himself, his scruples vanished. After all had been washed, the Saviour explained to them the meaning of what He had done. “If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. But this act was only the outward symbol of far greater sacrifices for them than they could as yet understand. It was a small matter to wash their feet; it was a great one to come down from the glories of heaven to save them. Later the Apostle Paul put this same lesson of humility into another form, and rested it upon deeper grounds. ‘Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross’ (Phil. ii. 5-8; Matt. xxvii. 17-20; Mark xiv. 12-17; Luke xxii. 7-30; John xiii. 1-20).—

From this act of love it does not seem that even the traitor Judas was excluded. But his treason was thoroughly known: and now Jesus denounced it. One of them should betray Him. They were all sorrowful at this, and each asked “Is it I?” and even Judas asked and received an affirmative answer (Matt.), but probably in an undertone, for when Jesus said “That thou dost do quickly,” none of the rest understood. The traitor having gone straight to his wicked object, the end of the Saviour’s ministry seemed already at hand. “Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him.” He gave them the new commandment, to love one another, as though it were a last bequest to them. To love was not a new thing, it was enjoined in the old Law; but to be distinguished for a special Christian love and mutual devotion was what He would have, and this was the new element in the commandment. Founded by a great act of love, the Church was to be marked by love (Matt. xxvi. 21-25; Mark xiv. 18-21; Luke xxii. 21-23; John xiii. 21-35).—

Towards the close of the meal Jesus instituted the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. He took bread and gave thanks and brake it, and gave to his disciples, saying, “This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.” He then took the cup, which corresponded to the third cup in the usual course of the paschal supper, and after giving thanks, He gave it to them, saying, “This is my blood of the new testament [covenant] which is shed for many.” It was a memorial of his passion and of this last supper that preceded it, and in dwelling on his Passion in this sacrament, in true faith, all believers draw nearer to the cross of his sufferings and taste more strongly the sweetness of his love and the evidence of his atoning death (Matt. xxvi. 28-32; Mark xiv. 22-25; Luke xii. 19 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25).—

The denial of Peter is now foretold, and to no man bearing a pitcher of water.” As the host was to be identified by this circumstance, it seems to be implied that the practice was unusual.
one would such an announcement be more incredible than to Peter himself. "Lord, why cannot I follow thee now?" I will lay down my life for thee." The zeal was sincere, and as such did the Lord regard it; but here, as elsewhere, Peter did not count the cost. By and by, when the Holy Spirit has come down to give them a strength not their own. Peter and the rest of the disciples will be bold to resist persecution, even to the death. It needs strong love and deep insight to view such an act as this denial with sorrow and not with indignation (Matt. xxvi. 31-55; Mark xiv. 27-31; Luke xxi. 31-38; John xiii. 36-38).

That great final discourse, which John alone has recorded, is now delivered. Although in the middle of it there is a mention of departure (John xiv. 31), this perhaps only implies that they prepared to go; and then the whole discourse was delivered in the house before they proceeded to Gethsemane. Of the contents of this discourse, which is the voice of the Priest in the holy of holies, something has been said already (p. 1388; John xiv.-xvii.).

Friday the 15th of Nisan (April 7), including part of the eve of it. — "When they had sung a hymn," a which perhaps means, when they had sung the second part of the Hallel, or song of praise, which consisted of Psalms ext.-xxviii., the former part having been sung (a) at an earlier part of the supper, they went out into the Mount of Olives. They came to a place called Gethsemane (oil-press), and it is probable that the place now pointed out to travellers is the real scene of that which follows, and even that its huge olive-trees are the legitimate successors of those which were there when Jesus visited it. A moment of terrible agony is approaching, of which all the Apostles need not be spectators, for He thinks of them, and wishes to spare them this addition to their sorrows. So He takes only his three proved companions, Peter, James, and John, and passes with them farther into the garden, leaving the rest seated, probably near the entrance. No pen can attempt to describe what passed that night in that secluded spot. He tells them "my soul is exceeding sorrowful," He will lay down his life for the sheep, and watch with me," and then leaving even the three He goes further, and in solitude wrestles with an inconceivable trial. The words of Mark are still more expressive — He began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy" (θυμομαις καὶ ἄνευνοις, xiv. 33). The former word means that he was struck with a great dread; not from the fear of physical suffering, however exorcizing, we may well believe, but from the contact with the sins of the world, of which, in some inconceivable way, He here felt the bitterness and the weight. He did not merely contemplate them, but bear and feel them. It is impossible to explain this scene in Gethsemane in any other way. If it were merely the fear of the terrors of death that overcame Him, then the martyr Stephen and many another would have sung Him a requiem. But when He says, "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt," (Mark), the cup was filled with a far bitterer potion than death; it was favored with the poison of the sins of all mankind against its God. Whilst the sinless Son is thus carried two ways by the present horror and the strong determination to do the Father's will, the disciples have sunk to sleep. It was in search of consolation that He came back to them. The disciple who had been so ready to ask "Why cannot I follow thee now?" must hear another question, that relaxes his former confidence — "Couldst not thou watch one hour?" A second time He departs and wrestles in prayer with the Father; but although the words He utters are almost the same (Mark says "the same"), He no longer asks that the cup may pass away from Him — "If this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, Thy will be done" (Matt.). A second time He returns and finds them sleeping. The same scene is repeated yet a third time; and then all is concluded. Henceforth they may sleep and take their rest; never more shall they be asked to watch one hour with Jesus, for his ministry in the flesh is at an end. "The hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" (Matt.). The prayer of Jesus in this place has always been regarded, and with reason, as of great weight against the monomelodious heresy. It expresses the natural shrinking of the human will from a horror which the divine nature has admitted into it, yet without sin. Never does He say, "I will flee," He says, "If it be possible:" and leaves that to the decision of the Father. That horror and dread arose from the spectacle of human sin: from the bearing the weight and guilt of human sin as about to make atonement for it: and from a conflict with the powers of darkness. Thus this scene is in complete contrast to the Transfiguration. The same companions witnessed both; but there was peace, and glory, and honor, for the sinless Son of God; here fear and conflict: there God bore testimony to Him: here Satan for the last time tempted Him. (On the account of the Agony see Krummacher, Der Leidende Christus, p. 206; Matt. xxxvi. 36-46; Mark xiv. 32-42; Luke xiii. 39-41; John xviii. 1.) Judas now appeared to complete his work. In the double light of torches, a kiss from him was the sign to the officers whom they should take. John xvi.; the kiss was given to Peter, and the sword of him whom Jesus loved, he drew a sword and smote a servant of the high-priest, and cut out off his ear: but His Lord refused such succor, and healed the wounded man. [MALCHUS.] He treated the seizure as a step in the fulfilment of the prophecies about Him, and resisted it not. All the disciples forsake Him and fled (Matt. xxvi. 47-50; Mark xiv. 43-52; Luke xxii. 47-53; John xvi. 2-12.)

There is some difficulty in arranging the events that immediately follow, so as to embrace all the four accounts. — The data will be found in the Commentary of Olshausen, in Wieseler (Chron. Syn. p. 401 ff.), and in Greswell's Dissertations (iii. 200 ff.). On the capture of Jesus He was first taken to the house of Annas, the father-in-law of Caiphas (see p. 1350 of the high-priest. It has been argued that as Annas is called, and conjointly with Caiphas, the high-priest, he must have held some actual office in connection with the priesthood, and Lightfoot and others suppose that he was the vicar or deputy of the high-priest, and Selden that he was president of the Council of the Sadducees;
Feeling and and and for subject principle he prefilled president the after, time, upon several some denies over a Peter disciples? tion in, the who them, chambers house Evangelists sent course Grammar); fact 1 did Caiaphas the most the court to the him, to the lamp of the portress threw its light on his face, and she took note of him; and afterwards, at the fire which had been lighted, she put the question to him, "Art not thou also one of this man's disciples?" The answer which she received at this time was both zealous and boldness of Peter seems to have deserted him. This was indeed a time of great spiritual weakness and depression, and the power of darkness had gained an influence over the Apostle's mind. He had come as in secret; he is determined so to remain, and he denies his Master! Feeling now the danger of his situation, he went out into the porch, and there some one, or, looking at all the accounts, probably several persons, asked him the question a second time, and he denied more strongly. About an hour after, when he had returned into the court, the same question was put to him a third time, with the same result. Then the cock crew; and Jesus, who was within sight, probably in some open room, communicating with the court, "turned and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out and wept bitterly" (Luke). Let no man who cannot fathom the utter perplexity and distress of such a time presume to judge the zealous disciple hardly. He trusted too much to his strength; he did not enter into the full meaning of the words, "Watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation." Self-confidence betrayed him into a great sin: and the most merciful Lord restored him after it. Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. x. 12; Matt. xxvi. 57, 58, 61-73; Mark xiv. 53, 54, 60-72; Luke xii. 34-62; John xviii. 13-18, 24-27).

The first interrogatory to which our Lord was surject (John xviii. 19-24) was addressed to Him by Caiphas (Annas?, Olkhausen, Wieseler), probably before the Sanhedrin had time to assemble. It was the questioning of an inquisitive person who had no right to make such a demand, rather than a formal examination. The Lord's refusal to answer is thus explained and justified. When the more regular proceedings begin He is ready to answer. A servant of the high-priest, knowing that he should thereby please his master, smote the cheek of the Son of God with the palm of his hand. But this was only the beginning of horrors. At the dawn of day the Sanhedrin, summoned by the high-priest in the course of the night, assembled, and brought their band of false witnesses, whom they must have had ready before. These gave their testimony (see Psalm xxvii. 12), but even before this unjust tribunal it could not stand, it was so full of contradictions. At last two false witnesses came, and their testimony was very like the truth. They deposed that He had said, "I will destroy this temple, that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands" (Mark xiv. 58). The perversion is slight but important; for Jesus did not say that He would destroy (see John ii. 19), which was just the point that would irritate the Jews. Even these two fell into contradictions. The high-priest now with a solemn adjuration asks Him whether He is the Christ the Son of God. He answers that He is, and foretells his return in glory and power at the last day. This is enough for their purpose. They pronounce Him guilty of a crime for which death should be the punishment. It appears that the Council was now suspended or broken up; for Jesus is delivered over to the brutal violence of the people, which could not be prevented while the high court of the Jews was sitting. The prophets had foretold this violence (Is. l. 6), and also the meekness with which it would be borne (Is. lli. 7). And yet this "lama led to the slaughter" knew that it was He that should judge the world, including every one of his perpetrators. The Sanhedrin had been within the range of its duties in taking cognizance of all who claimed to be prophets. If the question put to Jesus had been merely, Art Thou the Messiah? this body should have gone into the question of his right to the title, and decided upon the evidence. But the question was really twofold, "Art Thou the Christ, and in that name dost Thou also call Thyself the Son of God?" There was no blasphemy in claiming the former name, but there was in assuming the latter. Hence the proceedings were cut short. They had closed their eyes to the one, accessible to all, of the truths of Jesus, that He was indeed the Son of God, and without these they were not likely to believe that He could claim a title belonging to no other among the children of men (John xviii. 19-24; Luke xxii. 63-71; Matt. xxvi. 59-68; Mark xiv. 55-65).

Although they had pronounced Jesus to be guilty of death, the Sanhedrin possessed no power to carry out such a sentence (Josephus, Ant. xx. 6). So as soon as it was day they took Him to Pilate, the Roman procurator. The hall of judgment, or praetorium, was probably a part of the tower of Antonia near the Temple, where the Roman garrison was. Pilate hearing that Jesus was an offender under their law, was about to give them leave to treat him accordingly; and this would have made it quite safe to execute Him. But the council, wishing to shift the responsibility from themselves, from the sedition and fear of revolution among the people, the blindness of the Lord, such as they had seen on the first day of that week, said that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death: and having condemned Jesus for blasphemy, they now strove to have Him condemned by Pilate for a political crime, for calling Himself the King of the Jews. But the Jewish punishment was stoning; whilst crucifixion was
Roman punishment, inflicted occasionally on those who were not Roman citizens; and thus it came about that Pilate, saying he had found no fault of him, his death was fulfilled (Matt. xx. 19, with John xii. 33, 35). From the first Jesus found favor in the eyes of Pilate; his answer that his kingdom was not of this world, and therefore could not menace the Roman rule, was accepted, and Pilate pronounced that he found no fault in Him. Not so easily were the Jews to be chanted of their prey. They heaped up accusations against Him as a disturber of the public peace (Luke xxiii. 5). Pilate was no match for their vehemence. Finding that Jesus was a Galilean, he sent Him to Herod to be dealt with; but Herod, after cruel mockery and persecution, sent Him back to Pilate. Now commenced the fearful struggle between the Roman procurator, a weak as well as cruel man, and the Jews. Pilate was detested by the Jews as cruel, treacherous, and oppressive. Other records of his life do not represent him merely as the weakening that he appears here. He had violated their national prejudices, and had used the knives of assassins to avert the consequences. But the Jews knew the weak point in his breastplate. He was the merely worldly and professional statesman, to whom the favor of the Emperor was life itself, and the only evil of life a downfall from that favor. It was their policy therefore to threaten to denounce him to Caesar for lack of zeal in suppressing a rebellion, the leader of which was anizing at a crown. In his way Pilate believed in Christ; this the greatest crime of a stained life was that with which his own will had the least to do. But he did not believe, so as to make him risk delusion to his Master and all its possible consequences. He yielded to the stronger purpose of the Jews, and suffered Jesus to be put to death. Not many years after, the consequences which he had stained his soul to avert came upon him. He was accused and banished, and like Judas, the other great accomplice in this crime of the Jews, put an end to his own life [see [PILOT]]. The well-known incidents of the second interview are soon recalled. After the examination by Herod, and the return of Jesus, Pilate proposed to release Him, as it was usual on the feast-day to release a prisoner to the Jews out of grace. Pilate had the public peace in mind, and wished to object to this; but it was a covert appeal to the people, also present, with whom Jesus had so lately been in favor. The multitude, persuaded by the priests, preferred another prisoner, called Barabba. In the mean time the wife of Pilate sent a warning to Pilate to have nothing to do with the death of "that just man," as she had been troubled in a dream on account of Him. Oligod, as he thought, to yield to the clamors of the people, he took water and washed his hands before them, and adopting the phrase of his wife, which perhaps represented the opinion of both of them formed before this time, he said, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it." The people impressed on their own heads and those of their children the blood of Him whose doom was thus sealed.

Pilate released unto them Barabba "that for sedition and murder was cast into prison whom they had desired" (comp. Acts iii. 14). This was no unimportant element in their crime. The choice was offered them between one who had broken the laws of God and man, and one who had given his whole life up to the doing good and speaking truth amongst them. They condemned the latter to death, and were eager for the deliverance of the former. And in fact their demanding the acquittal of a murderer is but the prelude to requiring the death of an innocent person, as St. Ambrose observes: for it is but the very law of iniquity, that which hate innocence should love crime. They rejected therefore the Prince of Heaven, and chose a robber and a murderer, and an insurrectionist, and they received the object of their choice: so was it given them, for insurrections and murders did not fail them till the last, when their city was destroyed in the midst of such other insurrections, which they now demanded of the Roman governor" (Williams on the Passion, p. 215).

Now came the scourging, and the blows and insults of the soldiers, who, uttering truth when they thought they were only reviling, crowned Him and addressed Him as King of the Jews. According to John, Pilate now made one more effort for his release. He thought that the scourging might appease their rage, he saw the frame of Jesus bowed and withered with all that it had gone through; and, hoping that this moving sight might inspire them with the same pity that he felt himself, he brought the Saviour forth again to them, and said, "Behold the man!" Not even so was their violence assuaged. He had made Himself the Son of God, and must die. He still sought to release Jesus; but the last argument, which had been in the minds of both sides all along, was now openly applied to him: "If thou let this man go, thon art not Caesar's friend." This saying, which had not been until the vehemence of rage overcame their decent respect for Pilate's position, decided the question. He delivered Jesus to be crucified (Matt. xxvii. 15-20; Mark xvi. 16-18; Luke xxi. 17-25; John xviii. 39, 40; xix. 1-16). John mentions that this occurred about the sixth hour, whereas the crucifixion, according to Mark, was accomplished at the third hour; but there is every reason to think, with Greewell and Wieseler, that John reckons from midnight, and that this took place at six in the morning, whilst in Mark the Jewish reckoning from six in the morning is followed, so that the crucifixion took place at nine o'clock, the intervening time having been spent in preparations. [Hout, Amer. ed.]

Lifchit, but not insuperable, chronological questions arise in connection with (a) John xiii. 1, "before the feast of the Passover;" (b) John xviii. 28, "and they themselves went not into the judgmenthall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover;" and (c) John xix. 14, "And it was the preparation of the Passover, about the sixth hour," in all of which the account of John seems dissuant with that of the other Evangelists. The passages are discussed in the various commentaries, but nowhere more fully than in a paper by Dr. Robinson "Bibl. Sacra, 1845, p. 465," reproduced in his English Harmony in an abridged form.

One Person alone has been calm amidst the excitements of that night of horrors. He now laid the weight of his cross, or at least the transverse beam of it; and, with this pressing Him down, they procured out of the city to Golgotha or Calvary, a place the site of which is now uncertain. As He began to droop, his persecutors, unwilling to defile themselves with the accursed burden, by hold of Simon of Cyrene and compel Him to carry the cross after Jesus. Amongst the great multitude
that followed, were several women, who bewailed and lamented Him. He bade them not to weep for Him, but for the widespread destruction of their nation, which should be the punishment for his death (Luke). After offering Him wine and myrrh, they crucified Him between two thieves. Nothing was wanting to his humiliation; a thief had been preferred before Him, and two thieves share his punishment. The soldiers divided his garments and cast lots for them (see Psalm xxii, 18). Pilate set over Him in three languages the inscription "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." The chief-priests took exception to this, but Pilate did not denounce Him as falsely calling Himself by that name, but Pilate refused to alter it. The passers-by and the Roman soldiers would not let even the minutes of deadly agony pass in peace; they reviled and mocked Him. One of the two thieves underwent a change of heart even on the cross; he reviled at first (Matt.); and then, at the sight of the constancy of Jesus, repented (Luke) (Matt. xxvii.; Mark xv.; Luke xiii.; John xix.).

In the depths of his bodily suffering, Jesus calmly commenced to John (?), who stood near, the care of Mary his mother. "Behold thy son; behold thy mother." From the sixth hour to the ninth there was darkness over the whole land. At the ninth hour (3 p. m.) Jesus uttered with a loud voice the opening words of the 22d Psalm, all the inspired words of which referred to the sufferings of Messiah. One of those present dipped a sponge in the common sour wine of the soldiers and put it on a reed to moisten the sufferer's lips. Again He cried with a loud voice, "It is finished!" (John), "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke); and gave up the ghost. His words upon the cross had all of them shown how truly He possessed his soul in patience even to the end of the sacrifice He was making; "Father, forgive them," was a prayer for his enemies. "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," was a merciful acceptance of the offer of a penitent heart. "Woman, behold thy son," was a sign of loving consideration, even at the last, for those He had always loved. "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" expressed the fear and the need of God. "I thirst," the only word that related to Himself, was uttered because it was preload to that it I not denote Him to drink. "It is finished," expresses the completion of that work which, when He was twelve years old, had been present to his mind, and never absent since; and "Into thy hands I commend My spirit," was the last utterance of his resignation of Himself to what was laid upon Him (Matt. xxvii. 31-56; Mark xvi. 19-41; Luke xxi. 37-46; John xix. 28-30.

On the death of Jesus the veil which covered the most Holy Place of the Temple, the place of the more especial presence of Jehovah, was rent in twain, a symbol that we may now have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, through his flesh" (Heb. x. 19, 20). The priesthood of Christ superseded the priesthood of the law. There was a change in the order of service. Many who were estranged rose from their graves, although they returned to the dust again after this great token of Christ's quickening power had been given to many (Matt.): they were "saints" that slept—probably those who had most earnestly longed for the salvation of Christ were the first to taste the fruits of his conquest of death. [Saints, Amer. ed.] The centurion who kept guard, witnessing what had taken place, came to the same conclusion as Pilate and his wife, "Certainly this was a righteous man; there was nothing beyond them," "Truly this man was the Son of God" (Mark). Even the people who had joined in themocking and reviling were overcome by the wonders of his death, and "smote their breasts and returned" (Luke xxiii. 48). The Jews, very zealous for the Sabbath in the midst of their murderous work, begged Pilate that he would put an end to the punishment by breaking the legs of the criminals (John xv. 26), but it was too late. He had been taken down and buried before the Sabbath, for which they were preparing (Deut. xx. 23; Joseph., B. J. iv. 3, § 2). Those who were to execute this duty found that Jesus was dead and the thieves still living; so they performed this work on the latter only, that a bone of Him might not be broken (Ex. xix. 40; Psalm xxxiv. 20). The death of the Lord before the others was, no doubt, partly the consequence of the previous mocking and suffering which He had undergone, and partly because his will to die lessened the natural resistance of the frame to dissolution. Some seek for a "mysterious cause" of it, something out of the course of nature: but we must beware of such theories as would do away with the reality of the death, as a punishment inflicted by the hands of men. Joseph of Arimathea, a member of the council but a secret disciple of Jesus, came to Pilate to beg the body of Jesus, that he might bury it. Nicodemus assisted in this work of love, and they anointed the body and laid it in Joseph's new tomb (Matt. xxvii. 50-61; Mark xv. 37-47; Luke xxi. 40-46; John xix. 30-42).

Saturdy the 16th of Nisan (April 8th).—Love having done its part, hatred did its part also. The chief priests and Pharisees, with Pilate's permission, set a watch over the tomb, to lest his disciples come by night and steal Him away, and say unto the people He is risen from the dead" (Matt. xxvii. 62-66).

Sunday the 17th of Nisan (April 9th).—The Sabbath ended at six on the evening of Nisan 16th. Early the next morning the resurrection of Jesus took place. Although He had lain in the grave for about thirty-six or forty hours, yet those formed part of three days, and thus, by a mode of speaking not unusual to the Jews (Josephus frequently reckons years in this manner, the two extreme portions of a year reckoning as two years), the time of the dominion of death over Him is spoken of as three days. The order of the events that follow is somewhat difficult to harmonize; for each Evangelist selects the facts which belong to his purpose.® The exact hour of the resurrection is not mentioned by any of the Evangelists. But from Mark xvi. 2 and Matthew we infer that it was not long before the coming of the women; and from the time at which the guards went into the city to give the alarm the same inference arises (Matt. xxvii. 11). Of the great mystery itself, the resumption of life by Him who was truly dead, we see but little. There was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door of the tomb and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and the ground was as white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did

a In what follows, much use has been made of an excellent paper by Dr. Robinson, Bib. Sacra, 1845. p. 162.
snake, and became as dead men" (Matt.). The women, who had stood by the cross of Jesus, had prepared spices on the evening before, perhaps to complete the embalming of our Lord's body, already promised by Joseph of Arimathaea to Joseph and Mary Magdalene. They came very early on the first day of the week to the sepulchre. The names of the women are differently put by the several Evangelists, but with no real discrepancy. Matthew mentions the two Marys; Mark adds Salome to these two; Luke has the two Marys, Joanna, and others with them; and John mentions Mary Magdalene only. In thus citing such names as seemed good to him, each Evangelist was no doubt guided by some reason of his own. John, from the especial share which Mary Magdalene took in the testimony to the fact of the resurrection, mentions her only. The women discuss with one another who should roll away the stone, that they might do their pious office on the body. But when they arrive they find the stone rolled away, and Jesus no longer in the Sepulchre. He had risen from the dead. Mary Magdalene at this time, with haste; and just then learning that the body has been removed by men, tells Peter and John that the Lord has been taken away. The other women, however, go into the Sepulchre, and they see an angel (Matt., Mark), or two angels (Luke), in bright apparel, who declare to them that the Lord is risen, and will go before the disciples into Galilee. The two angels, mentioned by St. Luke, are probably two separate appearances to different members of the group: for he alone mentions an indefinite number of women. They now leave the sepulchre, and go in haste to make known the news to the Apostles. As they were going, "Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid; go tell My brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see Me." The eleven do not believe the account when they receive it. In the mean time Peter and John came to the Sepulchre. They ran, in their eagerness, and John arrived first and looked in; Peter afterwards came up, and it is characteristic that the awe which had prevented the other disciples from going in appears to have been unfeigned by Peter, who entered at once, and found the grave-clothes lying, but not Him who had worn them. This fact must have suggested that the removal was not the work of human hands. They then returned, wondering at what they had seen. Mary Magdalene, however, remained weeping at the tomb, and she too saw the two angels in the tomb, though Peter and John did not. They address her, and she answers, still, however, without any suspicion that the Lord is risen. As she turns away she sees Jesus, but in the tumult of her feelings does not even recognize Him at his first address. But He calls her by name, and then she joyfully recognizes her Master. He says, "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father: but go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and to My God and your God." The meaning of the prohibition to touch Him must be sought in the state of mind of Mary, since Thomas, for whom it was desirable as an evidence of the identity of Jesus, was permitted to touch Him. Hitherto she had not realized the mystery of the resurrection. She saw the Lord, and would have touched his hand or his garment in joy. Our Lord's answer means, "Death has now set a gulf between us. Touch not, as you once might have done, this body, which is now glorified by its conquest over death, for with this body I ascend to the Father" (so Euthymius, Theophylact, and others). Space has been wanting to discuss the difficulties of the discrepancy of this passage that attach to this part of the narrative. The remainder of the appearance presents less matter for dispute; in enumerating them the important passage in 1 Cor. xv. must be brought in. The third appearance of our Lord was to Peter (Luke, Paul); the fourth to the two disciples going to Emmaus in the evening (Mark, Luke); the fifth in the same evening to the eleven as they sat at meat (Mark, Luke, John). All of these occurred on the first day of the week, twenty-four hours after the resurrection. Exactly a week after, He appeared to the Apostles, and gave Thomas a convincing proof of His resurrection (John); this was the sixth appearance. The seventh was in Galilee, where seven of the Apostles were assembled, some of them probably about to return to their old trade of fishing (John). The eighth was to the eleven (Matt.), and probably to five hundred brethren assembled at a distance (Luke); the ninth was to James (Paul); and the last to the Apostles at Jerusalem just before the Ascension (Acts).

Whether this be the exact enumeration, whether a single appearance may have been quoted twice, or two distinct ones identified, it is clear that for forty days the Lord appeared to His disciples and to others at intervals. These disciples, according to the common testimony of all the Evangelists were by no means enthusiastic and prejudiced expectants of the resurrection. They were sober-minded men. They were only too slow to apprehend the nature of our Lord's kingdom. Almost to the last they shrunk from the notion of his suffering death, and thought that such a calamity would be the absolute termination of all their hopes. But from the time of the Ascension they went about preaching the truth that Jesus was risen from the dead. Kings could not alter their conviction on this point: the fear of death could not mingle them from proclaiming it (see Acts ii. 24, 32, iv. 8-13, iii., x., xiii.: 1 Cor. xv. 1: 1 Pet. i. 21). Against this event no real objection has ever been brought, except that it is a miracle. So far as historical testimony goes, nothing is better established.

In giving his disciples their final commission, the Lord said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 18-20). The living energy of Christ is ever present with his Church, even though He has withdrawn from it his bodily presence. And the facts of the life that has been before us are the substance of the apostolic teaching now as in all ages. That God and man were reconciled by the mission of the Redeemer into the world, and by his self-devotion to death (2 Cor. v. 18; 1 P.h. i. 10; Col. i. 20), that this sacrifice has prepared for man the restoration of the divine love (Rom. v. 8, viii. 32; 1 John iv. 9): that we by his incarnation become the child-
of God, knit to Hlin in bonds of love, instead of slaves under the bondage of the law (Rom. viii. 15, 29; Gal. iv. 1); these are the common ideas of the apostolic teaching. Brought into such a relation to Christ and his life, we see in all its acts and stages something that belongs to and instructs us. His birth, his baptism, temptation, lowliness of life and mind, his sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, all enter into the apostolic preaching, as furnishing motives, examples, and analogies for our use. Hence every Christian should study well this sinless life, not in human commentaries only, still less in a bare abstract like the present, but in the living pages of inspiration. Every one who has studied the study with the heart, he might hope, with God’s grace, that the conviction would break in upon him that did upon the Centurion at the cross — “ Truly this is the Son of God.”

CHRONOLOGY.—Year of the Birth of Christ.—It is certain that our Lord was born before the death of Herod the Great. Herod died, according to Josephus (Ant. xvi. 8, § 1), having reigned thirty-four years from the time that he had rescued Antigonus to be slain; but thirty-seven years from the time that he had been declared king by the Romans ("see also B. J. i. 33, § 8"). His appointment as king, according to the same writer (Ant. xiv. 14, § 3), coincides with the 184th Olympiad, and the consulship of C. Domitius Calvisius and C. Asinius Pollio. It appears that he was made king by the joint influence of Antony and Octavius; and the reconciliation of these two men took place on the death of Fulvia in the year 714. Again, the death of Antigonus and the siege of Jerusalem, which form the basis of calculation for the thirty-four years, coincide (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 16, § 4) with the consulship of M. Vipsanius Agrippa and L. Caminius Gallus, that is with the year of House 717; and occurred in the month Sivan (=June or July). From these facts we are justified in placing the death of Herod in A. u. C. 750. Those who place it one year later overlook the mode in which Josephus reconciles Jewish reigns. Wieseler shows by several passages that he reckons the year from the month Nisan to Nisan, and that he counts the fragment of a year at either extreme as one complete year. In this mode, thirty-four years, from June or July 717, would apply to any date between 750 and 751, but not to Nisan 751. And thirty-seven years from 714 would apply likewise to any date within the same termtini. Wieseler finds facts confirmatory of this in the dates of the reigns of Herod Antipas and Archelaus (see his Chronologische Synopse, p. 55). Between these two dates Josephus furnishes means for a more exact determination. Just after Herod’s death the Passover occurred (Nisan 15th), and upon the fourth years from Archelaus that he had kept seven days mourning to be kept for him (Joseph. Ant. xvi. 9, § 37. vii. 8, § 4): so that it would appear that Herod died somewhat more than seven days before the Passover in 750, and therefore in the first few days of the month Nisan A. u. C. 750. Now, if Jesus was born before the death of Herod, it follows that the Dionysian era, which corresponds to A. u. C. 754, is at least four years too late.

Many have thought that the star seen by the wise men gives grounds for an exact calculation of the time of our Lord’s birth. It will be found however, that this is not the case. For it has first been assumed that the star was not properly a star, but an astronomical conjunction of known stars. Kepler finds a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign of Pisces in A. u. C. 747, and again in the spring of the next year, with the planet Mars added; and from this he would place the birth of Jesus in 747. But, whether this be so or not, the kind of explanation places it in A. u. C. 747. But this process only proves a highly improbable date, on highly improbable evidence. The words of St. Matthew are extremely hard to reconcile with the notion of a conjunction of planets: it was a star that appeared, and it gave the Magi ocular proof of its purpose by guiding them to where the young child was. But a new light has been thrown on the subject by the Rev. C. Fritschard, who has made the calculations afores. Ideler (Handbuch d. Chronologie) asserts that there were three conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn in B. c. 7, and that in the third they approached so near that, “to a person with weak eyes, the one planet would almost seem to come within the range of the dispersed light of the other, so that both might appear as one star.” It is clear that this method must be rejected; but in November 12 in that year the planets were so close that “an ordinary eye would regard them as one star of surpassing brightness” (Greek Test. in loc.). Mr. Fritschard finds, and his calculations have been verified and confirmed at Greenwich, that this conjunction occurred not on November 12 but early on December 3; and that even with Ideler’s somewhat strange postulate of an observer with weak eyes, the planets could never have appeared as one star, for they never approached each other within double the apparent diameter of the moon (Memoires R. Aastr. Soc. vol. xxv. [Star in the East]). Most of the chronologists find an element of calculation in the order of Herod to destroy all the children “from two years old and under” (and dieuos kai katathipsera, Matt. ii. 16). But the age within which he destroyed, would be measured rather by the extent of his fears than by the accuracy of the calculation of the Magi. Gesenius has labored to show that, from the inclusive mode of computing years, mentioned above in this article, the phrase of the Evangelist would apply to all children just turned one year old, which is true; but he assumes that it would not apply to any that were older, say to those aged a year and eleven months. Herod was a cruel man, angry, and jealous, it is vain to assume that he adjusted the limit of his cruelties with the nicest accuracy. As a basis of calculation the visit of the Magi, though very important to us in other respects, must be dismissed (but see Gesenius, Dissertations etc., Diss. 18th; Wieseler, Chron. Syn. p. 57 ff., with all the references there).

The census taken by Augustus Cæsar, which led to the journey of Mary from Nazareth just before the birth of the Lord, has also been looked on as an important note of time, in reference to the chronology of the life of Jesus. Several difficulties have to be disposed of in considering it. (i.) It is argued that there is no record in other histories of a census of the whole Roman empire in the time of Augustus. (ii.) Such a census, if held during the reign of Herod the Great, would not have included Judæa, for it was not yet a Roman province. (iii.) The Roman mode of taking such a census was with reference to actual residence, so that it would not have been requisite for Joseph to go to Bethlehem. (iv.) The state of Mary at the time would render such a journey less probable.
St. Lake himself seems to say that this census was not actually taken until ten years later (ii. 2). To these objections, of which it need not be said Strauss has made the worst, answers may be given in detail, though scarcely in this place with the proper completeness. (i.) "As we know of the lege actionis and their abrogation, which were quite as important in respect to the early period of Roman history, as the census of the empire was in respect to a later period, not from the historical works of Livy, Dionysius, or Polybius, but from a legal work, the Institutes of Gaius; so we should think it strange if the works of Paulinus and Ulpian De,jus, the first of which was believed to have been published rather than not to have been. Nor mention were made in them of the census of Augustus; while it would not surprise us that in the ordinary histories of the time it should be passed over in silence" (Hinske in Wieseler, p. 78).

"If Suetonius in his life of Augustus does not mention this census, neither does Spartian in his Life of Hadrian devote a single syllable to the edictum personae which, in later times, has chiefly absorbed the name of the emperor, for the simple reason, that it seems that the argumentum de beneficiato is very far from conclusive. The effect possibly affected only the provinces, and in them was not carried out at once; and in that case it would attract less attention at any one particular moment.

In the time of Augustus all the procurators of the empire were brought under his sole control and supervision for the first time (T. C. 731 (Dion. Cass. lii. 32). This movement towards centralization renders it not improbable that a general census of the empire should be ordered, although it may not have been carried into effect suddenly, nor intended to be so. But proceedings in the way of an estimate of the empire, if not an actual census, are distinctly recorded to have taken place in the time of Augustus. "Haec addendae sunt mensurae, limitum et terminorum ex Heriss Augusti et Neronis Caesarum: sed et fallsi mensuris, qui temporibus Augusti omnium provinciarum et civitatum formam et mensuras comperitas in commentarios retulit et lege agraria per universitatem provinciarum distinctius et declaravit" (Frontinus, in the Res Agrae, Acc. of Gears, p. 102; quoted by Wieseler). This is confirmed from other sources (Wieseler, pp. 81, 82). Augustus directed, as we learn from the inscription, that a census be made, in which, according to Tacitus, "ops publice continentur: quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quos classes, regna, provinciae, tributa muta vectigalia et necessitates nec derogationes" (Tacit. Ann. i. 11; Sueton. Aug. 28, 101; Dion. Cass. lii. 30, 31, 33, given in Wieseler; see also Ritschel, in Reini. Hist. für Philos. New Series, i. 481).

All this makes a census by order of Augustus in the highest degree probable, apart from St. Lake's estimate. The time of our Lord's birth was most remote. Except some troubles in Decia, the Roman world was at peace, and Augustus was in the full enjoyment of his power. But there are persons who, though they would at once believe this fact on the testimony of some inferior historian, added to these confirmatory facts, reject it just because on Evangelist has said it (ii. 1 and 2). Next comes the objection, that, as Judaea was not yet a Roman province, such a census would not have included that country, and that it was not taken from the residence of each person, but from the place of his origin. It is very probable that the mode of taking the census would afford a clew to the origin of it. Augustus was willing to include in his census all the tributary kingdoms, for the region are mentioned in the passage in Tacitus; but this could scarcely be enforced. Perhaps Herod, desiring to gratify the emperor, said in his love for this kind of information, was ready to undertake the census for Judaea, but in order that it might appear to be his rather than the emperor's, he took it in the Jewish manner rather than in the Roman, in the place whence the family sprang, rather than in that of actual residence. There might be some hardship in this, and we might wonder that a woman about to become a mother should be compelled to leave her home for such a purpose, if we were sure that it was not voluntary. A Jew of the house and lineage of David would not willingly forgo that position, and if it were necessary to assert it by going to the city of David, he would probably make some sacrifice to do so. Thus the objection (iv.), on the ground of the state of Mary's health, is entitled to little consideration. It is said, indeed, that "all went to be taxed, every one to his own city" (Luke ii. 1). But this was the decree prescribed that they should. Nor could there be any means of enforcing such a regulation. But the principle being adopted, that Jews were to be taxed in the places to which their families belonged, St. Luke tells us by these words that as a matter of fact it was generally followed. (v.) The objection that, according to St. Luke's own admission, the census was not taken now, but when Quirinus was governor of Syria, remains to be disposed of. St. Luke makes two statements, that at the time of our Lord's birth ("in those days") there was a decree for a census, and that this taxing first came about, or took effect (πραγματευομενος), when Cyrenius, or Quirinus, was governor of Syria (Luke ii. 1, 2). And as the two statements are quite distinct, and the very form of expression calls special attention to some remarkable circumstance about this census, no historical inaccuracy is proved, unless the statements are shown to be contradictory, or one or other of them to be untrue. That Strauss makes such a charge without establishing either of these grounds, is worthy of a writer so dishonest (Luke 1., iv. 32). Now, without going into all the theories that have been proposed to explain this second verse, there is no doubt that the word "first" in Luke ii. 1 was not used by the Evangelist in a chronological manner, without violence to the sense or contradiction. Herod undertakes the census according to Jewish forms; but his death the same year puts an end to it, and no more is heard of it: but for its influence as to the place of our Lord's birth it would not have been recorded at all. But the Evangelist knows that, as soon as a census (αυτον) is mentioned, persons conversant with Jewish history will think at once of the census taken after the beginning of Archelaus, about ten years later, which was avowedly a Roman census, and which is said at first some resistance in consequence (Joseph. Ant. xvii. 1, § 1). The second verse therefore means — "No census was actually completed then, and I know that the first Roman census which was taken in his own name was after the banishment of Archelaus; but the decree went out much earlier, in the time of Herod." That this is the only possible explanation of so vexed a passage cannot of course be affirmed. But it will bear this inter-
pertation, and upon the whole evidence there is no
ground whatever for denying either assertion of the
Evangelist, or for considering them irreconcilable.
Many writers have confounded an obscurity with a
proved inaccuracy. The value of this census, as a
fact in the chronology of the life of Christ, depends
on the connection which is sought to be established
between it and the insurrection which broke out
under Matthias and Judas, the son of Sariaphus, in
the last illness of Herod (Josephus, Ant. xvi. § 3, 8).
If the insurrection arose out of the census, a
point of connection between the sacred history
and that of Josephus is made out. Such a connection,
however, has not been clearly made out (see Wes-
ke, Olshausen, and others, for the grounds on which
it is supposed to rest).

The age of Jesus at his baptism (Luke iii. 22)
affords an element of calculation. "And Jesus
Himself began to be about (δόξα) thirty years of
age." Born in the beginning of A. u. c. 730 (or
the end of 749), Jesus would be thirty in the
beginning of A. u. c. 780 (A. d. 27). Greswell
is probably right in placing the baptism of our Lord
in the beginning of this year, and the first Passover
during his ministry would be that of the same
year: Wieseler places the baptism later, in the
spring or summer of the same year. (In the
sense of ἀνακάλυψις, see the commentators.)
To this first Passover after the baptism attaches a note
of time which will confirm the calculations already
made. "Then said the Jews, Forty and six years
was this Temple in building (ἔδρασαν ἡ ἡγεμονία), and wilt
Thou rear it up in three days?" There can be
no doubt that this refers to the rebuilding of the
Temple by Herod: it cannot mean the second
Temple, built after the Captivity, for this was fin-
ished in twenty years (n. c. 525 to n. c. 515).
Herod, in the eighteenth year of his reign (Josephus,
Ant. xvi. 11, § 11, begun to reconstruc the Temple
on a larger and more splendid scale (A. u. c. 734).
The work was not finished till long after his death,
till A. u. c. 818. It is inferred from Josephus
(Ant. xvii. §§ 5, 6) that it was begun in the
month Z a n i, A. u. c. 794. And if the Passover
and the Passover feasts are made out of the year (A. u. c.
788), then forty-five years and some months have
eclapsed, which, according to the Jewish mode of
reckoning (p. 1381), would be spoken of as "forty
and six years." Thus the death of Herod enables us to fix
a boundary on one side to the calculations of our
Lord's birth. The building of the Temple, for
forty-six years, confirms this, and also gives a
boundary on the other. From the star of the Mag-
naster thing conclusive can be gathered, nor from the
census of Augustus. One datum remains: the
commencement of the preaching of John the Bap-
tist is connected with the fifteenth year of the reign
of Tiberius Caesar (Luke iii. 1). The rule of Ti-
berius may be calculated either from the beginning
of his sole reign, after the death of Augustus, A.
t. c. 767, or from his joint government with Au-
gustus, B. c. from the beginning of A. u. c. 785.
In the latter case the fifteenth year would corre-
spond with A. u. c. 779, which goes to confirm the
rest of the calculations relied on in this article.

An endeavor has been made to deduce the time
of the year of the birth of Jesus from the fact that
Zacharias was "a priest of the course of Abia" (L uke i. 5).
The twenty-four courses of priests served in the Temple according to a regular weekly
cycle, the order of which is known. The date of
the conception of John would be about fifteen
months before the birth of our Lord, and if the
date of the latter be A. u. c. 750, then the former
would fall in A. u. c. 748. Can it be ascertained
in what part of the year 748 the course of Abia
would be on duty in the Temple? The Talmud
preserves a tradition that the Temple was destroyed
by Titus, A. d. 70, on the ninth day of the month
Ab. Josephus mentions the date as the 10th of
Ab (B. J. vi. 4, §§ 5, 8). Without attempting to
follow the steps by which these are reconciled, it
seems that the "course" of Jehoiarib had just
entered upon its weekly duty at the time the Tem-
ple was destroyed. Wieseler, assuming that the
day in question would be the same as the 5th of
August, A. u. c. 823, reckons back the weekly
courses to A. u. c. 748, the course of Jehoiarib
being the first of all (1 Chr. xxiv. 7). "It fol-
lows," he says, "that the minister of the first
course of Abi, 74 years 10 months and 2 days, or (reck-
oning 19 intercalary years) 27,335 days earlier (=1
92 hieratic circles and 119 days earlier), fell be-
tween the 3rd and 9th of October, A. u. c. 748.
Reckoning from the 10th of October, on which
Zacharias might reach his house, and allowing
five months or the pregnancy of Elizabeth, to
which six months are to be added (Luke i. 29),
we have in the whole one year and three months,
which gives the 10th of January as the date of
Christ's birth." Greswell, however, from the same
starting-point, arrives at the date April 5th; and
when two writers so laborious can thus differ in
their conclusions, we must rather suspect the sound-
ness of their method than their accuracy in the use
of it.

Similar differences will be found amongst eminent
writers in every part of the chronology of the Gos-
pers. For example, the birth of our Lord is placed
in n. c. 1 by Pearson and Hug; n. c. 2 by Scaliger;
n. c. 3 by Baronius, Calvinus, Sinckind, and Paulus;
n. c. 4 by Lamk, Bengel, Anger, Wieseler, and
Greswell; n. c. 5 by Ushe and Petavius; n. c. 7
by Ideker and Sandemane. And whilst the cal-
culations given above seem sufficient to determine
us, with Ushe, Usber, Petavius, Bengel, Wieseler,
and Greswell, to the close of n. c. 5, or early part
of n. c. 4, let it never be forgotten that there is a
distinction between these researches, which the
Holy Spirit has left obscure and doubtful, and "the
weightier matters" of the Gospel, the things which
directly pertain to man's salvation. The silence of
the inspired writers, and sometimes the obscurity
of their allusions to matters of time and place,
have given rise to dispute. But their words
admit of no doubt when they tell us that Christ
Jesus came into the world to save sinners, and that

Quirinus (Ant. xviii. 1, § 1) mentions that Quirinus
was sent, after the banishment of Archelaus, to take
a census. Either Quinzio would set this authority
aside, or would hold that Quirinus, twice governor,
twice made a census; which is scarcely an easier
hypothosis than no others. [In addition to Criner
by Dr. Woolsey, Amer. ed. —II.]
universal sympathies. Solon, Socrates, and Plato were Greeks, and can only be fully appreciated as types of the Greek character. Christ is the life of men, who "draws all men" to him, because he is the universal, absolute man, elevated above the limitations of race and nationality and the prejudices of any particular age. He had the purest humanity, free from the demoniacal adulteration of sin. He is the most intensely human. Never man felt, spoke, acted, suffered, died so humanly, and so as to appeal to the universal sympathies and the universality of all men without distinction of race, generation, and condition of society. It was an approach to this idea of an universal humanity when the Jewish philosopher Philo, a contemporary of Christ, called the Logos, the eternal Word. Δλόθις άνθρωπος. As sin and death proceeded from the first Adam who was of the earth earthly, so righteousness and life proceed from the second Adam who is from heaven heavenly.

The perfect humanity of Christ has been the subject of peculiar interest and earnest investigation in the present age, and a deeper insight into it is perhaps the most substantial modern contribution to Christology, which is the very heart of the Christian system.

(1.) The singular perfection of Christ's character viewed as a man, according to the record of the Gospels and the more significant of the Acts.

The human side of Christ is expressed by the designation the Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), which applies to himself about eighty times in the Gospels, is probably derived from Dan. vii. 13, where it signifies the Messiah, as the head of a universal and eternal kingdom, and from the ideal representation of man as the divine image and head of creation in Ps. viii. In the Syriac, the Saviour's native dialect, bar našo, the son of man, is man generically; the full part of the compound denotes the identity and likeness. The Syriac bar našo is the Hebrew bar našo, the identity and imitation of God the Son of God is that of the Son of Man, the Son of man, the representative of all men to God the Father. It is the only person who is head of all men. From his resurrection to his ascension he was the head of humanity, the perfect man, the Son of man, the Son of God, and Lord of lords, and King of kings, and able to command the host of heaven and the angels; and could not command the host of holy angels to destroy that wicked hands crucified and slew him, and that we and all men must own him as the Lord and Redeemer.

SOURCES. — The bibliography of the subject of the Life of Jesus has been most fully set out in Hase, Leben Jesu, Leipzig, 1854, 4th edition. It would be vain to attempt to rival that enormous catalogue. The principal works employed in the present article are the four Gospels, and the best-known commentaries on them, including those of Beza, Wetstein, Lightfoot, De Wette, Lichte, Oehler, Stricker, Alford, Williams, and others; Neander, Leben Jesu (Hamburg, 1837 [5th Aufl. 1852, Eng. transl. by M'Culloch and Blumenthal, New York, 1848]), as against Strauss, Leben Jesu (Tübingen, 1853), also consulted; Stackhouse's History of the Bible; Ewald, Geschichte des Volks Israel, vol. v. x. (Stuttgart, 1857 [3d Ausg. 1867?]); Bammert, Geschichte Jesu (Brunswick, 1859); Krummacher, Die Lebenschristus (Riedel, 1854). Upon the harmony of the Gospels, see the list of works given under Gospel. The principal works used for the present article have been, Wieseler, Chronologische Synopsen, etc., Hamburg, 1843; Griswold's Harmony, Propositions, and Dissertations, Oxford, v. y.; two papers by Dr. Robinson in the Biblical Sac. for 1845; and his th. Tantale Sympo. ('Havinit, 1852). Special works on the Parables and on the Miracles, have also been consulted; and detached monographs, sermons, and essays in periodicals. For the text of the Gospels, the 7th edition of Tischendorf's Greek Test. has been employed.

W. T. * Moral Character of Jesus. — According to the unerring teaching of the Apostles, and the faith of the universal Christendom, Jesus was a divine-human person, the God-Man (θεομαν), and hence the Mediator between God and man and the Saviour of the race. The idea and aim of religion, as union and communion of man with God, was fully actualized in Christ, and can be actualized in us only in proportion as we become united to Him. The Synoptic Gospels represent Him predominantly as the divine man, the Gospel of John as the incarnate (ἐνθροισθεν, John v. 36), both is the God-Man. The human side of Christ is expressed by the designation the Son of Man (ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) — mark the article, the divine side by the term the Son of God (ὁ υιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ), also with the definite article, to distinguish Him as the eternal, only begotten Son from ordinary υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ whose adoption is derived from his absolute Sonship. The term ὁ υιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, which is applied to Him himself about eighty times in the Gospels, is probably derived from Dan. vii. 13, where it signifies the Messiah, as the head of a universal and eternal kingdom, and from the ideal representation of man as the divine image and head of creation in Ps. viii. In the Syriac, the Saviour's native dialect, bar našo, the son of man, is man generically; the full part of the compound denotes the identity and likeness of man. The Syriac bar našo is the Hebrew bar našo, the identity and imitation of God the Son of God is that of the Son of Man, the Son of man, the representative of all men to God the Father. It is the only person who is head of all men. From his resurrection to his ascension he was the head of humanity, the perfect man, the Son of man, the Son of God, and Lord of lords, and King of kings, and able to command the host of heaven and the angels; and could not command the host of holy angels to destroy
as itself the greatest moral, miracle, or monstrosity rather, that can be imagined.

(2) Perfect holiness. The positive side of sinlessness. It consists in the beautiful harmony and symmetry of all virtues and graces. Christ's life was one continued act of love or self-consecration to God and to man. "It was absolute love to God in purest humanity." The opposite and to us apparently contradictory virtues were found in him in equal proportion. He was free from all onesidedness, which constitutes the weakness as well as the strength of the greatest moral forces. The moral forces were so well tempered and moderated by each other that none was unduly prominent, none carried to excess, none alloyed by the kindred failing. Each was checked and completed by the opposite grace. He combined innocence with strength, love with earnestness, humility with dignity, wisdom with courage, devotion to God with interest in man. He was justly compared to the lamb and the lion. His dignity was free from pride, his self-denial free from narrowness; his zeal never degenerated into passion, nor his constancy into obstinacy, nor his benevolence into weakness, nor his tenderness into sentimentality; he was equally removed from the excesses of the legalist, the pietist, the mystic, the ascetic, and the enthusiasm. His character from tender childhood to ripe manhood was one of purity and innocence in unbroken communion with God, overflowing with the purest love to men, free from every sin and error, exhibiting in doctrine and example the ideal of virtue, scaling the purest life with the sublimest death, and ever acknowledged since as the perfect model of goodness for universal imitation. All human greatness loses on closer inspection; but Christ's character grows more pure, sacred, and lovely, the better we know him. The whole range of history and fiction furnishes no parallel to it. His person is the great miracle of which his works are only the natural manifestations.

Such a perfect man in the midst of universal imperfection and sinfulness can only be understood on the ground of the godhead dwelling in him. The perfection of his humanity is the proof of his divine nature. Other theories, the theory of enthusiasm and self-deception, the theory of imposture, and the theory of mythical or legendary fiction, explain nothing, but substitute an unnatural monstrosity for a supernatural miracle. Only a Jesus could have invented a Jesus. Even Renan must admit that "whatever be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed; his worship will grow young without ceasing; his legend (?) will call forth tears without end; his sufferings will melt the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that, among the sons of men, there is none born greater than Jesus." But this and similar admissions of modern infidels refute their own hypothesis, and have no meaning unless we admit the truth of Christ's testimony concerning his unity with the Father and his extraordinary claims which in the mouth of every other with this blaspheous or madness, while burning his lips they excite no surprise, nor appear as natural and easy as the rays of the shining sun. The church of all ages and denominations in response to these claims worships and adores, exclaiming with Thomas: "My Lord and my God!" This is the testimony of the soul left to its deepest instincts and noblest aspirations, the soul which was originally made for Christ and finds in Him the solution of all moral problems, the satisfaction of all its wants, the unfailing fountain of everlasting life and peace.

JESUS CHRIST
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The first formal description of the personal appearance of Christ, which, though not authentic and certainly not older than the fourth century, exerted great influence on the pictorial representations, is ascribed to the heathen Publius Lentinus, a supposed contemporary of Pilate and Proconsul of Judea, in an apocryphal Latin letter to the Roman Senate which was first discovered in a MS. copy of the writings of Aeschn of Canterbury, and is as follows:—

"In this time appeared a man, who lives till now, a man endowed with great powers. Men call Him a great prophet; his own disciples term Him the Son of God. His name is Jesus Christ. He restores the dead to life, and cures all manner of diseases. This man is of noble and well-proportioned stature, with a face full of kindness and yet firmness, so that the beholders both love Him and fear Him. His hair is the color of wine, and golden at the root; straight, and without luster, but from the level of the ears curling and glossy, and divided down the centre after the fashion of the Nazarenes. His forehead is even and smooth
his face without blushing, and enhanced by a tempered bloom. His countenance ingenious and kind. Nose and mouth are in no way faulty. His beard is full, of the same color as his hair, and forked in form; his eyes blue, and extremely brilliant. In reproof and rebuke he is formidable; in exhortation and teaching, gentle and amiable of tongue. None have seen Him to laugh; but many, on the contrary, to weep. His person is tall; his hands beautiful and straight. In speaking He is deliberate and grave, and little given to loquacity. In beauty surpassing—most men. Another description is found in the works of the Greek theologian John of Damascus in the 8th century. It ascribes to Christ a stately person, beautiful eyes, curly hair, "black beard, yellow complexion and long fingers, like his mother."

On the ground of these descriptions and of the Abgar and the Veronica legends, arose a vast number of pictures of Christ which are divided into two classes: the "Selectio pictures, with the expression of calm serenity and dignity, without the faintest mark of grief, and the Free Homo pictures of the suffering Savior with the crown of thorns. But "no figure of Chr., in color, or bronze, or marble, can reach the ideal of perfect beauty which came forth into actual reality in the Son of God and Son of Man. The highest-creations of art are here but feeble reflections of the original in heaven; yet prove the mighty influence which the living Christ continually exerts even upon the imagination and sentiment of the great painters and sculptors, and which He exert to the end of the world."

(Schaff's History of the Church, vol. iii. p. 571.)

JETHRO


P. S.

JETHOR (יְהֶתְרוֹ) [string, cord, and abundance, residuce]. 1. (תֵּיתְרוֹ: Jethro). Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, is so called in Ex. iv. 18 and the margin of A. V.; though in the Heb.-Sum. text and Sum. version the reading is יְהֵתְרָו, as in the Syriac and Targ.-Jon., one of Kennicott's MSS., and a MS. of Targ. Onk., No. 16 in De Rémusat's collection.

2. (תֵּיתְרוֹ: Jethro). The firstborn of Gideon's seventy sons, who were all, with the exception of Jotham, the youngest, slain at Ophrah by Abimelech. At the time of his father's victorious pursuit of the Midianites and capture of their kings he was still a lad on his first battle-field, and feared to draw his sword at Gideon's bidding, and avenge, as the representative of the family, the slaughter of his kinmen at Tabor (Judg. viii. 20).

3. (תֵּיתְרוֹ: Jethro) in 1 K. ii. 5, 32; (תֵּיתְרוֹ: Jethro) in 1 Chr. ii. 17; the Alex. MS. has תֵּיתְרוֹ in all the passages: Jethor. The father of Amasa, captain-general of Abshalom's army. Jethor is merely another form of Ethan (2 Sam. xvii. 25), the latter being possibly a corruption. He is described in 1 Chr. ii. 17 as Ethan the Ezrahite, which again is more likely to be correct than the "Israhelie" of the Heb. in 2 Sam. xvii., or the "Jezreelite" of the LXX. and Vulg. in the same passage. "Israhelie" is said by the author of the Quest. Hebr. in 1b. Reg. to have been the reading of the Hebrew, but there is no evidence of it in the old MSS. One MS. of Chronicles reads "Israilie," as does the Targum, which adds that he was called Jethor the Israhelie, "because he girt his loins with the sword, to help David with the Arabs, when Abner sought to drive away David and all the race of Jesse, who were not pure to enter the congregation of Jehovah on account of Ruth the Moabitess." According to Jarchi, Jethor was an Ezrahite, dwelling in the land of Israel, and theeis acquired his surname, like the house of Obadiah the Gittlete. Josephus calls him תֵּיתְרוֹ (Ant. vii. 10, § 1). He married Abigail, David's sister, probably during the sojourn of the family of Jesse in the land of Moab, under the protection of its king.

4. The son of Jada, a descendant of Hezon, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chr. ii. 32). He died without children, and being the eldest son the succession fell to his brother's family.

5. The son of Ezra, whose name occurs in a disputed passage in the genealogy of Judah (1 Chr. v. 17). In the LXX the name is repeated, "and Jethor begat Miriam," etc. By the author of the

Quest. Hebr. in Par. he is said to have been Aaron, Ezra being another name for Aaron.

6. (תֵּיתְרוֹ: Alex. תֵּיתְרוֹ). The chief of a family of warriors of the line of Asher, and father of Jehu (1 Chr. vii. 38). He is probably the same as Ishram in the preceding verse. One of Konmott's MSS. and the Alex. had Jethor in both cases.

W. A. W.

JETHITH (יֵיתִית) [pin, nail, Sim.]: תֵּיתְרוֹ [pin, nail, Sim.;]: תֵּיתְרוֹ [pin, nail, Sim.;]. *Jetheth*, one of the phylarchs (A. V. "dukes") of the name of Esaun (Gen. xxvii. 40; 1 Chr. i. 54), enumerated separately from the genealogy of Esau's children in the earlier part of the chapter, "according to their families, after their places, by their names," and "according to their habitations in the land of their possession" (vv. 40-44). This record of the Edomite phylarchs may point specially to the places and habitations, or towns, named after, or occupied by them; and even otherwise, we may look for some trace of their names, after the custom of the wandering tribes to leave such footprints in the changeless desert. Identifications of several in the list have been proposed: Jetheth, as far as the writer knows, has not been yet recovered. He may, however, be probably found if we adopt the likely suggestion of Simonis, יֵיתִית = יֵיתִית, "a nail," "a tent-pin," etc. (and metaphorically "a prince," etc., as being stable, firm) = Arab. یَتُتُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُثُתُثُתُתُتُتُ." (n. of unity of the former), is a place in Nejd, said to be in the Dahnah (see ISHRAB): there is also a place called EL-Wedid, and EL-Wedidat (perhaps pl. of the first-named), which is the name of mountains belonging to Benez 'Abd-Allah Ibn Gatitain (Muirhead, s. v.).

E. S. F.

JETHIAH (יֵיתִיה) i. e. Jehihah [high, exalted; Gez.; hill-place, Frst.]: סאלאד: [Yat. סאלאד]: Alex. [Adb. Comp.] יֵיתִיהוֹ: Jetheda, one of the cities of the tribe of Dan (Josh. xiv. 42), named with Abdon and Thimmothah. In the Onomasticon it is mentioned, without any description or indication of position, as Jetheda. It has not since been met with, even by the indefatigable Toher in his late Wandering in that district.

JETHRO (יֵיתִרוֹ), i. e. Jithro [preeminence, superiority]: תֵּיתְרוֹ: Jethro], called also Jethor and Hobah; the son of Reuel, was priest or prince of Midian, both offices probably being combined in one person. Moses spent the forty years of his exile from Egypt with him, and married his daughter Zipporah. By the advice of Jethro, Moses appointed deputies to judge the congregation and share the burden of government with himself (Ex. xviii.). On account of his local knowledge he was entrusted with the mission with the Israelites throughout their journey to Canaan; his room, however, was supplied by the ark of the covenant, which supernaturally indicated the places for encamping (Num. x 31, 33). The idea conveyed by the name of Jethro or Jethor is probably that of excellence, and as Hobah may mean beloved, it is quite possible that both appellations were given to the same person for similar reasons. That the custom of having more than one name was common among
JETHRO

Jethro, a. but, with, confirmed, and, to proceeding thou of Raguel of Canaan of broth Judg. Comment.) (Kenite, that was gone Moses. Moses' said ell. Closes, hospitality, and, the wanderer, on the relation of his children that he had watered their flock, is a picture of eastern manners no less true than lovely.

We may perhaps suppose that Jethro, before his acquaintance with Moses, was not a worshipper of the true God. Traces of this appear in the delay which Moses had suffered to take place with respect to the circumcision of his son (Ex. iv. 24-26): indeed it is even possible that Zipporah had afterwards been subjected to a kind of divorce (Ex. xviii. 2, "בֵּיתֵיהּ 3 לִ֭יְבָּם"), on account of her attachment to an alien creed, but that growing convictions were at work in the mind of Jethro, from the circumstance of Israel's continued prosperity, till at last, acting upon these, he brought back his daughter, and declared that his impressions were confirmed, for "now he knew that the Lord was greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly, he was above them:" consequently we are told that "Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came and all the elders of Israel to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God:" as though to celebrate the event of his conversion. Whether or not the account given at Num. x. 29-32 refers to this same event, the narrative at Ex. xviii. 27, coincides with Hobah's own words at Num. x. 39: and, comparing the two, we may suppose that Moses did not prevail upon his father-in-law to stay with the congregation. Calvin (in 5 lib. Mosis Comment.) understands vv. 31, 32 thus: "Thou last gone with us hitherto, and hast been to us instead of eyes, and now what profit is it to thee if, having suffered so many troubles and difficulties, thou dost not go on with us to inherit the promised blessing?" And Mat. Henry imagines that Hobah complied with this invitation, and that traces of the settlement of his posterity in the land of Canaan are apparent at Judg. i. 16 and 1 Sam. xv. 6. Some, and among them Calvin, take Jethro and Hobal to be identical, and call Hobal the brother-in-law of Moses. The present punctuation of our Bibles does not warrant this. Why, at Judg. i. 16, Moses' father-in-law is called אָבִּי (Kenite, comp. Gen. xv. 19), or why, at Num. xii. 1, Zipporah, if it be Zipporah, is called אָבִי אֲבָרָך. A. V. Ethiopian, is not clear.

The Mohammedan name of Jethro is Sheelah (Koran, 7, 11). There is a tale in the Midrash that Jethro was a counsellor of Pharaoh, who tried to dissuade him from slaughtering the Israelite children, and consequently, on account of his enemies, was forced to flee into Midian, but was rewarded by becoming the father-in-law of Moses (see Weis' Biblical Legends, p. 93, note). [Jethro; Hobal.] S. L.

JETUR (יהָּתּוּר) [prob. nomadic camp or circuit] [=torpo, tertro, tyroupaoi;] [Vat. in 1 Chr. v. 19, Tyuyupaic; Jethur, [Jethar, Hurael]], Gen. xxv. 13; 1 Chr. i. 31, v. 19. [Tukeia.]

JEU EL. I. (Jôewel) [perh. treasure of God?] (=Tea;] [Vat. Peouel; Jehuel,]. A chief man of Judah, one of the Iunu-Zeraah [sons of J.]; apparently at the time of the first settlement in Jerusalem (1 Chr. ix. 65; comp. 2).


For other occurrences of this name see Jeeiel.

JEU SH (יֵעֵש; collecting or hasting;]; Isa. '16, '16, '16, '16, '16; Jus, Jus, Jus]. 1. [Jeu, Juael; Alex. in. xxvi. 14, Jus, Jus,]. Son of Esau, by Abidahamah, the father of Anah, the son of Zibeon the Hivite (Gen. xxxvi. 5, 14, 18; 1 Chr. i. 35). It appears from Gen. xxxvi. 20-25, that Anah is a man's name (not a woman's, as might be thought from ver. 2), and by comparison with ver. 2, that the Hittites were Hivites. Jeshua was one of the Edomites, dukes (ver. 18). The Cethith has repeatedly יֵעָש, Jeshua.

2. [Juael; Alex. Iosef,]. Head of a Benjaminite house, which existed in David's time, son of Bilhan, son of Jedid (1 Chr. vii. 10, 11).

3. [Jes, Jus, omits: Jus]. A Levite, of the house of Shimei, of the family of the Gershonites. He and his brother Uriah were reckoned as one house in the census of the Levites taken in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxii. 10, 11).

4. [Jeu; Alex. Judah; omits: Jus, Jus,]. Son of Jedaiah king of Judah, by Ahubah, the daughter of Eliah, the son of Jesse (2 Chr. xi. 18, 19). [A. C. H.

JEU UZ (Ieauz) [counseling;]. Jauzos;] [Vat. Ijuos; Alex. Iosef; Jus,]. Son of Rehobam king of Judah, by Abiah, the daughter of Ethab, the son of Jesse (2 Chr. xi. 18, 19).

JEW (Iew; [patronym, see Judah]; Iew, Iew, Iew, Iew, Iew, Iew, Iew, Iew,]. Jews, Jews, Jews;] [Judah, i. e. Judah; Iewos, Fath. xvii. 17, [Gal. ii. 14; Iewaiakos, 2 Marc. xxi. 8, 11, 21; Iewaiakos, as do the Jews,] Gal. ii. 14; יֵעָשָׁי, Iewaiakos, in the Jews' language,] 2 K. xix. 26, 28; 2 Chron. xxxii. 18; Neh. iii. 21; 14. xxxi. 11, 13)]. This name was properly applied to a member of the kingdom of Judah after the separation of the ten tribes. In this sense it occurs twice in the second book of Kings, 2 K. xxi. 6, xxv. 25, and seven times in the later chapters of Jeremiah: Jer. xxxii. 12, xxxix. 9 (in connection with Hebrew), xxxviii. 19, xl. 12, xli. 3, xlvii. 1, lii. 28. After the return the word received a larger application. Partly from the predominance of the members of the old kingdom of Judah among those who returned to Palestine, partly from the identification of Judah with the religious ideas and hopes of the people, all the members of the new state were called Jews (Judaeans), and the name was extended to the remnant of the race scattered
The JEWRY (from Heb. 'Iouda'ios: Judaios), that of Greece by the spread of liberty, and speculation [ALEXANDER; ALEXANDRIA; HELLENISTS], that of the Asomons by the strengthening of independence and faith [MACCABEES], that of the Herodians by the final separation of the elements of temporal and spiritual dominion into antagonistic systems [HEROD]; and so at length the inheritance of six centuries, painfully won in times of exhaustion and persecution and oppression, was transferred to the treasury of the Christian Church.

B. F. W.

JEW (יוודא: יודא), JEWS (יוודאים: יوذאים), in Ezra and Dan. Originally "man, or men of Judah." The term first makes its appearance just before the Captivity of the ten tribes, and then is used to denote the men of Judah who held Elath, and were driven out by Rezin king of Syria (2 K. xvi. 6). Elath had been taken by Azariah or Uzziah, and made a colony of Judah (2 K. xiv. 22). The men of Judah in prison with Jeremiah (Jer. xxii. 12) are called "Jews" in our A. V., as those who deserted to the Chaldeans (Jer. xxxviii. 19), and the fragments of the tribe which were dispersed in Moab, Edom, and among the Ammonites (Jer. xi. 3). Of these latter were the confederates of Ishmael the son of Nathaniah, who were of the blood-royal of Judah (Jer. xii. 3). The fugitives in Egypt (Jer. xxiv. 1) belonged to the two tribes, and were distinguished by the name of the more important; and the same general term is applied to those who were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. ii. 28, 30) as well as to the remnant which was left in the land (2 K. xxv. 25; Neh. i. 2, 16, &c.). That the term Yehudah or "Jew" was in the latter history used of the members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin without distinction is evident from the case of Mordecai, who, though of the tribe of Benjamin, is called a Jew (Esth. ii. 5, &c.), while the people of the Captivity are called the people of Mordecai! (Esth. iii. 6). After the Captivity the appellation was universally given to those who returned from Babylon.

W. A. W.

JEWEL. [Precious Stones.]

JEWESS (יוודא: יודא), a woman of Hebrew birth, without distinction of tribe (Acts xvi. 1, xiv. 24). It is applied in the former passage to Eunice the mother of Timothy, who was unquestionably of Hebrew origin (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 15), and in the latter to Drusilla, the wife of Felix and daughter of Herod Agrippa I.

JEWISH (יוודא: יודא), of or belonging to Jews; an epithet applied to the rabbinical legends against which the elder apostle warns his younger brother (Tit. i. 14).

JEWRY (יוודא: יודא), the same word elsewhere rendered JUDAH and JUDEA. It occurs but once in the O. T., Dan. v. 13, in which verse the Hebrew is translated both by Judah and

Gospel; Mark vii. 3 (a similar note); Luke vii. 8 & xxiii. 51.

The exceptions are, Matt. xxviii. 15 (a note of the evangelist of later date than the sentence of the
JEWISH LANGUAGE

Jewry: the A. V. retaining the latter as it stands in Coverdale, Tyndale, and the Geneva Bible. The variation possibly arose from a too faithful imitation of the Vulg., which has juda and Juda. Jewry comes to us through the Norman French, and is of frequent occurrence in Old English. It is found besides in 1 Esdr. i. 32, ii. 4, iv. 49, v. 7, 8, 57, vi. 1, viii. 31, ix. 3; Bel. 33; 2 Macc. x. 24; Luke xxii. 35; John vii. 1. [The earlier English versions have generally "Jewry" (Jure) for Juda in the N. T. See Trench, Authorized Version, p. 49, 2d ed.—H.]

JEWS LANGUAGE IN THE (םלענמ)

Literally "Jewishly:" for the Hebrew must be taken adverbially, as in the LXX. (יווֹשֵׁב) and Vulgate (Judæo). The term is only used of the language of the two southern tribes after the Captivity of the northern kingdom (2 K. v. 28, 32; 2 Chr. xxvii. 18; lxix. 11, 13), and of that spoken by the captives who returned (Neh. xiii. 24). It therefore denotes as well the pure Hebrew as the dialect adopted during the Captivity, which was characterized by Aramaic forms and idioms. Elsewhere (Is. xix. 18) in the poetical language of Isaiah it is called "the Lip of Canaan."

*JEWS' RELIGION* (2 Macc. viii. 1, xiv. 38; Gal. iv. 14, 15). [IUDAISM.]

JEZANIAH [עָבָר יֵזָנְיָה]: [one whom Jehovah hears]: E'zowas [Vat. F. Acts]. E'zowas in Jer. xi. 8: פֶּרַשׁ נוֹעַי, 'A'pia in Jer. xiii. 1: Jezemias, the son of Hosiah, the Machaithe, and one of the chiefs of the forces, who had escaped from Jerusalem during the final attack of the Babylonian army of the Chaldaeans. In the consequent pursuit which resulted in the capture of Zedekiah, the army was scattered from him and dispersed throughout the open country among the neighboring Ammonites and Moabites, watching from thence the progress of events. When the Babylonians had departed, Jezaiah, with the men under his command, was one of the first who returned to Zedekiah at Mizpah. In the events which followed the assassination of that officer Jezaiah took a prominent part. He joined Johnan in the pursuit of Ishmael and his murderous associates, and in the general consternation and distrust which ensued he became one of the foremost advocates of the migration into Egypt, so strongly opposed by Jeremias. Indeed in their interview with the prophet at the Khan of a Chidan, when words ran high, Jezaiah (there called Azariah) was apparently the leader in the dispute, and for once took precedence of Johnan (Jer. xii. 2). In 2 K. xxv. 23 he is called Jezanias, in which form the name was easily corrupted into Azariah, or Zariah, as one MS. of the LXX. reads it. The Syriac and Josephus follow the Hebrew. In the LXX. his father's name is Manciah.

JEZEBEL (גָּיָבֵל): LXX. and N. T. Iz'ge-βa: Joseph. [Ieo'da:n: Jezebel: probably a name, like Agnes, signifying "eclat," nine coins.

a Amongst the Spanish Jews the name of Jezebel was given to Isabella "the Catholic," in consequence of the detestation in which her memory was held as their persecutor, Lord's Handbook of Spain, 2d ed. p. 496. Whether the name Isabella was originally connected with that of Jezebel is doubtful.

b According to the reading of A. V. and the older, Gessenius in loc., wife of Ahab, king of Israel and mother of Athaliah, queen of Judah, and Ahaziah and Joash, kings of Israel" She was a Phoenician princess, daughter of "Ethiopian king of Sidon," the Sidonian king of the Syrians and Sidonians, Menander apud Joseph. Ant. x. 23, § 2; c. Apion, i. 18). Her marriage with Ahab was a turning point in the history of Israel. Not only was the union with a Canaanitish wife unprecedented in the northern kingdom, but the character of the queen gave additional force and significance to what might else have been regarded merely as a commercial and political measure, natural to a king devoted to the arts of peace and the splendor of regal luxury. She was a woman in whom, with the reckless and licentious habits of an oriental queen, were united the sternest and fiercest qualities inherent in the Phoenician people. The royal family of Tyre was remarkable at that time both for its religious fanaticism and its savage temper. Her father Ethbaal united with her royal office the priesthood of the goddess Ashtaroth, and gave her charge to be the throne by inheritance of her predecessor Phelles (Joseph. c. Apion, i. 18). The next generation included within itself Nicanah, or Matgenes, king and priest of Baal, the murderer Pygmalion, and Elisa or Bido, foundress of Carthage (xviii.). Of this stock came Jezebel. In her hands her husband became a mere puppet (1 K. xvi. 25). Even after his death, through the reigns of his sons, her influence was the evil genius of the dynasty. Through the marriage of her daughter Athaliah with the king of Judah, it extended even to the rival kingdom. The wild license of her life, the magical fascination of her arts, or of her character, became a proverb in the nation (2 K. ix. 32). Long afterwards her name lived as the byword for all that was execrable, and in the Apocalypse it is given to a church or an individual in Asia Minor, combining in like manner fanaticism and profligacy (Rev. ii. 20). If we may trust the numbers of the text, she must have married Ahab before his accession. He reigned 22 years; and 12 years from that time her grandson Ahaziah was 21 years of age. Her daughter Athaliah must have been born therefore at least 35 years before.

The first effect of her influence was the immediate establishment of the Phoenician worship on a grand scale in the court of Ahab. At Bethel alone were supposed less than 4,300 prophets of Baal, and 400 of Astarte (1 K. xi. 31, 32, xviii. 19). The prophets of Jehovah, who up to this time had found their chief refuge in the northern kingdom, were attacked by her orders and put to the sword (1 K. xviii. 13; 2 K. ix. 7). When at last the people, at the instigation of Elijah, rose against her ministers, and slaughtered them at the foot of Carmel, she had come to the throne by submission, she alone retained her presence of mind; and when she received in the palace of Jezebel the tidings that her religion was all but destroyed (1 K. xix. 1), her only answer was one of those fearful vows which have made the leaders of Semitic nations so terrible whether for good or evil—versions IT is the feminine one, "thy wife." In that case she must be the wife of the "angel," and the expression would thus confirm the interpretation which makes "the angel" to be the bishop or presiding officer of the Church of Thyatira; and this woman would thus be his wife.
pressed a message to the very man who, as it might have seemed but an hour before, had her life in his power: "As surely as those art Eli'jah and as I am Jezebel (LXX), so may God do to me and more also, if by this time tomorrow I make not thy life as the life of one of them" (1 K. xix. 2). Eli'jah, who had encountered un-daunted the king and the whole force of the prophets of Baal, "scared" (LXX.) the wrath of the awful queen, and for his life beyond the farthest limits of Israel (1 K. xix. 3). [Eli'jah.]

The next instance of her power is still more characteristic and complete. When she found her husband cast down by his disappointment at being thwarted by Naboth, she took the matter into her own hands, with a spirit which reminds us of Clytemnestra or Lady Macbeth. "Dost thou now govern the kingdom of Israel? (play the king, pregnant Balsehia, LXX.) Arise and eat bread and let thine heart be merry, and I will give thee the vineyard of Naboth the Jezereliteth." (1 K. xxi. 7).

She wrote a warrant in Ahab's name, and sealed it with his seal. It was couched in the official language of the Israelite law—a solemn fast—witnesses—a charge of blasphemy—the authorized punishment of stoning. To her, and not to Ahab, was sent the announcement that the royal wishes were accomplished (1 K. xii. 14), and she bade her husband go and take the vacant property, and on her accordingly fell the prophet's curse, as well as on her husband (1 K. xxi. 21).

We hear no more of her for a long period. But she survived Ahab by 14 years, and still, as queen-mother (after the oriental custom), was a great personage in the court of her son, and, as such, became the special mark for vengeance when Jehu advanced against Jezebel to overthrow the dynasty of Ahab. "What peace so long as the whoreldons of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?" (2 K. ix. 22). But in that supreme hour of her life the spirit of the aged queen rose within her, equal to the dreadful emergency. She was in the palace, which stood by the gate of the city, overlooking the approach from the east. Re-neth by the open space, under the city walls. She determined to face the destroyer of her family, whom she saw rapidly advancing in his chariot.c She painted her eyelids in the eastern fashion with antimony, so as to give a darker border to the eyes, and make them look larger and brighter (Keil), possibly in order to induce Jehu, after the manner of eastern usipers, to take her, the widow of his predecessor, for his wife, but more probably as the last act of regal splendor. She fired ("made good") her head, and, looking down upon him from the high lattice window in the tower (Joseph. Ant. ix. 6, § 4), she met him by an allu-asion to a former act of treason in the history of her adopted country, which conveys a different ex-

a A graphic conception of this scene occurs in Racine's A'har terrified, Act II. Sc. 5.
b According to the explanation of S. Ephraim Syrus ad loc.
c The A. V. (2 K. ix. 30) renders the Hebrew (יִנָּשָׁא שָׁמַר יֹבְסָדְךָ) in the text, "painted her face," but in the margin more strictly, "put her eyes in painting" (or "in paint"). The act referred to is a familiar one among Syrian women at the present lime. They "paint," or blacken the eyelids and eyebrows with kohl, and prolong the apparent length of the de-
presurion, according as we take one or other of the different interpretations given to it. (1) "Was there peace to Zimri, who slew his lord?" and as if to remind Jehu, now in the fullness of his triumph, how Omri, the founder of the dynasty which he was destroying, had himself come into power as the avenger of Zimri, who had murdered Baasha, as he now had murdered Jehoram: or (2) a direct address to Jehu, as a second Zimri: "Is it well to reign, O Zimri, slayer of Zimri?" (So Keil and LXX. "εἰρήνη ὑμῶν δαμαθία διά τὴν κυρίαν αὐτῶν") Or (3) "Peace to Zimri, who slew his lord?"—(according to Josephus, Ant. ix. 6, § 4, καλός δούλος ο ἀδελφός των δαμαθίων)—which again may be taken either as an ironical welcome, or (according to Ewald, iii. 163, 290) as a reminder that as Zimri had spared the scragno of Baasha, so she was pre-
approached to welcome Jehu. The general character of Jezebel, and the doubt as to the details of the his-
tory of Zimri, would lead us rather to adopt the stern eye of her speech. Jehu looked up from his chariot—and his answer, again, is variously given in the LXX. and in the Hebrew text. In the former he exclaims, "Who art thou?" Come (Keil), "Who is on my side, who?" In either case the issue is the same. Two or three emnuchs of the royal harem show their faces at the windows, and at his command dashed the ancient princes down from the chamber. She fell immediately in front of the conqueror's chariot. The blood flew from her mangled corpse over the palace-walls behind, and over the advancing horses in front. The merciless destroyer passed on; and the last remains of life were tranqULed out by the horses' hoofs. The body was left in that open space called in modern eastern language "the mounds," where offal is thrown from the city-walls. The dogs of eastern cities, which prowl around these localities, and which the present writer met on this very spot by the modern village which occ-
upies the site of Jezebel, pounced upon this unexpected prey. Nothing was left by them but the hard portions of the human skeleton, the skin of the hands, and the feet. Such was the sight which met the eyes of the messengers of Jehu, whom he had sent from his triumphal banquet, struck with a momentary feeling of compassion for the fall of so much greatness. "Go, see now this cursed woman and bury her, for she is a king's daughter." When he heard the fate of the body, he exclaimed in words which no doubt were long remembered as the epitaph of the greatest and wickedest of the queens of Israel—"This is the word of Jehovah, which He spake by his servant Elijah the Tishbi, saying, In the portion of Jezebel the dogs shall eat the flesh of Jezebel; and the carcasse of Jezebel shall be as dung on the face of the earth; so that
JEZELUS

they shall not say, This is Jezebel ," (2 K. ix. 36, 37).

JEZELUS (Iēζελος; [Vat. Iεθβαλς] Zech.
ultra.). 1. The same as JAMAVELE (1 Esdr. viii.
32).

2. (Iηζελος; Jezebel.) Jezebel, the father of
Olahias (1 Esdr. viii. 35).

JEZER (ζηζερον, ινινεον; :ιεζερ) in Gen.
xxvi. 34; :ιεζερ, Num. xxxvi. 49. Alex.
Iεζερ; Αζερ, 1 Chr. xiii. 13. Alex. Ζαζερ; [Vat.
Iεζερων, Comp. Abd. :ιεζερ'] Jezier), the third
son of Nathaniel, and father of the family of
the Jezirites, who were numbered in the plains
of Moab.

JEZERITES, THE (ζηζερίται) δι: ιεζερι.
[Vat.-req], Alex. o:ιεζερίτες: Jezriate). A family
of the tribe of Nathaniel, descendants of Jezir
(Num. xxxvi. 49).

JEZIEL (εζιέλ, Keri ) ιεζιέλ, which is
the reading of some MSS.: [assembly of God]: Ιαποο:
F.A. Aίχηα; [Abb. Ιαποο; Comp. Εζιέλα: Jezriel],
one of the skilled Hejazite archers or singers
who joined David in his retreat at 'Ziklag. He
was probably the son of Azmaveth of Bahurim, one
of David's heroes (1 Chr. xii. 7). In the Syriac Jeziel
is omitted, and the sons of Azmaveth are there
Peket and Berachah.

JEZI'LIAH (εζιέληα) [Jehovah delivers.
Forst.]: Iεζιέλα; [Vat. Ζαζερας] Alex. Εξιελα;
[Comp. Abd. Iεζιέλα: Jezriel], one of a long list
of Benjamite heads of houses, sons of Ephah, who
dwelt at Jerusalem (1 Chr. xiii. 18).

A. C. H.

JEZOAR (εζωαρ) [shining, brilliant, as a
verb]: Ζαφρων: Jezron), the son of Helah, one of
the wives of Asher, the father or founder of Tekon,
and posthumous son of Herson (1 Chr. iv. 7). The
Keri has ἡλα' and Zohar", which was followed
by the LXX, and by the A. V. of 1611. [Zoharn
at the end].

JEZRAHIAH (εζραέλια, Jehovah causes
to break forth, i.e. into life]: [Vat. Alex. F.A.
omit: F.A.]; Ιεζραεως; [Comp. Abd. Ιεζραηπ']
Jezreel), a Levite, the leader of the chieftains
at the solemn dedication of the wall of Jerusalem
under Nehemiah (Neh. xii. 42). The scribes
had built themselves villages in the environs of the
city, and the oasis of the Jordan, and with the
minstrels they gathered themselves together at the
first summons to keep the dedication with gladness.

JEZREEL (εζραελ) [gird will saw or
matter]; Iεζραεως; [Vat. Αζραεως; Alex. Ιεζρα
ωας, Alex. 2: Ιεζραηπ'); Jezreel], according to the
revised text, a descendant of the father or founder
of Etam, of the line of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 3). But

as the verse now stands, we must supply such
word as "families;" "these (are the families of)
the father of Etam.” Both the LXX. and Vulg.
read τις, "sons," for των, "father," and six
of Kennicott's MSS. have the same, while in two
of the Ross's readings are combined. The
Syriac is singularly different from all. "And
these are the sons of Ammodob, Achizertel.,
Nehem, and Dibesh," the last clause of vers. 3
being entirely omitted. But, although the
Syriac text of the Chronicles is so corrupt as to be
of little authority in this case, there can be no
doubt that the genealogy in vv. 3, 4 is so confused as
to be attended with almost insuperable difficulties.

Tremellius and Junius regard Etam as the proper
name of a person, and Jezreel as one of his sons,
while Becherim considers them both names of
the place. The Targum on Chron. has, "And these
are the Rabbis dwelling at Etam, Jezreel, etc.",
in vers. 4 Hur is referred to as the ancestor of
this branch of the tribe of Judah, and therefore,
if the present text be adopted, we must read, "and
these, namely, Abd-Elam, Jezreel," etc. But the
probability is that in vers. 3 a clause has been
omitted.

W. A. W.

JEZREEL (εζραελ) [see above]: LXX.
Iεζραελα, [Iεζραηλα, Ιεζραηλα, Ιεζραηλα, Iεζραηλα, etc.; Vulg. Jezroel, Jezreel, Jezriel],
Joseph. Iεζραηλα, Ant. viii. 13, § 6, 7; 1εζραηλα, Ant.
vi. 13, §§ 4, 6; Ιεζραηπος, or 'Ιεζραηπεος; Jud.
i. 8, iv. 6; 5οζραηλα, Etsehoises and Jerome, in
Oudemation, pore Jezreel, Latinized into Streirola.
Its modern name is Zerin, which is in fact the
same word, and which first appears in William
of Tyre (xxi. 28) as Gairn (Germain), and Benjamin
of Tudela as Zizin. The history of the identification
of these names is well given in Robinson, B. K.
1st ed. iii, 163, 165, and is curious as an example
of the tenacity of a local tradition, in spite of the
carelessness of modern travellers.

The name is used in 2 Sam. ii 9 and (2) iv. 4, and
10, i. 5, for the valley or plain between Gilboa
and Little Hermon and to this plain, in its widest
extent, the general form of the name Esdrachon
(first used in Jud. i. 8) has been applied in modern
times. It is probably from the richness of the
plain that the name is derived, "God has seen", or
"God has sown." For the events connected with this
great battle-field of Palestine, see ESDRACHON.

In its more limited sense, as applied to the city,
it first appears in Josh. xix. 18, where it is
mentioned as a city of Issachar, in the neighborhood
of the hill-slopes and Shunem; and it had citizens
(1 K. xxi. 1-3), elders, and nobles of its own (1 K.
ei. 8). But its historical importance is derived
from the reign of Ahaz; who chose it for his chief
residence, as Onni had chosen Samaria, and Baasha
Tirzah.

The situation of the modern village of Zerin still
remains to show the fitness of his choice. It is
on one of the gentle swells which rise out of the fertile
plain of Esdrachon; but with two peculiarities which
mark it out. First, the hill is the remnant of a mountain
On the N. E. the hill presents a steep rocky
descent of at least 100 feet (Robinson, 1st ed. i. 162)
in vili. 15, §§ 4, 6, 7, Ιεζραη. Various readings are given
of Iεζραη, Αζραης, Αζραης, Αζραης.
The other is its central locality. It stands at the opening of the middle branch of the three eastern forks of the plain, and looks straight towards the wide western level; thus commanding the view towards the Jordan on the east (2 K. ix. 17), and visible from Carmel on the west (1 K. xviii. 46).

In the neighborhood, or within the town probably, was a temple and grove of Ashtar, with an establishment of 400 priests supported by Jezebel (1 K. xvi. 23; 2 K. x. 11). The palace of Ahab (1 K. xxi. 1, xviii. 46), probably containing his "ivory house" (1 K. xxi. 39), was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the city wall (comp. 1 K. xxi. 1; 2 K. ix. 25, 30, 33). The seraglio, in which Jezebel lived, was on the city wall, and had a high window facing eastward (2 K. ix. 30).

Close by, if not forming part of this seraglio (as Josephus supposes, σταυρός τοις πύργοις, Ant. ix. 6, § 4), was a watch-tower, on which a sentinel stood, to give notice of arrivals from the disturbed district beyond the Jordan (2 K. ix. 17). This watch-tower, well-known as "the tower in Jezreel," may possibly have been the tower or "moglod" near which the Egyptian army was encamped in the battle between Necho and Josiah (Jer. lix. 159). An ancient square tower which stands amongst the hovels of the modern village may be its representative. The gateway of the city on the east was also the gateway of the palace (2 K. ix. 34).

Immediately in front of the gateway, and under the city wall, was an open space, such as existed before the neighboring city of Bethshan (2 Sam. xxvi. 12), and is usually found by the walls of eastern cities, under the name of "the mounds" (see Arabian Nights, passim), whence the dogs, the scavengers of the East, prowled in search of offal (2 K. ix. 25). Here Jezebel met with her end (2 K. ix. 30). [JEZREEL]

A little further east, but adjoining to the royal domain (1 K. xxi. 1), was a smooth tract of land cleared out of the uneven valley (2 K. ix. 25), which belonged to Naboth, a citizen of Jezreel (2 K. ix. 25), by a hereditary right (1 K. xxi. 3): but the royal grounds were so near that it would have been easily turned into a garden of herbs for the palace (1 K. xxi. 22). The Eliahim net Ahab, Jehu, and Bidk (1 K. xxi. 17). Here Jehim met Joram and Ahaziah (2 K. ix. 21, 23). [ELIAHIM; JEHU]. Whether the vineyard of Naboth was here or at Samaria is a doubtful question. [NAROTII.]

Still in the same eastern direction are two springs, one 12 minutes from the town, the other 29 minutes (Robinson, 1st ed. iii. 167). This latter spring "flows from under a sort of cavern in the wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. The water is excellent; and issuing from crevices in the rocks, it spreads out at once into a fine limpid pool, 40 or 50 feet in diameter, full of fish" (Robinson, Bibl. Res. iii. 168). This probably, both from its size and situation, was known as "the spring of Jezreel" (mistranslated A. V. "a fountain," 1 Sam. xxix. 1), where Saul was encamped before the battle of Gilboa; and probably the same as the spring of "Harod," where Gideon encamped before his night attack on the Midianites (Judg. vii. 1, mistranslated A. V. "the well"). The name of Harod, "trembling," probably was taken from the "trembling" of Gideon's army (Judg. vii. 5). It was the scene of successive encampments of the Crusaders and Saracens; and was called by the Christians Tutania, and by the Arabs "Ain Jubal," the spring of Goliath" (Robinson, Bibl. Res. iii. 69).

This last name, which it still bears, is derived from a tradition mentioned by the Bordeaux Pilgrim, that here David killed Goliath. The tradition may be a confused reminiscence of many battles fought in its neighborhood (Ritter, Jordu, p. 416); or the word may be a corruption of "Gilead," supposing that to be the ancient name of Gilboa, and thus explaining Judg. v. 3, "depart from Mount Gilead" (Schwartz, 344).

According to Josephus (Ant. viii. 15, §§ 4, 6), this spring, and the pool attached to it, was the spot where Naboth and his sons were executed, where the dogs and swine licked up their blood and that of Ahab, and where the harlots bathed in the blood-stained water (I.XX). But the natural inference from the present text of 1 K. xxi. 38 makes the scene of these events to be the pool of Samaria. [See NAROTII.]

With the fall of the house of Ahab the glory of Jezreel departed. No other king is described as living there, and the name was so deeply associated with the family of its founder, that when the Divine retribution overtook the house of their destroyer, the eldest child of the prophet Hosen, who was to be a living witness of the coming vengeance, was called "Jezreel:" I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Ahab... and at that day I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel... and great shall be the day of Jezreel" (Hos. iv. 5, 11). And then out of that day and place of humiliation the name is to go back to its original significance as derived from the beauty and fertility of the rice plain, and to become a pledge of the revived beauty and richness of Israel. "I will hear and answer the heavens, and they will hear and answer the earth, and the earth shall hear and answer the corn and the wine and the oil [of that fruitful plain], and they shall hear and answer 'Jezreel [that is, the seed of God], and I will set thee among me in the earth'" (Hos. ii. 22; see Ewald ad loc., and Gesenius in vose Jezreel). From this time the image seems to have continued as a prophetic allusion for expressing the sorrowing the people of Israel, as it were, and her city, without the name of the country where the world were to become, in a spiritual sense, one rich plain of Jezreel. "I will set them among the people, and they shall remember me in far countries" (Zech. x. 9). "Ye shall be tilled and sown, and I will multiply men upon you" (Ez. xxxvi. 9, 10). "I will set the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of men and with the seed of beasts" (Jer. xxxi. 27). Hence the consecration of the image of "sowing," as it appears in the N. T. Matt. xiii. 2.

2. [Ιεζρεήλ: Alex. Ἰεσσαρεᾶ: Comp. Alfd. Ιηςρεήλ: Jezreel.] A town in Judah, in the neighborhood of the southern Carmel (Josh. xv. 56). Here David in his wanderings took Ahinoam the Jezreelitess for his first wife (1 Sam. xxvii. 3, xxx. 5). A. P. S. Jezreel (Ιηςρεήλ: Ιεζρεῆλ). The eldest son of the prophet Hosen (Hos. i. 4), significantly so called because Jehovah said to the prophet, "Yet a little while and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu," and "I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel." W. A. W. Jezreelitess (Ιηςρεήλτης: Ιεζρεήλτης).
In this case the valley is the great | valley, which "has its head in the hills near | Jezreel, and runs thence westward to the | plain" (Robinson, iii, 107). Vande Veide conveys in this, and identifies Zelah (Josh. xix. 27), which he considers to be a town, with the ruins of | Abyla (Memoir, p. 326). It should, however, be | remarked that the Hebrew word Ge, here rendered | "valley," has commonly rather the force of a | ravine or glen, and is distinct from Nachal, which answers | exactly to the Arabic Wady (Stanley, S. & F. | App. §§ 2, 38).

JOAB (38N; Jehoveh father [or, whose | father is Jehoveh]: (d)7é: Joab), the eldest | and most remarkable of the three nephews of David, the | children of Zeruiah, David's sister. Their father | is unknown, but seems to have resided at Bethel, | and to have died before his sons, as we find mention of his sepulchre at that place (2 Sam. ii. 32). They both exhibit the activity and courage of David's constitutional character. But they never rise beyond this to the nobler qualities which lift | him above the wild soldiers and chieftains of the | time. Asahel, who was cut off in his youth, and | seems to have been the darling of the family, is | only known to us from his gaudy and lively | personal. (2 Sam. ii. 18). Abishai and Joab are alike in their | impetuous courage. Joab, however, combines with | these ruder qualities something of a more states- | man-like character, which brings him more nearly | to a level with his youthful uncle: and unquestion- | ably gives him the second place in the whole history | of David's reign.

I. He first appears after David's accession to | the throne at Hebron, thus differing from his brother | Abishai, who was already David's companion during | his wanderings (1 Sam. xxvi. 6). He with his two | brothers went out from Hebron at the head of | David's "servants," or guards, to keep a watch on | the movements of Abner, who with a considerable | force of Benjaminites had crossed the Jordan, and | come as far as Gibea, perhaps on a pilgrimage to | the sanctuary. The two parties so met opposite | each other, on each side of the bank by that city. Abner's | challenge, to which Joab assented, led to a desperate | struggle between twelve champions from either side. | (Gehron.) The left-handed Benjaminites, and the | right-handed men of Judah — their sword-hands | thus coming together — seized each his adversary | by the head, and the whole number fell by the | mutual wounds they received.

This roused the blood of the rival tribes; a | general encounter ensued; Abner and his company | were defeated, and in his flight, being hard pressed | by the swift-footed Asahel, he reluctantly killed | the unfortunate youth. The expressions which he uses, | "Therefore should I smite thee to the ground? | how then should I hold up my face to Joab thy | brother?" (2 Sam. ii. 22), imply that up to this | time there had been a kind of friendly feeling | between the two chiefs. It was rudely extingu- | ished by this deed of blood. The other soldiers of | Judah, when they came up to the dead body of | their young leader, halted, struck dumb by grief. | But his two brothers, on seeing the corpse, only | hurried on with greater fury in the pursuit. At | sunset the Benjamite force rallied round Abner, | andrended "triumph" in the A. V. (2 Sam. ii. 25), is |
JOAB

and he then made an appeal to the generosity of Joab not to push the war to extremities. Joab reluctantly consented, drew off his troops, and returned, after the loss of only nineteen men, to Hebron. They took the corpse of Asahel with them, and on the way halted at Bethlehem in the early morning, or at dead of night, to inter it in their family burial-place (2 Sam. iii. 32).

But Joab's revenge on Abner was only postponed. He had been on another of these predatory excursions from Hebron, when he was informed on his return that Abner had, with his absence paid a visit to David, and been received into favor (2 Sam. iii. 23). He broke out into a violent remonstrance with the king, and then, without David's knowledge, immediately sent messengers after Abner, who was overtaken by them at the well of Sirah, according to Josephus (Ant. viii. 1, § 5), about two miles from Hebron. Abner, with the unsuspecting generosity of his noble nature, returned at once. Joab and Abishai met him in the gateway of the town: Joab took him aside (2 Sam. iii. 27), as if with a peaceful intention, and then struck him a deadly blow "under the fifth rib." It is possible that with the passion of vengeance for his brother may have been mingled the fear lest Abner should supply him in the king's favor. David burst into passionate invective and imprecations on Joab when he heard of the act, and forced him to appear in sackcloth and torn garments at the funeral (iii. 31). But it was an infirmation of Joab's power, which David never forgot. The awe in which he stood of the sons of Zeruiah cast a shade over the whole remainder of his life (iii. 39).

II. There was now no rival left in the way of Joab's advancements, and soon the opportunity occurred for his legitimate succession to the highest, and rest post that David could confer. At the siege of Jerusalem, the king offered the office of chief of the army, now grown into a "host," to any one who would lead the forlorn hope, and scale the precipice on which the besieged fortress stood. With an agility equal to that of David himself, or of his brother Asahel, Joab succeeded in the attempt, and became in consequence commander-in-chief—"captain of the host." He held under Saul, the highest in the state after the king (1 Chr. vi. 6; 2 Sam. viii. 16). His importance was immediately shown by his undertaking the fortification of the conquered city, in conjunction with David (1 Chr. xi. 8).

In this post he was content, and served the king with undeviating fidelity. In the wide range of wars which David undertook, Joab was the acting general, and he therefore may be considered as the founder, as far as military prowess was concerned, of the Marlborough, the Belisarius, of the Jewish empire. Abishai, his brother, still accompanied him, as captain of the king's "mighty men" (1 Chr. xxvii. 20; 2 Sam. x. 10). He had a chief armor-bearer of his own, Nahash, a Beerothite (2 Sam. xxvii. 37; 1 Chr. xxvii. 39), and ten attendants to carry his equipment and the royal office (2 Sam. x. 18). He had the charge, formerly belonging to the king or judge, of giving the signal by trumpet for advance or retreat (2 Sam. xvii. 16). He was called by the almost regal title of "Lord" (2 Sam. xi. 11), an unusual one, פּלֶנֶה (Aqvedah), elsewhere employed for a bunch or knot of hyssop.

Possibly the spring which still exists about that "the prince of the king's army" (1 Chr. xxvii. 34). His usual residence (except when campaigning) was in Jerusalem—but he had a house and property, with barley-fields adjoining, in the country (2 Sam. xiv. 30), in the "wilderness" (1 K. ii. 34), probably on the N. E. of Jerusalem (comp. 1 Sam. xii. 13, Josh. viii. 15, 20), near an ancient sanctuary, called from its nomadic village "Edad-hazor" (2 Sam. xiii. 23; comp. with xiv. 30), where there were extensive sheepwalks. It is possible that this "house of Joab" may have given its name to Aroth, Beth-Joab (1 Chr. ii. 54), to distinguish it from Aroth-adar. There were two Arothos in the tribe of Benjamin [see AROTH].

1. His great war was that against Ammon, which he conducted in person. It was divided into three campaigns. (a) The first was against the allied forces of Syria and Ammon. He attacked and defeated the Syrians, whilst his brother Abishai did the same for the Ammonites. The Syrians rallied with their kindred tribes from beyond the Euphrates, and were finally routed by David himself. [HADADEZER.] (b) The second was against Edom. The decisive victory was gained by David himself in the "valley of salt," and celebrated by a triumphal monument (2 Sam. viii. 13). But Joab had the charge of carrying out the victory, and remained in the land for months, expelling the native population, whom he then buried in the tombs of Petra (1 K. xi. 15, 16). So long was the terror of his name preserved that only when the fugitive prince of Edom, in the Egyptian court, heard that "David slept with his fathers, and that Joab the captain of the host was dead," did he venture to return to his own country (ib. xi. 21, 22). (c) The third was against the Ammonites. They were again left to Joab, who was ordered to "take the city," and forced to "repent" lest the glory of the conquest should pass from the king to his general (2 Sam. xii. 26-28).

2. The services of Joab to the king were not confined to these military achievements. In the entangled relations which grew up in David's domestic life, he bore an important part. (a) The first occasion was the unhappy correspondence which passed between him and the king during the Amnonite war respecting Uriah the Hittite, which led to the treacherous sacrifice of Uriah in the above-mentioned sortie (2 Sam. i. 1-25). It shows both the confidence reposed by David in Joab, and Joab's too unscrupulous fidelity to David. From the possession which Joab thus acquired of the terrible secret of the royal household, has been dated, with some probability, his increased power over the mind of the king.

(b) The next occasion on which it was displayed was in his successful endeavor to reinstate Absalom in David's favor, after the murder of Amnon. It would almost seem as if he had been guided by distance out of Hebron on the left of the road going northward, and bears the name of Ain-Sarah. The road has doubtless always followed the same track.

See Blunt's Coincidences, ii., xi.
of the king by Nathan's parable.
A similar apologue he put into the mouth of a "wise woman of Tekoah." The exclamation of David on perceiving the application intimates the high opinion which he entertained of his general, "Is this the face of Amasa, which thou didst ever regard in the face of Joab in all the days of David (2 Sam. xiv. 1-20).
A like indication is found in the confidence of Absalom that Joab, who had thus procured his return, could also go a step further and demand his admission to his father's presence. Joab, who evidently thought that he had gained as much as could be expected (2 Sam. xiv. 22), twice refused to visit the prince, but having been entraped into an interview by a stratagem of Absalom, undertook to make an admission, and succeeded in this also (ib. xvi. 28-33).
(c.) The same keen sense of his master's interests that had prompted this desire to heal the breach in the royal family ruled the conduct of Joab no less, when the relations of the father and son were reversed by the successful revolt of Absalom. His former intimacy with the prince did not impair his fidelity to the king. He followed him beyond the Jordan, and in the final battle of Ephraim assumed the responsibility of taking the rebel prince's dangerous life in spite of David's injunction to spare him, and when no one else had courage to act so decisive a part (2 Sam. xviii. 2, 11-15).
He was well aware of the terrible effect it would have on the king (ib. xviii. 20), and on this account possibly dissuaded his young friend Ahinaez from bearing the news; but, when the tidings had been broken, he had the spirit himself to raise David from the frantic grief which would have been fatal to the royal cause (2 Sam. xix. 5-7). His stern resolution (as he had himself anticipated) well-nigh proved fatal to his own interests. The king could not forgive it, and went so far in his unreasonable resentment as to transfer the command of the army from the too faithful Joab to his other nephew Amasa, the son of Abigail, who had even sided with the insurgents (2 Sam. xix. 13). In like manner he returned only a reproachful answer to the vindictive loyalty of Joab's brother, Abishai (ib. 22).
(d.) Nothing brings out more strongly the good and bad qualities of Joab than his conduct in this trying crisis of his history. On the one hand, he remained still faithful to his master. On the other hand, as before in the case of Absalom, he was determined not to lose the post he so highly valued.
Amasa was commander-in-chief, but Joab had still his own small following of attendants; and with him were the mighty men commanded by his brother Abishai (2 Sam. xx. 7, 10), and the bodyguard of the king. With these he went out in pursuit of the remnants of the rebellion. In the heat of pursuit, he encountered his rival Amasa, meeting him in the same quest. At "the great stone" in Gileon, the cousins met. Joab's sword was attached to his girdle; by design or accident it protruded from the sheath. Amasa rushed into the treacherous embrace, to which Joab invited him, holding fast his sword by his own right hand, whilst the unsheathed sword in his left hand plunged into Amasa's stomach; a single blow from the practiced hand in the case of Absalom, sufficed to do its work. Joab and his brother hurried on to discharge their commission, whilst one of his ten attendants staid by the corpse, calling on the royal party to follow after Joab. But the deed produced a frightful impression. The dead body was lying in a pool of blood by the roadside; every one halted, as they came up, at the ghastly sight, till the attendant dragged it out of the road, and threw a cloak over it.
Then, as if the spell was broken, they rallied about Joab, and once more the king (2 Sam. xx. 5-13). He, too, when they overtook him, presented an aspect long afterwards remembered with horror. The blood of Amasa had spilt all over the girdle to which the sword was attached, and the sandals on his feet were red with the stains left by the falling corpse (1 K. ii. 5).
(e.) But, at the moment, all were absorbed in the pursuit of the rebels. Once more a proof was given of the wide-spread confidence in Joab's judgment. In the besieged town of Abel Beth-mannach, far in the north, the same appeal was addressed to his sense of the evils of an endless civil war, that had been addressed to him years before by Abner near Gilson. He demanded only the surrender of the rebel chief, and on the sight of his head thrown over the wall, withdrew the army and returned to Jerusalem (2 Sam. xx. 16-22). [SIEBA.]
He was not only a traitor, but a traitor who was in the thick of the battle, when it was announced on the king's desire to number the people. "The king prevailed against Joab" (2 Sam. xxiv. 1-4). But Joab's scruples were so strong that he managed to avoid numbering two of the tribes, Levi and Benjamin (1 Chr. xxi. 6).
3. There is something mournful in the end of Joab. At the close of his long life, his loyalty, so long unshaken, at last wavered. "Though he had not turned more of the cause of the house of David than of the house of Joab (2 Sam. xxiv. 32).
The revival of the pretensions of Adonijah after David's death was sufficient to awaken the suspicions of Solomon. The king deposed the high-priest Abiathar, Joab's friend and fellow-conspirator—and the news of this event at once alarmed Joab himself. He claimed the right of sanctuary within the curtains of the sacred tent, under the shelter of the altar at Gibeon. He was pursued by Benaijah, who at first hesitated to violate the sanctuary of the refuge; but Solomon urged that the guilt of two such murders overrode all such protection. With his hands on the altar therefore, the gray-headed warrior was slaughtered by his successor. The body was carried to his house in "the wilderness," and there interred. He left descendants, but nothing is known of them, unless it may be inferred from the double curse of David (2 Sam. iii. 29) and of Solomon (1 K. ii. 33) that they seemed to dwindle away, stricken by a succession of visitations—weakness, leprosy, lameness, murder, starvation. His name is by some supposed (in allusion to his part in Adonijah's coronation on that spot) to be preserved in the modern appellation of En-regel—"the well of Job"—corrupted from Joab.
A. V. N.
2. [2811]: 164165: Alex. 1616: Jech."
Son of Seraijah, and descendant of Kenaz (1 Chr. iv. 14). He was father, or prince, as Jechri explains
rt. of the valley of Charashim, or smiths, so called, according to the tradition quoted by Jerome (\emph{Quast. Hebr. in Psal.}), because the architects of the Temple were selected from among his sons.

3. (\textit{Joahaz}: [Vat. in Ezr. ii. 6; Neh. vii. 11, 12; Ezra ii. 10.] Job in 1 Esdr. i. 34.) The head of a family, not of priestly or Levitical rank, whose descendants, with those of Joshua, were the most numerous of all who returned with Zerubbabel (Exx. ii. 6, viii. 9; Neh. vii. 11; 1 Esdr. viii. 35). It is not clear whether Joshua and Joab were two prominent men among the children of Pahath-Moab, the ruler or sultan (\emph{shâlon}) of Moab, as the Syrian readers, or whether, in the registration of those who returned, the descendants of Joshua and Joab were represented by the sons of Pahath-Moab. The latter is more probably the true solution, and the verse (Exx. ii. 6; Neh. vii. 11) should then be rendered: "the sons of Pahath-Moab, for (i. e. representing) the sons of Joshua and Joab."

In this case the \textit{Joahaz} of Exx. vii. 9 and 1 Esdr. viii. 35 was probably a distinct personage.

\textbf{JO`ACHAZ} (\textit{Ioschiua; Alex. Iosa\'i}; [\textit{Iosa\'i};] \textit{Ieshonim} = JOHACHIAH (1 Esdr. i. 34), the son of Josiah. The LXX. and Vulgate and in most Jewish manuscripts followed St. Matthew (\textit{xxv. 11}), or have been altered so as to agree with him.

\textbf{JO`ACHIM} (Ioschah; [Vat. Ioschiua; Alex. Iosa\'i; and Iosa\'i;] JOACHIM, L. = JOHAOAH, called also JOACHIN.)

1. (Bar. i. 5 = JOAAHIN, J. = JOHAOAHIN (1 Esdr. i. 37, 38, 39).) [\textit{Iosa\'i;}, 1.]  

2. (\textit{Iosa\'i;}; Vat. Alex. \textit{Iosa\'i;}, \textit{Iosa\'i;}; JOACHIN) = JOHAOAHIN (1 Esdr. i. 43).

3. (\textit{Ioscha\'i;}; Alex. -\textit{Iosa\'i;}; JOACHIN.) = JOHACHIAH, the son of Josiah (1 Esdr. v. 5). He is by mistake called the son of Zerubbabel, as is clear from Neh. xii. 10, 26; and the passage has in consequence been corrected by Junius, who renders it: "Jehoshua filius Jehohazakki zum Jehohazaki filio." Harrington (\textit{Gen.} i. 72) proposed to omit the words \textit{Iosa\'i;} \textit{Iosa\'i;} altogether as an interpolation.

4. (\textit{Ioschiua;} Vat. Sin. Alex. -\textit{Iosa\'i;}; Elechim, JOACHIN.) "The high-priest who was in Jerusalem" (Jud. iv. 6, 14) in the time of Judith, who welcomed the heroine after the death of Holofernes, in company with "the ancients of the children of Israel" (\textit{\gamma\varepsilon\varphi\omicron\sigma\iota\tau\omega\varsigma \tau\eta\iota\nu\varsigma \iota\varsigma\varphi\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\varsigma\varphi\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu}; xv. 8 ff.). The name occurs with the various reading Elechim, but it is impossible to identify him with any historical character. No such name occurs in the lists of high-priests in 1 Chr. vi. (Joseph. \textit{Ant.} x. 8, \textit{§} 6); and it is a mere arbitrary conjecture to suppose that Elechiam mentioned in 2 K. xviii. 18 was afterwards raised to that dignity. Still less can be said for the identification of Joscheim with Hilkiah (2 K. xxi. 4: \textit{Elia\'k\iota;), Joseph. \textit{Ant.} x. 4, \textit{§} 2: \textit{Xe\'lad\iota;}, LXX.). The name itself is appropriate to the position which the high-priest occupies in the story of Judith ("The Lord hath set up"), and the person must be regarded as a necessary part of the fiction.

5. (\textit{Ioschiua;} \textit{Ieshonim}, but ed. 1590 JOACHIN.) The husband of Susanna (Sus. i. 1 ff.). The name seems to have been chosen, as in the former case, with a reference to its meaning; and it was probably for the same reason that the husband of Anna, the mother of the Virgin, is called Joachim in early legends (\textit{Protev. Jos.}, i., \&c.).

\textbf{JOADA\'NAS} (\textit{Ioschob\'os;} JOANCE, one of the sons of Josiah, the son of Josadak (1 Esdr. ix. 19). His name occupies the same position as that of Gedaliah in the corresponding list in Ezx. x. 18, but it is uncertain how the corruption originated. Probably, as Burrington suggests (\textit{Gen. ed.}, i. 167), the \textit{\gamma} was corrupted into \textit{\eta}, and \textit{\alpha} into \textit{\nu}, a change which in the uncial character would be very slight.

\textbf{JO\'AIH} (\textit{Jehochaih his brother = friend}; \textit{Ioad} in Kings, \textit{Iosa\'i} in Isaiah; Alex. JOIDA\'NAS in 2 K. xviii. 18, 26, and \textit{Ioad} in ver. 37.; [Vat. and Comp. \textit{Ioad} in Is. xxxvi. 11; \textit{Sin.} \textit{Ioad} in Is. xxxvi. 3, ver. 11 omits, ver. 22, \textit{Ioad} = Joah). 1. The son of Asaph, and chronicler, or keeper of the records, to Hezekiah. He was one of the three chief officers sent to communicate with the Assyrian general at the conduit of the upper pool (Is. xxxvi. 3, 11, 22), and probably belonged to the tribe of Levi.

2. (\textit{Ioad}; Alex. \textit{Iosa\'i}; JOAH.) The son or grandson of Zimmah, a Gershonite (1 Chr. vi. 21), and apparently the same as Ethan (ver. 42), unless, as is not improbable, in the latter list some names are supplied which are omitted in the former, and vice versa. For instance, in ver. 42 Shimeu is added, and in ver. 43 Libni is omitted (comp. ver. 20). If Joah and Ethan are identical, the passage must have been early corrupted, as all ancient versions give it as it stands at present, and there are no variations in the MSS.

3. (\textit{Ioad}; Alex. \textit{Iosa\'i}; JOAHAH.) The third son of Obad-edom (1 Chr. xxiv. 4), a Korhite, and one of the door-keepers appointed by David. With the rest of his family he is characterized as a man of excellence in strength for the service (ver. 8). They were appointed to keep the southern gate of the Temple, and the house of Asuppim, or "gatherings," which was either a storehouse or council chamber in the outer court (ver. 15).

4. (\textit{Ioad}; [Vat. omits: Alex. Iosa\'i; (Comp. \textit{Ioad};)] JOAH.) A Gershonite, the son of Zimmah, and father of Eden (2 Chr. xxix. 12). As one of the chief priests, or high-priests, or other dignitaries in the Temple to which he belonged, he took a leading part in the purification of the Temple in the reign of Hezekiah. In the last clause of the verse the LXX. have \textit{Ioad}, which is the reading of both MSS.; but there is nothing to show that the same person is not in both instances intended, nor any MS. authority for the various reading.

5. (\textit{Ioad}; [\textit{\textit{Iosa\'i;}, Comp. \textit{Ioad};.] JOAH.) The son of Joahaz, and keeper of the Temple, or an assistant to Joahaz. Together with the chief officers of state, Shaphan the scribe, and Massaiah, the governor of the city, he superintended the repair of the Temple which had been neglected during the two previous reigns (2 Chr. xxvii. 8). Jospehus calls him \textit{Ioad}, as if he read \textit{\\gamma\nu\\iota\\nu\\phi\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu}; the Syriac and Arabic omit the name altogether.

\textbf{JO`AHAB} (\textit{Jehohave; Ioha\'b;}, takes as by the hand); \textit{Iosa\'i}; [Vat. \textit{Iosa\'i}; JOACHAZ), the father of Joah, the chronicler or keeper of the records to King Josiah (2 Chr. xxiv. 8). One of Kennicott's MS. readings \textit{Iosa\'i};, i. e. AHAB,
and the margin of Bomberg's Bible gives  Joi.

Joan. E.

and is elsewhere called John. [John, 2]

* Joan'nas, Luke iii. 27. [Joanna.]

Joseph, chief of the first of the twenty-four courses of priests in the reign of David, and 1. son of Ahaziah king of Judah, and the only one of his children who escaped the murderous hand of Athaliah. Jehoash having himself killed all his own brethren, and all his sons, except Ahaziah, having been killed by the irritation of the Philistines and Arameans, and all Ahaziah's remoter relations having been put to death by Athaliah (2 Chr. xxxi. 4, 17; xxiii. 7, 8, 9, 10), the house of David was reduced to the lowest ebb, and Joash appears to have been the only surviving descendant of Solomon. After his father's sister Jehoshabeath, the wife of Jehoiahad, had stolen him from among the king's sons, he was hid for 6 years in the chambers of the Temple. In the 7th year of his age and of his confinement, a successful revolution placed him on the throne of his ancestors, and freed the country from the tyranny and idolatries of Athaliah. [Jehoiahad.] For at least 23 years, while Jehoiahad lived, this reign was very prosperous. Excepting that the high-places were still restored to incense and sacrifice, pure religion was restored, large contributions were made for the repair of the Temple, which was accordingly restored; and the country seems to have been free from foreign invasion and domestic disturbance. But, after the death of Jehoiahad, Joash, who was evidently of weak character, fell into the hands of bad advisers, at whose suggestion he revived the worship of Baal and Ashhtaroth. When he was relented for this by Zacharias, the son of Jehoiahad, who had probably succeeded to the high-priesthood, with base ingratitude and daring impertinence Joash caused him to be stoned to death in the very court of the Lord's house, "between the Temple and the altar" (Matt. xxix. 35). The vengeance imprest by the murdered high-priest was not long delayed. That very year, Hazael king of Syria, after a successful campaign against the Philistines, came up against Jerusalem, and carried off a vast booty as the price of his departure. A decisive victory, gained by a small band of Syrians over a great host of the king of Judah, had thus placed Jerusalem at his mercy. This defeat is expressly said to be a judgment upon Joash for having forsaken the God of his fathers. He had scarcely escaped this danger, when he fell into another and a fatal one. Two of his servants, taking advantage of his severe illness, some think of a wound received in battle, conspired against him, and slew him in his bed in the fortress of Millo, thus averting the innocent blood of Zacharias. He was buried in the sepulchres of the kings of Judah, in the sepulchres of the kings of Judah. Possibly the fact of Jehoiahad being buried there had something to do with this exclusion. Joash's reign lasted 40 years, from 878 to 838 B.C. He was 10th king from David inclusive, reckoning the reign of the usurper Athaliah. He is one of the three kings (Ahaziah, Joash, and Zacharias) omitted by St. Matthew in the genealogy of Christ.

With regard to the different accounts of the Syrian invasion given in 2 K. and in 2 Chr., which have led some (as Theusins and many older commentators) to imagine two distinct Syrian invasions, and others to see a direct contradiction, or at least a strange incompleteness in the narratives, as Winer, the difficulty exists solely in the minds of the critics. The narrative given above, which is also that of the Syrian historian Josephus (Ant. iv. 7, § 4) as well as of Josephus, perfectly units the two accounts, which are merely different abridgments of the one fuller account contained in the original chronicles of the kingdom. Grundberg pushes the system of irreverent criticism to such an absurd pitch, that he speaks of the murder of Zacharias as a pure fable (Winer, Rech. art. Jehoash).
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It should be added that the prophet Elisha triumphed in Israel throughout the days of Joash; and there is some ground for concluding with Winer (agreeing with Cremer, Movers, Hitzig, Meier, and others) that the prophet Joel also prophesied in the former part of this reign. (See Movers, Chronik, pp. 119-121.)

2. Son and successor of Jehoahaz on the throne of Israel from b. c. 840 to 825, and for two full years a contemporary sovereign with the preceding (2 K. xiv. 1; comp. with xii. 1, xii. 10). When he succeeded to the crown, the kingdom was in a deplorable state from the devastations of Hazael and Ben-hadad, king of Syria, of whose power at this time we had also evidence in the preceding article. In spite of the perseverance of Joash in the worship set up by Jeroboam, God took compassion upon the extreme misery of Israel, and in remembrance of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, interposed to save them from entire destruction. On occasion of a friendly visit paid by Joash to Elisha on his deathbed, where he wept over his sins and the sins of his ancestors, Joash, king of Judah, a younger son of Ahaz, who held a subordinate jurisdiction in the lifetime of his father, or was appointed viceroy (E*Wyrta, LXX. of 2 Chr. xviii. 25) during his absence in the attack on Ramoth-Gilead (1 K. xxii. 26: 2 Chr. xxi. 25).

Or he may have been merely a prince of the bloodroyal. But if Geiger be right in his conjecture, that Masseiah, "the king's son," is 2 Chr. xxviii. 7, was a prince of the Moloch worship, Joash would be a priest of the same. There is, however, but slender foundation for the belief (Geiger, Urschrift, etc., p. 397). The Vulgate calls him "the son of Amelech," taking the article as part of the noun, and the whole as a proper name. Thenius suggests that he may have been placed with the governor of the city for the purpose of military education.

3. [Vat. corrupt.] A descendant of Shelah the son of Judah, but whether his son or the son of Jokim, as Burrington (Genealogies, i. 179) supposes, is not clear (1 Chr. iv. 22). The Vulgate rendering of this name by Scisurus, according to its etymology, is as well as of the other names in the same verse, very remarkable. The Hebrew tradition, quoted by Jerome (Quast. Hebr. in Paral., & Jarchi (Comm. in loc.), applies it to Mahlon, the son of Elimelech, who married a Moabitess. The expression rendered in A. V., "he had the dominion (5722, bddla) in Moab," would, according to this interpretation, signify "who married in Moab." The same explanation is given in the Targum of R. Joseph.

6. [Rom. FA. ‘Idar: Vat. Isa. Alex. Iapar.] A Benjamine, son of Shemaiah of Gibeah (1 Chr. xii. 3). He was one of the heroes, "helpers of the battle," who resorted to David at Ziklag; and assisted him in his excursions against the marauding parties to whose attacks he was exposed (ver. 21). He was probably with David in his pursuit of the Amalekites (comp. 1 Chr. xii. 21, with 1 Sam. xxx. 8, where 7555 should be "troop" in both passages). The Peshito-Syriac, reading 32, for 7557, makes him the son of Ahiezer.

7. One of the officers of David's household, to whose charge were entrusted the store-houses of oil, the produce of the plantations of sycamore and the olive-yards of the lowlands of Judah (1 Chr. xxvii. 28).

W. A. W
JOASH [םֹזִי] (to whom Jehoachaz kadosh], a different name from the preceding: יְאָשׁ: יְאָשׁ; son of Becher, and head of a Benjamite house, which existed in the time of king David (1 Chr. vii. 8). A. C. H.

JOATHAM (יְאָתָם: יְאָתָם) = JOOTHAM
the son of Uzziah (Matt. i. 9).

JOAZZAB'US [יְאֹזבּוֹס; [Vat. Zabdois;
Ald. יְאֹזבּוֹס]: YOZOBOS]: Job (13:7) = JOZABOTH the
Levite. (1 Esdr. ix. 48; comp. Neh. viii. 7).

JOB [יָבֹא: יָבֹא; { לְאָבֹא}; ειλ return, or re-
turner, correct]: أُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُיُوُيُوُيُوُيُوُיُوُيُوُיُوُيُوُيُوُיُوُيُوُيُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُוُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُוُיُوُיُוُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُوُיُוُיُوُיُוُיُوُיُוُיُוُיُوُיُוُיُוُיُوُיُוُיُоُיُוُיُוُיُוُיُоُיُוُיُوُיُوُיُоُיُوُיُוُיُоُיُوُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُוُיُоُיּוُיُоُיُоُיُоُיُоُיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּоּיּוּיּוּיּוּיּo

JOB [יָבֹא]: i.e. /job (one persecuted, af-
flicted: see further, Fürst, Handw. s. v.; Ges. Theaur., s. v.): יֹזְבֹא: Job.
The numerous and difficult questions touching the integrity of this book, its plan, object, and general character; and the probable age, country, and circumstances of its author, cannot be satisfactorily discussed without a previous analysis of its contents. It consists of five parts: the introduction, the discussion between Job and his three friends, the speech of Eliph, the manifestation and address of Almighty God, and the concluding chapter.

I. Analysis. — 1. The Introduction supplies all the facts on which the argument is based. Job, a chieftain in the land of Uz, 2 of immense wealth and high rank; 3 the greatest of all the men of the East, 4 is represented to us as a man of perfect integrity, blameless in all the relations of life, declared indeed by the Lord Himself to be 5 without his like in all the earth, a perfect, and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil. The highest goodness, and the most perfect temporal happiness are combined in his person; under the protection of God, surrounded by a numerous family, he enjoys in advanced life an almost parabolical state, exemplifying the normal results of human obedience to the will of a righteous God. One question could be raised by envy: may not the goodness which secures such direct and tangible rewards be a refined form of selfishness? In the world of spirits, where all the mysteries of existence are brought to light, Satan, the accusing angel, suggests the doubt: 6 doth Job fear God for naught? his life vividly to his face. The problem is thus distinctly propounded which this book is intended to discuss and solve. [See addition, Amer. ed.] Can goodness exist irregardless of reward, can the fear of God be retained by man when every inducement to selfishness is taken away? The problem is obviously of infinite importance, and could only be answered by inflicting upon a man, in whom, while prosperous, malice itself could detect no evil, the calamities which are the due, and were then believed to be invariably the results, even in this life, of wickedness. The answer receives permission to make the trial, he destroys Job's property, then his children; and afterwards, to leave no possible opening for a cavil, is allowed to inflict upon him the most terrible disease known in the East. Each of these calamities assumes a form which produces an impression that it must be a visitation from God, precisely such as was to be expected, supposing that the patriarch had been a successful hypercrite, reserved for the sake of the trials which Satan had anticipated the patriarch himself would at last utter in his despair, she counsels him to curse God and die. 7 a Job remains steadfast.

The destruction of his property draws not from him a word of complaint: the death of his children elicits the sublimest words of resignation which ever fell from the lips of a mourner — the disease which made him an object of loathing to man, and which seemed to designate him as a visible example of divine wrath, is borne without a murmur; he repels his wife's suggestion with the simple words, What! shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil? 8 In all this Job did not sin with his lips.

The question raised by Satan was thus answered. His assaults had but issued in a complete removal of the outer forms which could mislead men's judgment, and in developing the highest type of disinterested worth. Had the narrative then ended, the problem could not be regarded as unsolved, while a sublime model would have been exhibited for men to admire and imitate.

2. Still in that case it is clear that many points of deep interest would have been left in obscurity. Entire as was the submission of Job, he must have been inwardly perplexed by events which had no clear explanation whatever. 9 an unaccountable on any hypothesis hitherto entertained, and seemed repugnant to the ideas of justice engraven on man's heart. It was also most desirable that the impressions made upon the generality of men by sudden and unaccountable calamities should be thoroughly discussed, and that a broader and firmer basis than heretofore should be found for speculations concerning the providential government of the world. An opportunity for such discussion is afforded in the most natural manner by the introduction of three men, representing the wisdom and experience of the age, who came to console with Job on bearing of his misfortunes. Some time 10 appears to have elapsed in the interim, during which the situation of Uz is doubtful. Ewald: Der Buch Job, p. 41 suggests it to have been the district south of Bashan. Spaulding and Rosenmuller (Proll pp. 29-33) fix it in the N. E. of the desert near the Ephrates. See also Dr. Lee, Introduction to Job, p. 21.

1 From ch. xii. 16 it may be inferred that he was about 70 years old at this time.

12 'יִנְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְנִי נְn

14 * The Hebrew words are properly rendered, according to Gesenius and other eminent Hebraists, Bless God and die. d It is a tampering reproach, unless otherwise indicated. For the use of the Heb. words, see the note on Gen. viii. 17. 20 It is a tampering reproach, unless otherwise indicated. For the use of the Heb. words, see the note on Gen. viii. 17. 21 It is a tampering reproach, unless otherwise indicated. For the use of the Heb. words, see the note on Gen. viii. 17.
which the disease had made formidable progress, and Job had thoroughly realized the extent of his misery. The meeting is described with singular beauty. At a distance they greet him with the wild demonstrations of sympathizing grief usual in the East; coming near they are overpowered by the sight of his wretchedness, and sit seven days and seven nights without uttering a word. This awful silence, whether Job felt it as a proof of real sympathy, or as an indication of inward suspicion on their part, drew out all his anguish. In an agony of desperation he curses the day of his birth, and sees and hopes for no end of his misery, but death.

With the answer to this outburst begins a series of discussions, continued probably (as Ewald shows, p. 55) with some intervals, during several successive days. Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar in turn, bring forward arguments, which are severally answered by Job.

The results of the first discussion (from c. iii. -xiv.) may be thus summed up. We have on the part of Job's friends a theory of the divine government resting upon an exact and uniform correlation between sin and punishment (iv. 6, 11, and throughout). Afflictions are always penal, issuing in the destruction of those who are radically opposed to God, or who do not submit to his chastisements. They lead of course to correction and amendment of life when the sufferer repents, confesses his sins, puts them away, and turns to God. In that case restoration to peace, and even increased prosperity may be expected (vv. 17-27). Still the fact of the suffering always proves the commission of some special sin, while the demeanor of the sufferer indicates the true internal relation between him and God.

These principles are applied by them to the case of Job. They are in the first place scandalized by the vehemence of his complaints, and when they find that he maintains his freedom from wild, or conscious sin, they are driven to the conclusion that his faith is radically unsound; his protestations appear to them almost blasphemous, they become convinced that he has been secretly guilty of some unpardonable sin, and their tone, at first courteous, though warning (comp. c. iv. with c. xv.), becomes stern, and even harsh and menacing. It is clear that unless they are driven from their partial and exclusive theory they must be led on to an unqualified condemnation of Job.

In this part of the dialogue the character of the three friends is clearly developed. Eliphaz represents the true patriarchal chieftain, grave and dignified, and erring only from an exclusive adherence to tenets hiterto unquestioned, and influenced in the first place by genuine regard for Job, and sympathy with his affliction. Bildad, without much originality or independence of character, reposes partly on the wise saws of antiquity, partly on the authority of his older friend. Zophar differs from both, he seems to be a young man; his language is violent, and at times even coarse and offensive (see especially his second speech, c. xx.). He represents the prejudiced and narrow-minded bigots of his age.

In order to do justice to the position and argu- ments of Job, it must be borne in mind, that the direct object of the trial was to ascertain whether he would deny or forsake God, and that his real integrity is asserted by God Himself. His answers throughout correspond with these data. He knows with a spirit of unshrinking simplicity that he is not an offender in the sense of his opponents: he is there fore confident that whatever may be the object of the afflictions for which he cannot account, God knows that he is innocent. This consciousness, which from the nature of things cannot be tested by others, enables him to examine fearlessly their position. He denies the assertion that punishment follows surely on guilt, or proves its commission. Appealing boldly to experience, he declares that in point of fact prosperity and misfortune are not always, or generally, commensurate; both are often irrespective of man's deserts, "the tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure" (c. xii. 6). In the government of Providence he can see but one point clearly, namely, that all events and results are absolutely in God's hand (xii. 9-25), but as for the principles which underlie those events he knows nothing. In fact, he is sure that his friends are equally unenlightened, and are sophists, defending their position, out of mere prejudice, by arguments and statements false in themselves and doubly offensive to God, being hypocritically advanced in his defense (xiii. 1-13). Still he doubts not that God is just, and although he cannot see how or when that justice can be manifested, he feels confident that his innocence must be recognized. Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him; He also will be my salvation" (xiii. 14, 16). There remains then but one course open to him, and that he takes. He turns to supplication, implores God to give him a fair and open trial (xiii. 18-28). Admitting his liability to such sins as are common to man, being maimed by birth (xiii. 25, iv. 4), he yet protests his substantial innocence, and in the bitter struggle with his misery, he first meets the thought which is afterwards developed with remarkable distinctness. Believing that with death all hope connected with this world ceases, he prays that he may be hidden in the grave (xiv. 13), and there reserved for the day when God will try his cause and manifest Him self in love (ver. 15). This prayer represents but a dim, yet a profound and true presentiment, drawn forth, then evidently for the first time, as the possible solution of the dark problem. As for a renewal of life hereafter, he dreams not of it (14), nor will he allow that the possible restoration or prosperity of his descendants at all meets the exigencies of his case (21, 22).

In the second discussion (xv.-xxi.) there is a more resolute elaborate attempt on the part of Job's friends to vindicate their theory of retributive justice. This requires an entire overthrow of the position taken by Job. They cannot admit his innocence. The fact that his "cities are unpolluted, proves to them that there must be something quite unique in his guilt. Eliphaz (c. xv.), who, as usual, lays down the basis of the argument, does not now hesitate to impugn to Job the worst crimes of which man could be guilty. His defense is blasphemous, and proves that he is quite godless; that he disregards the wisdom of age and experience, denies the fundamental truths of religion (19-161), and by his infamous strangle "the naked" against God deserves every calamity which can befall him systematized by Basildes, to the great scandal of the early Fathers. See Clem. Al. Strom. iv. p. 506.

a Thus Schottmann.

b It is curious that this theory was revived and
Bildad (xviii.) takes up this suggestion of ungodliness, and after enlargeing upon the inevitable results of all iniquity, concludes that the special evils which had come upon Job, such as agony of heart, ruin of home, destruction of family, are peculiarly the penalties due to one who is without God. Zophar (xx.) draws the further inference that a sinner's sufferings must needs be proportioned to his former enjoyments (6-14), and his losses to his former gains (15-19), and thus not only accounts for Job's present calamities, but menaces him with still greater evils (20-24).

In answer Job recognizes the hand of God in his afflictions (xvi. 7-16, and xix. 6-20), but rejects the charge of ungodliness; he has never forsaken his Maker, and never ceased to pray. This being a matter of inward consciousness cannot of course be proved. He appeals therefore directly to earth and heaven: "My witness is in heaven, and my record is on high" (xvi. 19). The train of thought thus suggested carries him much farther in the way towards the great truth—that since in this life the righteous certainly are not saved from evil, it follows that their ways are watched and their sufferings recorded, with a view to a future and perfect manifestation of the divine justice. This view becomes gradually brighter and more definite as the controversy proceeds (xvi. 18, 19, xxii. 8, 9, and perhaps 13-16), and at last finds expression in a strong and clear declaration of his conviction that at the latter day (evidently that day which Job had expressed a longing to see, c. xiv. 12-14) God will personally manifest Himself, and that he, Job, will then see him, in his body, with his own eyes, and notwithstanding the destruction of his skin, i.e., the outward man, retaining or recovering his personal identity (xix. 25-27). There can be no doubt that Job here virtually anticipates the final answer to all difficulties supplied by the Christian revelation.

On the other hand, stung by the harsh and narrow-minded bigotry of his opponents, Job draws out (xxii.) with terrible force the undeniable fact, that from the beginning to the end of their lives unjustly men, avowed atheists (xx. 14, 15), persons, in fact, guilty of the very crimes imputed, out of more conjecture, to himself, frequently enjoy great and unbroken prosperity. From this he draws the inference, which he states in a very unguarded manner, and in a tone calculated to give just offense, that an impenetrable veil hangs over the temporal dispensations of God.

In the third dialogue (xxii.-xxvii.) no real progress is made by Job's opponents. They will not give up and cannot defend their position. Eliphaz (xxii.) makes a fast effort, and raises one new point which he states with some ingenuity. The station in which Job was formerly placed presented temptations to certain crimes; the punishments which he undergoes are precisely such as might be expected had those crimes been committed; hence he infers they actually were committed. The tone of this discourse thoroughly harmonizes with the character of Eliphaz. He could scarcely come to a different conclusion without surrendering his fundamental principles, and he urges with much dignity and impressiveness the exhortations and warnings which in his opinion were needed. Bildad has nothing to say in this section. He only repeats the insensible majesty of God and the nothingness of man. Zophar, the most violent and least rational of the three, is put to silence, and retires from the contest.

In his two last discourses Job does not alter his position, nor, properly speaking, adduce any new argument, but he states with incomparable force and eloquence the chief points which he regards as established (c. xxviii.). All creation is conditioned by the majesty and might of God; man catches but a faint echo of God's word, and is baffled in the attempt to comprehend his ways. He then (c. xxviii.) describes even more completely than his opponents had done d the destruction which, as a rule, ultimately falls upon the hypocrite, and which he certainly would deserve if he were hypocritically to disguise the truth concerning himself, and deny his own integrity. He thus recognizes what was true in his opponent's arguments, and corrects his own hasty and unguarded statements. Then follows (xxviii.) the grand description of Wisdom, and the declaration that human wisdom does not consist in exploring the hidden and inscrutable ways of God, but in the fear of the Lord, and in turning away from evil. The remainder of this discourse (xxix.-xxxii.) contains a singularly beautiful description of his former life, contrasted with his actual misery, together with a full vindication of his character from all the charges made or insinuated by his opponents.

3. Thus ends the discussion, in which it is evident both parties had partially failed. Job has been betrayed into very hazardous statements, while his friends had been on the one hand disingenuous, on the other bigoted, harsh, and pitiless. The points which had been omitted, or imperfectly developed, are now taken up by a new interlocutor (xxxii.-xxxviii.). Elihu, a young man, descended from a collateral branch of the family of Abraham, has listened in indifferent silence to the arguments of his elders (xxxii. 7), and, impelled by an inward inspiration, he now addresses himself to both parties in the discussion, and specially to Job. He shows, 1. that they had accused Job upon false or insuffi- cient grounds, and failed to convict him, or to vindicate God's justice. Job again had assumed his entire innocence, and had arraigned that justice (xxxii. 9-11). These errors he traces to their own over-weighing one main object of all suffering. God speaks to man by chastisement (14, 19-22) warns him, teaches him self-knowledge and humility

---

\( a \) This gradual and progressive development was perhaps first brought out distinctly by Ewald.

\( b \) מְזַלְצָל, lit. "from my flesh," may mean in the body, or out of the body. Each rendering is equally tenable on grammatical grounds; but the specification of the time (יחצִייאז) and the place (ףִּיַּאֹל) requires a personal manifestation of God, and a personal recognition on the part of Job. Complete personality in the mind of the ancients implies living body.
Job 18, 17 — and prepares him (23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah a of Genesis) to inquire and to obtain pardon (24), renewal of life (25), perfect access and restoration (26). This statement does not involve any charge of special guilt, such as the friends had alleged and Job had repudiated. Since the warning and suffering are preventive, as well as remedial, the visitation anticipates the commission of sin; it saves man from pride, and other temptations of wealth and power, and it effects the real object of all divine interpositions, the entire submission to God's will. Again, the passage (xxxv. 10–17) that any charge of injustice, direct or implicit, against God involves a contradiction in terms. God is the only source of justice; the very idea of justice is derived from his governance of the universe, the principle of which is love. In his absolute knowledge God sees all secrets, and by his absolute power he controls all events, and that, for the one end of bringing righteousness to light (21–30). Man has of course no knowledge of his own heart, but he perceives it as a matter of grace (xxxv. 6–9). The occasional appearance of unanswered prayer (9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (12, 13). Job may look to his heart, and he will see if that is true of himself.

Job is silent, and Elihu proceeds (xxxv.) to show that the Almighty of God is not, as Job seems to assert, associated with any contempt or neglect of his creatures. Job, by ignoring this truth, has been led into grave error, and terrible danger (12; cf. 18), but God is still drawing him, and if he yields and follows he will yet be delivered. The rest of the discourse brings out forcibly the lessons taught by the manifestations of God, as well as greatness in creation. Indeed, the great object of all natural phenomena is to teach men — " who teacheth like Him? " This part differs from Job's magnificent description of the mystery and majesty of God's works, insasmuch as it indicates a clearer recognition of a loving purpose — and from the address of the Lord which follows, by its discursive and argumentative tone. The last words are evidently spoken while a violent storm is coming on; in Job, Elihu elicits a sign of Theophany, which cannot fail to produce an intense realization of the nothingness of man before God.

4. From the preceding analysis it is obvious that many weighty truths have been developed in the course of the discussion — nearly every theory of the objects and uses of suffering has been reviewed — while a great advance has been made towards the apprehension of doctrines hereafter to be revealed, such as were known only to God. But the mystery is not as yet really cleared up. The position of the three original opponents is shown to be untenable — the views of Job himself to be but imperfect — while even Elihu gives not the least intimation that he recognizes one special object of calamity. In the case of Job, as we are expressly told, that object was to try his sincerity, and to demonstrate that goodness, integrity in all relations, and devout faith in God, can exist independent of external circumstances. [See addition, Amer. ed.] This object never occurs to the mind of any one of the interlocutors, nor could it be proved without a revelation. On the other hand, the exact amount of censure due to Job for the excesses into which he had been betrayed, and to his three opponents for their harshness and want of caution, could only be awarded by an omniscient Judge. Hence the necessity for the Theophany — from the midst of the storm Jehovah speaks. In language of incomparable grandeur He reproves and silences the murmurs of Job. God does not confound, strictly speaking, to argue with his creatures. The speculative questions discussed in the colloquy are unnoticed, but the declaration of God's absolute power is illustrated by a marvellously beautiful and comprehensive survey of the glory of creation, and his all-embracing Providence by reference to the phenomena of the animal kingdom, which would argue, if anything, that He understands at least the objects for which instincts so strange and manifold are given to the beings far below man in gifts and powers. This declaration suffices to bring Job to a right mind: he confesses his inability to comprehend, and therefore to answer his Maker (xl. 3, 4). A second address completes the work. It proves that a charge of injustice against God involves the consequence that the accuser is more competent than He to rule the universe. He should then be able to control, to punish, to reduce all creatures to order — but he cannot even subdue the monsters of the irrational creation. Buffeted by levitation and bemoaneth, how can he hold the reins of government, how contend with Him who made and rules them all?

5. Job's unreserved submission terminates the trial. He expresses deep contrition, not of course for sins falsely imputed to him, but for the bitterness and arrogance which had characterized some portions of his complaints. In the rebuke then addressed to Job's opponents the integrity of his character is distinctly recognized, while they are condemned for untruth, which, insasmuch as it was not willful, but proceeded from a real but narrow-minded estimate of the divine justice, is pardoned on the intercession of Job. The rebuke confirms an external prosperity, which is an inevitable result of God's personal manifestation, symbolizes the ultimate compensation of the righteous for all sufferings undergone upon earth.

From this analysis it seems clear that certain views concerning the general object of the book are partial or erroneous. It cannot be the object of the writer to prove that there is no connection between guilt and sorrow, or that the old orthodox doctrine of retribution was radically unsound. Job himself recognizes the general truth of the doctrine, which is in fact confirmed by his ultimate restoration to happiness. Nor is the development of the great doctrine of a future state the primary object.

a Tims A. Schultens. There can be no doubt that "angel," not "messenger," is the true translation, nor that the angel, the one of a thousand, is the רְאוֹּלָן־גָּאוֹן of Genesis.

b This bearing of the statement upon the whole argument is satisfactorily shown by Hahn (Introduction to Job, p. 4), and by Schloßmann in his commentary on the passage (p. 458).

c This is the strangely exaggerated form in which Mr. Froude represents the views of Ewald. Nothing can be more contrary to the whole tenor of the book.

d See Ewald's remarks in his Jahrb., 1858, p. 33. The notion that Job is a type of the Hebrew nation in their sufferings, and that the book was written to console them in their exile, held by Clermont-Ganneau, is generally rejected. See Rosemauller, pp. 13-16.

e Ewald's theory, on which Schloßmann has some excellent observations (p. 45).
It would not in that case have been passed over in Job's last discourse in the speech of Elihu, or in the blessing of the Lord God. In fact, critics who hold that view admit that the doctrine is rather suggested than developed, and amounts to scarcely more than a wish, a presentiment, at the most a subjective conviction of a truth first fully revealed by Him — who brought life and immortality to light. The great object must surely be that which is distinctly intimated in the introduction, and confirmed in the conclusion, to show the objects of calamity in its worst and most awful form upon a truly religious spirit. Job is no Stoic, no Titan (Ewald, p. 24), struggling rebelliously against God; nor Prometheus, victim of a jealous and unrelenting Deity: he is a suffering man, acutely sensitive to all impressions inward and outward, grieved by the loss of wealth, position, domestic happiness, the respect of his countrymen, dependents, and followers, tortured by a homesickness and all but unendurable disease, and stung to an agony of grief and passion by the insinuations of conscious guilt and hypocrisy. Under such provocation, being wholly without a clue to the cause of his misery, and hopeless of restoration to happiness on earth, he is shaken to the utmost, and driven almost to desperation. Still in the centre of his being he remains firm — with an interest concerning the success of his own integrity — without a doubt as to the power, wisdom, truth, or absolute justice of God, and therefore awaiting with longing expectation the final judgment which he is assured must come and bring him deliverance. The representation of such a character, involving the discomfiture of man's great enemy, and the development of the manifold problems which such a spectacle suggests to men of imperfect knowledge, but thoughtful and inquiring minds, is the true object of the writer, who, like all great spirits of the ancient world, dealt less with abstract propositions than with the objective realities of existence. Such is the impression naturally made by the book, and which is recognized more distinctly in proportion as the reader grasps the tenor of the arguments, and realizes the character and events. [See appendix to the text.]

11. Integrity of the book. — It is satisfactory to find that the arguments employed by those who impugn the authenticity of considerable portions of this book are for the most part mutually destructive, and that the most minute and searching investigations bring out the most convincing proofs of the unity of its composition, and the coherence of its constituent parts. One point of great importance is noted by the latest and one of the most ingenious writers (M. E. Renan, Le Livre de Job, Paris, 1853) on this subject. After some strong remarks upon the inequality of the style, and appearance of interpolation, M. E. Renan observes (p. xiv.): — The Hebrews, and Orientalists in general, differed widely from us in their views about composition. Their works never lack that perfectly defined outline to which we are accustomed, and we should be careful not to assume interpolations or alterations (retoches) when we meet with defects of sequence which surprise us." He then shows that in parts of the work, acknowledged by all critics to be by one hand, there are very strong instances of what Europeans might regard as repetition, or suspect of interpolation; thus Elihu recommences his argument four times; while discourses of Job which have distinct portions, such as, to modern critics might seem unconnected and even misplaced, are impressed with such a character of sublimity and force as to leave no doubt that they are the product of a single inspiration. To this just and true observation it must be added that the assumed want of coherence and of logical consistency is for the most part only apparent, and results from a radical difference in the mode of thinking and4 conceiving thought between the old Eastern and modern European.

Four parts of the book have been most generally attacked. Objections have been made to the introductory and concluding chapters (1) on account of the style. Of course there is an obvious and natural difference between the prose of the narrative and the highly poetical language of the colloquy. Yet the best critics now acknowledge that the style of these portions is quite as genuine in its simple and severe grandeur as that of the Pentateuch itself (to which it bears a striking resemblance), or as any other part of this book, while it is as strikingly unlike the narrative style of all the later productions of the Hebrews. Ewald says with perfect truth, "these proaic words harmonize thoroughly with the old poem in subject-matter and thoughts, in coloring and in art, also in language, so far as prose can be like poetry." It is said again that the doctrinal views are not in harmony with those of Job. This is wholly unfounded. The fundamental principles of the patriarch, as developed in the most solemn of his discourses, are identical with those maintained throughout the whole. The form of worship belongs essentially to the early patriarchal type; with little of ceremonial ritual, without the angelic and inart, wholly domestic in form and spirit. The representation of the angels, and their apellation, "sons of God," peculiar to this book and to Genesis, accord entirely with the intimations in the earliest documents of the Semitic race. It is moreover alleged that there are discrepancies between the facts related in the introduction, and statements or allusions in the dialogue. But the apparent contradiction between xix. 17 and the statement that all Job's children had perished, rests upon a misinterpretation of the words "founs of my womb," i.e. "of the womb that bare me" — "my brethren," not "my children" (cf. xxii. 10): indeed the destruction of the patriarch's whole family is repeatedly assumed in the dialogue (v. viii. 4, xxix. 5). Again, the omission of all reference to the — that the MSS. must have been very good — the verbal connection is accurate — and emendations unnecessary (see p. 63). M. Renan asserts, "Vers antiquis most perfecti sunt et parvis manu et patris penu sub-perscrvanda, dum un it fort miserabile et moele en pluribus endrota" (p. 1x3.

M. Renan: "Le grand caractere du recitat est une preuve de son anciennete."
defeat of Satan in the last chapter is quite in accordance with the grand simplicity of the poem (Schloßmann, pp. 30, 40). It was too obvious a result to need special notice, and it had in fact been accomplished by the steadfast faith of the patriarch even before the discussions commenced. No allusion to the agency of that spirit was to be expected in the colloquy, since Job and his friends are represented as wholly ignorant of the transactions in heaven. At present, indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the entire work would be unintelligible without these portions.

2. Strong objections are made to the passage xxvii. from ver. 7 to the end of the chapter. Here Job describes the ultimate fate of the godless hypocrite in terms which some critics hold to be in direct contradiction to the whole tenor of his arguments in other discsourses. Dr. Kennicott, whose opinion is adopted by Eliechorn, Froude, and others, held that, owing to some confusion or omission in the MS., the missing speech of Zophar has been put into the mouth of Job. The fact of the contradiction is denied by able writers, who have shown that it rests upon a misapprehension of the patriarch's character and fundamental principles. He had been provoked, under circumstances of peculiar aggravation, into statements which at the close of the discussion he would be anxious to guard or recall: he was bound, having spoken so harshly, to recognize, what beyond doubt he never intended to deny, the general justice of divine dispensations even in this world. Moreover he intimates a belief or presentiment of a future retribution, of which there are no indications in any other speaker (see ver. 8). The whole chapter is thoroughly colored: the first part is admitted by all to belong to Job; nor can the rest be disjoined from it without injury to the sense. Ewald says, "only a grievous misunderstanding of the whole book could have misled the modern critics who hold that this passage is interpolated or misplaced." Other critics have abundantly vindicated the authenticity of the passage (Hahn, Schlottmann, etc.). As for the style, E. Renan, a most competent and critical critic, declares that "it is one of the finest developments of the poem. It certainly differs exceedingly in its breadth, loftiness, and devout spirit, from the speeches of Zophar, for whose silence satisfactory reasons have been already assigned (see the analysis).

3. The last two chapters of the address of the Almighty have been rejected as interpolations by many of course rationalistic writers (Stuhlhmann, Herstein, Eliechorn, Ewald, Meier): partly because of an alleged inferiority of style; partly as not having any bearing upon the argument; but the connection of reasoning, involved, though, as was to be expected, not drawn out in this discourse, has been shown in the preceding analysis: and as for the style, few who have a true ear for the resonant gracefulness of ancient Hebrew poetry will dissent from the judgment of E. Renan, whose suggestion, that it may have been written by the same author at a later date, is far from weakening the force of his observation as to the identity of the style.

4. The speech of Elihu presents greater difficulties, and has been rejected by several rationalists, whose view is contested not only by orthodox writers, but by some of the most sceptical commentators. The former support their decision chiefly on the manifest, and to a certain extent the real, difference between this and other parts of the book in tone of thought, in doctrinal views, and more positively in language and general style. Much stress also is laid upon the facts that Elihu is not mentioned in the introduction nor at the end, and that his speech is unanswered by Job, and unnoticed in the final address of the Almighty. These points were observed by very early writers, and were accounted for in various ways. On the one hand, Elihu was regarded as a specially inspired person (Schloßmann, p. 58). In the Seder Olam (a rabbinical system of chronology) he is reckoned among the prophets who declare the will of God to the Gentiles before the promulgation of the law. S. Bar Nachman (12th century) notes his connection with the family of Abraham as a sign that he was the fittest person to expound the ways of the God. The Greek Fathers generally follow Chrysostom in attributing to him a superior intellect; while many of the best critics of the two last centuries consider that the true dialectic solution of the great problems discussed in the book is to be found in his discourse. On the other hand, Jerome, who is followed by Gregory, and many ancient as well as modern writers of the Western Church, speak of his character and arguments with singular contempt. Later critics, chiefly rationalists, see in him but an empty babbler, introduced only to heighten by contrast the effect of the last solemn and dignified discourse of Job. The alternative of rejecting his speech as an interpolation was scarcely less objectionable and has been preferred by Stuhlmann, Bernstein, Ewald, Renan, and other writers of similar opinions in our country. A candid and searching examination, however, leads to a different conclusion. It is proved (see Schlottmann, Einl. p. 55) that there is a close internal connection between this and other parts of the book; there are references to numerous passages in the discourses of Job and his friends; so covert as to be discovered by close inquiry; yet, when pointed out, so striking and natural as to leave no room for doubt. Elihu supplies exactly what Job repeatedly demands — a confirmation of his opinions, not merely produced by an overwhelming display of divine power, but by rational and human arguments, and proceeding from one, not like his other opponents

a Hahn, p. 13; Rosenmüller, p. 46; Eliechorn, Ewald, Schloßmann, Renan, etc.
b "Le style du fragment dont nous parlons est celui des meilleurs endroits du poème. Nulle part la coupe n'est plus vigoureuse, le parallelisme plus sonore: tout indique que ce singulier morceau est de la main même, mais non pas du même jet, que le reste du discours. Jowrah (p. 1).
c Berthold, Gesenius, Schäber, Jahn, Umbreit, Rosenmüller; and of course by moderate or orthodox writers, as Haverkoch, Hahn, Stichel, Hengstenberg, and Schloßmann. Mr. Froude ventures, nevertheless, to assert that this speech is "now decisively pronounced by Hebrew scholars not to be genuine," and he disposes of the question in a short note (The Book of Job, p. 24).
d Thus Calvin, Thomas Aquinas, and A. Schultens, who speaks of his speech thus: "Elihu moderatisissent illa quidem sed tamen adei flagrantesinsa Elisaeus Elythus; Elythus obbat Dagon usurpans non minus quam graviter composserat aggressor." e The commentary on Job is not by Jerome, but one of his disciples, and probably expresses his thoughts.
f Moralia Magna, lib. xxxvii. 1, 11

Eliechorn, Berthold, Umbreit.
bigoted or hypercritical, but upright, candid, and truthful (comp. xxxiii. 3 with vi. 24, 25). The reasons of Eilhin are, moreover, such as are needed for the development of the doctrines inculcated in the book, while they are necessarily cast in a form which could not with impunity be ascribed to the Almighty. As to the objection that the doctrinal system of Eilhin is in some points more advanced than that of Job or his friends, it may be answered, first, that there are no traces in this discourse of certain doctrines which were undoubtedly known at the earliest date to which those critics would assign the interpretation; whereas it is evident that if known they would have been advanced as the very strongest arguments for a warning and consolation. No reader of the Psalms and of the prophets could have failed to urge such topics as the resurrection, the future judgment, and the personal advent of Messiah. Secondly, the doctrinal system of Eilhin differs rather in degree than in kind from that which has been either developed or intimated in several passages of the work, and consists chiefly in the speculative application of the modi­datory theory, not unknown to Job, and in a deeper appreciation of the love manifested in all providential dispensations. It is quite consistent with the plan of the writer, and with the admirable skill shown in the arrangement of the whole work, that the highest view as to the object of afflictions, and to the source to which men should apply for comfort and instruction, should be reserved for this, which, so far as regards the human reasoner, is the culminating point of the discussion. Little can be said for Lightfoot's theory, that the whole work was composed by Eilhin; or for E. Renan's conjecture that this discourse may have been composed by the author in his old age: yet these views imply an unconscious impression that Eilhin is the fullest exponent of the truth. It is satisfactory to know that two1 of the most impartial and discerning critics, who unite in denying this to be an original and integral portion of the work, fully acknowledge its intrinsic excellence and beauty.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the omission of Eilhin's name in the introduction. No persons are named in the book until they appear as agents, or as otherwise concerned in the events. Thus Job's brethren are named incidentally in one of his speeches, and his relations make their first appearance at the time in the concluding chapter. Had Eilhin been mentioned at first, we should of course have expected him to take part in the discussion, and the impression made by his startling address would have been lost. Job does not answer him, nor indeed could he deny the cogency of his arguments; while this silence brings out a curious point of coincidence with a previous declaration of the patriarch (vi. 24, 25). Again, the discourse between Eilhin finally true did not meet correction, and is therefore left unnoticed in the final decision of the Almighty. Nothing indeed could be more in harmony with the ancient traditions of the East than that a youth moved by a special and supernatural impulse to speak out God's truth in the presence of his elders, should return to obscurity by what he had accomplished. More weight is to be attached to the objection resting upon diversity of style, and dialectic peculiarities. The most acute critics differ indeed in their estimate of both, and are often grossly deceived (see Schlottmann, p. 61), still there can be little doubt as to the fact. It may be accounted for either on the supposition that the author adhered strictly to the form in which he had handed down the dialogue; in which case the speech of a Syrian might be expected to bear traces of his dialect; or that the Chaldaic forms and idioms, which are far from resembling later vulgarisms or corruptions of Hebrew, and occur only in highly poetic passages of the oldest writers, are such as pecu­liarly suit the style of the young and fiery speaker (see Schlottmann, Eidel. p. 61). It has been observed that none of the other interlocutors have each a very distinct and characteristic coloring, shown not only in the general tone of thought, but in peculiarities of expression (Ewald and Schlottmann). The excessive obscurity of the style, which is universally admitted, may be accounted for in a similar man­ner. A young man speaking under strong excite­ment, embarrassed by the presence of his elders, and by the peculiar responsibility of his position, might be expected to use language Obscured by repetitions: and, though ingenious and true, yet somewhat intricate and imperfectly developed arguments; such as in fact present great difficulties in the excess of this portion of the book.

III. Historical Character of the Work. — Three distinct theories have been maintained at various times — some believing the book to be strictly historical; others a religious fiction; others a composition based upon facts. Until a comparatively late time the prevalent opinion was, not only that the persons and events which it describes are real, but that the very words of the speakers were accurately recorded. It was supposed either that Job himself employed the later years of his life in writing it (A. Schultens), or that at a very early age some inspired and sagacious collector of the facts faithfully preserved by oral tradition, and presented them to his countrymen in their own tongue. By some the authorship of the work was attributed to Moses; by others it was believed (and this theory has lately been sustained with much ingenuity) that Moses became acquainted with the documents during his residence in Medinah, and that he added the introductory and concluding chapters.

The fact of Job's existence, and the substantial truth of the narrative, were not likely to be denied

---

1 See Schlottmann (t. c.). The reader will remember the just, though sarcastic, criticism of Pope on Milton's irreverence and bad taste.

2 Hahn says of Eilhin: "A young wise man, representing all the intelligence of his age." (p. 5). Cf. A. Schultens and Hengstenberg in Kittel's Tzyt. of Bibl. Lit.

3 Page 98. This implies, at any rate, that in his opinion there is no absolute incompatibility between the historical part of the book and the parts of style or thought. The conjecture is a striking instance of ins­sistency in a very dogmatic writer.

4 Ewald and Renan. Ewald says: "The thoughts

5 In this speech are in themselves exceedingly pure and true, conceived with greater depth, and presented with more force than in the rest of the book." (p. 320).

6 This seems a sufficient answer to an objection more likely to occur to a modern European than to a Hebrew.

7 Sticker supposes that the Aramaic forms were intentionally introduced by the author on account of the Syrian descent of Eilhin.

8 By Dr. Lee: see his Introduction. He accounts thus for the use of the name מְלֹאכָה, found, with one exception, only in these chapters.
by Hebrews or Christians, considering the term in which the patriarch is named in the 14th of Exe-
kilo and in the Epistle of St. James (ver. 11). It seemed to early writers incompatible with any idea of inspiration to assume that a narrative, certainly not legendary, should be a mere fiction; and con-
sequent to suppose that the Almonight would be in-
introduced as a speaker in an imaginary coloquy.
In the East numerous traditions (Ewald, pp. 17, 18; 
see D'Herbolot, s. v. Agimub) about the patriarch and his family show the deep impression made by his character and calamities: these traditions may possibly have been derived from the book itself; but it is at least equally probable that they had an independent origin. We are led to the same con-
clusion by the soundest principles of criticism. 
Ewald says (Fuld, p. 15) most truly, "The inven-
tion of a history without foundation in facts — the
creation of a person, represented as having a real
historical existence, out of the mere head of the
poet — is a notion so entirely alien to the spirit of
all antiquity, that it only began to develop itself
gradually in the latest epoch of the Literature of
any ancient people, and in its complete form belongs
only to the most modern times." In the canonical
books there is not a trace of any such invention.
Of all people the Hebrews were the least likely to
mingle the mere creations of imagination with the
sacred records revered as the peculiar glory of their
race.

This principle is corroborated by special argu-
ments. It is, to say the least, highly improbable
that a Hebrew, had he invented such a character as
that of Job, should have represented him as be-
longing to a race which, though descended from a
common ancestor, was never on friendly, and
generally on hostile, terms with his own people.
Uz, the residence of Job, is in no way associated
with Israelish history, and, apart from the patri-
arch's own history, would have no interest for a
Hebrew. The names of most persons introduced
have no meaning connected with the part attrib-
uted to them in the narrative. The name of Job
himself is but an apparent exception. According
to most critics בִּנְיָם is derived from בָּנָי
influence, and means "crucially or hostilely treated." According to others (Ewald and Rosenmüller)
of high authority it may signify a "true penitent,"
corresponding to אֵין אוב, so applied to Job, and
evidently with reference to his name, in the Koran
(Sur. 38, 44). In either case the name would give
but a very partial view, and would indeed fail to
represent the central principle of the patriarch's heroi
character. It is concluded far from improbable
that the name previously borne by the hero
may have been changed in commemoration of the

a A fictitious name would of course have meant
what the ancients supposed that Job must signify.
A Bad 40- דִּבֵּר, כַּאֲשִׁרָה, אָבָה, דִּבֵּר
owel 3 בָּנָי אֱלֹהָי, וֹלָה, אָבָה, דִּבֵּר
and מגה, Diophylus Alexander, col. 112), ed. Migone.
b This is assumed by all the critics who believe the
details of the work to be a pure creation of the poet.
He "has represented the simple relations of patri-
archal life, and sustained the assumed character of a
rich Arabian chieftain of a nomad tribe, with the
greatest truthfulness." (Hinn.) Thus Ewald, Schlott-
mann, etc., p. 79.
c It races probably dwelt near the land of Uz.
d Thus Origen, e. Cels. vi. 5, 2; Abufida, Hist
Antesi., אָבָה דִּבֵּר, אָבָה דִּבֵּר
p. 27, ed. Fleischer,
i. his body was smitten with elephantiasis (the
9 Job, 19), and eaten by worms. The disease is de-
scribed by Ainslie, Transactions R. S., and Bruce.
See Ewald, p. 23.
e Ch. li. 7, 8; vii. 5, 13; xvi. 8; xix. 17, 20; xxx
18; and other passages. See the valuable remarks
of Ewald, p. 22.
Forbade as these arguments may appear, many critics have adopted the opinion either that the whole work is a moral or religious apologue, or that, upon a substratum of a few rudimental facts preserved by tradition, the genius of an original thinker has raised this, the most remarkable monument of the Semitic mind. The first indications of this opinion are found in the Talmud (Baba Batra, i. 14). In a discussion upon the age of this book, while the Rabbis in general maintain its historical character, Samuel Bar Nachman declares his conviction—an Job did not exist, and was not a created man, but the work is a parable.

"Hai Gam, A. d. 1000, who is followed by Jaradi, alters this passage to—"Job existed and was created to become a parable." They had evidently no critical ground for the change, but bore witness to the prevalent tradition of the Hebrews. Maimonides (Mevorah Nevehkiah, iii. 22), with his characteristic freedom of mind, considers it an open question of little or no moment to the real value of the inspired book. Balbag, i. e. R. Levi Ben Gershom, treats it as a philosophic work. A late Hebrew commentator, Sinucha Arieh (Schloottmann, p. 4), denies the historical truth of the narrative, on the ground that it is incredible the patriarchs of the chosen race should be surpised in goodness by a child of Edom. This is worth noting in corroboratation of the argument that such a fact was not likely to have been invented by an Israelite of any age.

Luther first suggested the theory which, in some form or other, is now most generally received. In his introduction to the first edition of his translation of the Bible, he speaks of the author as having so treated the historical facts as to demonstrate the truth that God alone is righteous — and in the Tischendorf (ed. Welch, tom. xxii. p. 2034), he says, "I look upon the book of Job as a true history, yet I do not believe that all took place just as it is written, but that an ingenious, pious, and learned man brought it into its present form." This position was strongly attacked by Bellarmine, and other Roman theologians, and was afterwards repudiated by himself. The fact that Spinoza, Clericus (Le Clerc), Du Pin, and Father Simon, held nearly the same opinion, the first denying, and the others notoriously holding low views of the inspiration of Scripture, had of course a tendency to bring it into disrepute. J. D. Michaelis first revived the old theory of Bar Nachman, not upon critical but dogmatic grounds. In a more recent history, the opinions or doctrines enunciated by Job and his friends could have no dramatic authority; whereas if the whole book were a pure inspiration, the strongest arguments could be deduced from them on behalf of the great truths of the resurrection and a future judgment, which, though implied in other early books, are nowhere so distinctly inculcated. The arbitrary character of such reasoning is obvious. At present no critic doubts that the narrative is founded upon facts, although the present opinions among continental scholars is certainly that in its form and general

---

features, in its reasonings and representations of character, the book is a work of creative genius.

The question, however, cannot be settled, nor indeed thoroughly understood, without reference to other arguments by which critics have endeavored to determine the date at which the work was completed in its present form, and the circumstances under which it was composed. We proceed, therefore, to these arguments.

IV. The probable Age, Country, and Position of the Author.—The language alone does not, as some have asserted, supply any decisive test as to the date of the composition. Critics of the last century generally adopted the opinion of A. Schultens (Proef. ad librum Jobis), who considered that the indications of external influences were best accounted for on the supposition that the book was written at a very early period, before the different branches of the Semitic race had completely formed their distinct dialects. The fact that the language of this work approaches far more nearly to the Arabic than any other Hebrew production was remarked by Jerome and is recognized by the soundest critics. On the other hand, there are undoubtedly many Aramaic words, and grammatical forms, which some critics have regarded as a strong proof that the writers must have lived during, or even after the Captivity. At present this hypothesis is universally given up as untenable. It is proved (Evall, Renan, Schloottmann, and Kosegarten) that there is a radical difference between the Aramaisms of the later Hebrew writings and those found in the book of Job. These latter are, without an exception, such as characterize the antique and highly poetic style; they occur in parts of the Talmud, in the Song of Deborah, in the earliest Psalms, and the Song of Solomon, all of which are now admitted even by the ablest rationalistic critics to be among the earliest and purest productions of Hebrew literature. So far as any argument can be drawn from idiomatic peculiarities, it may be regarded as a settled point that the book was written long before the exile (see some good observations by Havernick, p. 209, etc.); while there is absolutely nothing to prove a later date than the Pentateuch, or even those parts of the Pentateuch which appear to belong to the patriarchal age.

This impression is borne out by the style. All critics have recognized its grand archaic character. Firm, compact, sonorous as the ring of a pure metal, severe and at times rugged, yet always dignified and majestic, the language belongs altogether to a period when thought was slow, but profound and intensely concentrated, when the weighty and oracular sayings of the wise were wont to be engraved upon rocks with a pen of iron and in characters of metal lead (see xix. 24). It is truly a lapidary style, such as was natural only in an age when writing, though known, was rarely used, before language had acquired so much freshness, fluency, and beauty, or gained the qualities of its freshness and native force. Much stress has been laid upon the fact such as could only proceed from a vain and ignominous Heathen. Even Ezra, among the Jews, maintained the same position.

---

a A list is given by Lee, p. 50. See also Havernick, Introd. to O. T. p. 176. Eng. Trans.

b Renan's good taste and candor here, as elsewhere, neutralize his rationalistic tendency. In the Histories of Jews (Kronikynen der Juden, 1857), he held that the Aramaisms indicate a very late date; in the preface to Job he has adopted the opinion here expressed.
that the book bears a closer resemblance to the
Proverbs of Solomon than to any other Hebrew
work (see especially Rosenmuller, *Prolz. p. 38*).
This is true to a remarkable extent with regard
to the thoughts, words, and forms of expression,
while the style which is somewhat diffuse and
strongly marked, is almost identical. Hence it has
been inferred that the composition belongs to the
Solomonic era, or to the period between Solomon
and Hezekiah, by whose orders, as we are expressly
informed, a great part of the book of Proverbs was
compiled. But the argument loses much of its
force when we consider that Solomon did not merely
rewrite the proverbs, but felt himself inspired by
the most ancient and curious sayings of olden times,
not only of the Hebrews, but probably of other nations
with whom he had extensive intercourse, and in whose
philosophy he is supposed, not without good reason,
to have taken deep interest, even to the detriment
of his religious principles (see Renan's *Job*, p. xxiii.);
while those proverbs which he invented himself
would as a matter of course be cast in the same
mold as that in which he had been born in mundane character.
Again, there can be little doubt that the passages
in which the resemblance is most complete and
striking, were taken from one book by the author of
the other, and adapted, according to a Hebrew
custom common among the prophets, to the special
purposes of his work. On comparing these pas-
sages, it seems impossible to deny that they be-
longed in the first instance to the book of Job,9
where they are in thorough harmony with the
tenor of the argument, and have all the character-
istics of the author's genius. Taking the resem-
bance as a fact, we are entitled to conclude that
we have in *Job* a composition not later than the
most ancient proverbs, and certainly of much earlier
date than the entire book.

The extent to which the influence of this book is
perceptible in the later literature of the Hebrews
is a subject of great interest; and importance; but
it has not yet been thoroughly investigated.
Hilvernick has a few good remarks in his general
*Introduction to the Old Testament*, § 30. Dr. Lee
(Introd. section vii.) has led the way to a more
complete and searching inquiry by a close examination
of five chapters, in which he produces a vast
number of parallel passages from the Pentateuch
(where they are in thorough harmony with the
proverbs, and which he concludes with an intro-
duction, and of a later date than the rest of the
book), from Ruth, Samuel, the Psalms, Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel,
Amos, Micah, and Nahum, all of which are probably,
and some of them demonstrably, copied from Job.

---

a Each verse, with very few exceptions, consists of
two parallel members, and each member of three
words: when that number is exceeded, it is owing to
the particles or subordinate words, which are almost
always so combined as to leave only three tones in
each member (Schloottmann, p. 68).  

b See Rosenmuller, *Prolz. p. 40*. Even Renan, who
believes that Job was written after the time of Solo-
mon, holds that the description of Wisdom (ch. xxviii.)
is the original source of the idea which we find in
the Proverbs (chs. viii., ix.).

c See some excellent remarks by Renan, p. xcvii.

d The Makamat of Haiiri, and the Life of Timour
by Arbabshah, in Arabic, the works of Lycephon in
Greek, which are apparently examples, although this
character may perhaps be found in the last chapters
of Ecclesiastes, while it is conspicuous in the apocryphal
books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch. In-

---

Considerable weight must also be attached to
the fact that Job is far more remarkable for obscu-

---

1 See, on the other side, Pareau ap. Rosenm.

---

2 The *εκάτω τῶν* and passages of which the
interpretation is wholly a matter of conjecture, far
surpass those of any portion of the O.T.

3 This is true of the Greek dramatists, and of
the greatest original writers of our own, and indeed of
every country before the 15th century.

4 In fact, scarcely one work of fiction exists in
which the arching criticism does not detect anachronisms
or inconsistencies.

5 See Renan, p. xvi. It should be noted that even
the word *τούτων*, so common in every other book,
especially in those of the post-Davidic age, occurs only
once in *Job* (xxii. 22), and then not in the special
technical signification of a received code.
or no allusions to those institutions or events. The statement is inaccurate. In each of the books spec.

ified there are abundant traces of the Law. It was not to be expected that a complete view of the Levitical rites, or of historical facts unconnected with the subject-matter of those works, could be derived from them; but they abound in allusions to customs and notions peculiar to the Hebrews trained under the Law, to the services of the Tabernacle or Temple, and they all recognize most distinctly the existence of a sacerdotal system, whereas our author ignores, and therefore, as we may reasonably conclude, was unacquainted with any forms of religious service, save those of the patriarchal age.

Ewald, whose judgment in this case will not be questioned,5 asserts very positively that in all the descriptions of manners and customs, domestic, social, and political, and even in the indirect allusions and illustrations, the genuine coloring of the age of Job, that is of the period between Abraham and Moses, is very faithfully observed; that all historical examples and allusions are taken exclusively from patriarchal times, and that there is a complete and successful avoidance of direct reference to later occurrences,6 which in his opinion may have been known to the writer. All critics concur in extolling the fresh, antique simplicity of manners described in this book, the genuine air of the wild, free, vigorous life of the desert, the stamp of hearth and family, and the thorough consistency in the development of characters, equally remarkable for originality and force. There is an absolute contrast between the manners, thoughts, and feelings, and those which characterized the Israelites during the monarchical period; while whatever difference exists between the customs of the older patriarchs as described in Genesis and those of Job's family and associates, is accounted for by the progress of events in the intervening period. The chieftain lives in considerable splendor and dignity; menial offices, such as commonly devolved upon the elder patriarchs and their children, are now performed by servants, between whom and the family the distinction appears to be more strongly marked. Job visits the city frequently, and is there received with high respect as a prince, judge, and distinguished warrior. There are no courts of judicature, written indictments,7 and regular forms of procedure (xiii. 26, and xxxi. 28). Men had begun to observe and reason upon the phenomena of nature, and astronomical observations were made with curious speculations upon primeval traditions. We read (xx. 13, xxi. 10, xvii. 16, 17, xviii. 1-21) of mining operations, great buildings, ruined sepulchres, perhaps even of sculptured figures of the dead,8 and there are

throughout copious allusions to the natural productions and the arts of Egypt. Great revolutions had occurred within the time of the writer; nations once independent had been overthrown, and whole races reduced to a state of misery and degradation. All this might be expected, even supposing the work to have been written before or near the date of the Exodus. The communications with Egypt were frequent, and indeed uninterrupted during the patriarchal age, and in that country each one of the customs upon which most reliance is placed as indicating a later date in now proved to have been common long before the age of Moses (see Lepinus, Schlottmann, p. 107). Moreover, there is sufficient reason to believe that under favorable circumstances a descendant of Abraham, who was himself a warrior, and accustomed to meet princes on terms of equality, would at a very early age acquire the habits, position, and knowledge which we admire in Job. He was the head of a great family, successful in war, prosperous in peace, supplied abundantly with the necessaries of life, and enjoying many of its luxuries; he lived near the great cities on the Euphrates and Tigris, and on the route of the caravans which at the remotest periods exchanged the productions of Egypt and the far East, and had therefore abundant opportunities of procuring information from those merchants, supposing that he did not himself visit a country so full of interest to a thoughtful mind.

Such a progress in civilization may or may not be admitted by historical critics to be probable within the limits of time thus indicated, but no positive historical fact or allusion can be produced from the book to prove that it could not have been written before the time of Moses. The single objection (Erenan, p. 40) which presents any difficulty is the mention of the Cabirians in the introductory chapter. It is certain that they appear first in Hebrew history about the year c. 770. But the name of Chesed, the ancestor of the race, is found in the genealogical table in Genesis (xxii. 22), a fact quite sufficient to prove the early existence of the people as a separate tribe. It is highly probable that an ancient race bearing that name in Usuristan (see Xenoph. Cyrr. iii. 1, § 34; Jerub. p. 222, 5) which still appears in the courts of that nation, who were there trained in predaceous habits, and accustomed, long before their appearance in history, to make excursions into the neighboring deserts;9 a view quite in harmony with the part assigned to them in this book.

The arguments which have induced the generality of modern critics to assign a later date to this book, notwithstanding their concurrence in most of the points and principles which we have just considered, 

5 Known in Egypt at an early period (Diod. Sic. i. p. 75).
6 Ch. xxi. 22. The interpretation is very doubtful.
7 The remarkable treatise by Chwolson, Uber die Vorschriften des Babyloni schen Rechts in Arabischen Abhandlungen, proves an advance in mental cultivation in those regions at a far older age, more than sufficient to answer every objection of this nature.
8 This is now generally admitted. See M. Renan, Histoire Generale des Langues Semitiques, ed. 1858, p. 56. He says truly that they were "redoutes dans tout l'Orient pour leurs brigandages" (p. 65). See also Chwolson, Die Schabir, vol. i. p. 322. Of the Chaldeans was undoubtedly so named because it was founded or occupied by that people.
may be reduced to two heads, which we will now anteriorly—:

1. We are told that the doctrinal system is considerably in advance of the Mosaic; in fact, that it is the result of a recoil from the stern, narrow dogmatism of the Pentateuch. Here of course there can be no common ground between those who admit, and those who secretly or openly deny the authenticity and inspiration of the Mosaic writings. Still even rationalistic criticism cannot show, what it so confidently assumes, that there is a demonstrable difference in any essential point between the principles recognized in Genesis and those of our author. The absence of all recognition of the peculiar views and institutions first introduced or developed in the Law has been already shown to be an evidence of an earlier date—all that is really proved is that the elementary truths of primeval revelation are represented, and their consequences developed under a great variety of striking and original forms—a fact sufficiently accounted for by the highly thoughtful character of the book and the undoubted genius of the writer (comp. Job x. 9; Gen. iii. 19; Isa. xxvii. 3; Gen. ii. 7, vii. 22; Job xii. 15, 16, with the account of the deluge). In Genesis and in this work we have the same theology; the attributes of the Godhead are identical. Man is represented in all his strength and in all his weakness, glorious in capacities, but infirm and impure in his actual condition, with a soul and spirit allied to the eternal, but with a physical constitution framed from the dust to which it must return. The writer of Job knows just so much of the fall of Adam and the early events of man's history, including the deluge (xxi. 15, 16), as was likely to be preserved by tradition in all the families descended from Shem. And with reference to those points in which a real progress was made by the Israelites after the time of Moses, the position from which this writer starts is precisely that of the lawgiver. One great problem of the book is the reconciliation of unmerited suffering with the love and justice of God. In the prophets and psalms the subject is repeatedly discussed, and receives, if not a complete, yet a substantially satisfactory settlement in connection with the great doctrines of Messiah's kingdom, priesthood, sufferings, and second coming, and of judgment and retribution to be wrought out by God's righteous judgment. In the book of Job, as it has been shown, there is no indication that the question had previously been raised. The answers given to it are evidently elicited by the discussions. Even in the discourse of Eliphaz, in which the nearest approach to the full development of the true theory of providential dispensations is admitted to be found, and which indeed for that very reason has been suspected of interpolated character, there is no such question. The writer knew those characteristics of Messiah which from the time of David were continually present to the mind of the Israelites.

Again it is said that the representation of angels, and still more specially of Satan, belongs to a later epoch. Some have even asserted that the notion must have been derived from Persian or Assyrian mythology. That hypothesis is now generally rejected—on the one hand it would fix a far later date for the composition than any critic of the highest authority would assign to the book; on the other it is proved that Satan bears no resemblance to Ahriman; he acts only by permission from God, and differs from the angels not in essence but in character. It is true that Satan is not named in the Pentateuch, but there is an exact correspondence between the characteristics of the malignant and envious accuser in this book and those of the enemy of man and God, which are developed in the history of the Fall. The appellation of "sons of God" is peculiar to this book and that of Genesis.

It is also to be remarked that no charge of idolatry is brought against Job by his opponents when enumerating all the crimes which they can imagine to account for his calamities. The only allusion to the subject (xxx. 26) refers to the earliest form of false religion known in the East. To an Israelite, living among heathen rites, such a charge was the very first which would have suggested itself, nor can any one satisfactory reason be assigned for the omission.

2. Nearly all modern critics, even those who admit the inspiration of the author, agree in the opinion that the composition of the whole work, the highly systematic development of the plot, and the philosophic tone of thought indicate a considerable progress in mental cultivation far beyond what can, with any show of probability, be supposed to have existed before the age of Solomon. We are told indeed that such topics as are here introduced occupied men's minds for the first time when schools of philosophy were formed under the influence of that prince. Such assertions are easily made, and resting on no tangible grounds, they are not easily disproved. It should, however, be remarked that the persons introduced in this book belong to a country celebrated for wisdom in the earliest times; insomuch that the writer who speaks of those schools considers that the peculiarities of the Solomonian writings were derived from intercourse with its inhabitants (Renaux, pp. xxiii.—xxv.). The book of Job differs from those writings chiefly in its greater earnestness, vehemence of feeling, vivacity of fancy, and force of independent inquiry into the principles of divine government; characteristics as it would seem of a primitive race, acquainted only with the patriarchal form of religion, rather than of a scholastic age. There is indeed nothing in the composition incompatible with the Mosaic age, admitting (what all rationalistic critics who assign a later date to this book deny) the authenticity and integrity of the Pentateuch.

We should attach more weight to the argument derived from the admirable arrangement of the entire book (Schlottmann, p. 108), did we not remember how completely the same course of reasoning misled the acutest critics in the case of the Homeric poems. There is a kind of artifice in style and arrangement of a subject which is at once recognized as an infallible indication of a highly the name of Job is perhaps more than an accidental coincidence.

a To the epoch of the Achaemenide.

b See Renaux, p. xxxix. This was previously pointed out by Herder.

c Dr. Lee (Introduction to Job, p. 78) observes that although Satan is not named in Genesis, yet the character which that name implies is clearly intimated in the words, "I will put enmity (יְשִׂיתָא) between thee and him." The connection between this word and the name of Job is perhaps more than an accidental coincidence.

d The worship of the moon was introduced into Mesopotamia, probably in the earliest age, by the Aryans. See Chwolson, Die Sterne, p. 219.
cultivated or declining literature. This, however, differs essentially from the harmonious and majestic simplicity of form, and the natural development of a great thought which characterize the first grand productions of genius in every nation, and produce so powerful an impression of reality as well as of grandeur in every unprejudiced reader of the book of Job.

These considerations lead of course to the conclusion that the book must have been written before the promulgation of the Law, by one speaking the Hebrew language, and thoroughly acquainted with the traditions preserved in the family of Abraham. Whether the writer had access to original documents or not is mere matter of conjecture; but it can scarcely be doubted that he adhered very closely to the accounts, whether oral or written, which he received.

It would be a waste of time to consider the arguments of those who hold that the writer lived near the time of the Captivity,—that view is now all but universally repudiated: but one hypothesis which has been lately brought forward (by Sticke, who is followed by Schloittmann), and supported by very ingenious arguments, deserves a more special notice. It meets some of the objections which have been here adduced to the prevalent opinion of modern critics, who maintain that the writer must have lived at a period when the Hebrew language and literature had attained their full development; while it accounts in a satisfactory manner for some of the most striking peculiarities of the book. That supposition is, that Job may have been written after the settlement of the Israelites by a dweller in the south of Judaea, in a district immediately bordering upon the blanune desert. The inhabitants of that district were to a considerable extent isolated from the rest of the nation: their attendance at the festivals and ordinances of the Tabernacle and of the Temple before the time of the later kings was probably rare and irregular, if it were not altogether interrupted during a long period. In that case it would be natural that the author, while recognizing and enforcing the fundamental principles of religion, should be sparing in allusions to the sanctions or observances of the later law resident in that district. It would have peculiar opportunities of collecting the varied and extensive information which was possessed by the author of Job. It was not far from the country of Eliphaz; and it is probable that the intercourse with all the races to which the persons named in the book belonged was frequent during the early years of Israelish history. The caravans of Tema and Sheba (Job vi. 19) crossed there in a route much frequented by merchants, and the communications with Egypt were of course regular and uninterrupted. A man of wealth, station, and cultivated mind, such as we cannot doubt the author must have been, would either learn from conversation with merchants the peculiarities to which he so frequently alludes, or, as is highly probable, he would avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded of visiting that country at all the most interesting to an ancient. The local coloring, so strikingly characteristic of this book, and so evidently natural, is just what might be expected from a writer: the families in Southern Palæstine even at a later age, lived very much after the manner of the patriarchs; and illustrations derived from the free, wild, vigorous life of the desert, and the customs of pastoral tribes, would spontaneously suggest themselves to his mind. The people appear also to have been noted for freshness and originality of mind.—qualities seen in the woman of Tekoa, or still more remarkably in Amos, the poor and unlearned herdsman, also of Tekoa. It has also been remarked that Amos seems to have known and imitated the book of Job (comp. Am. iv. 13; v. 8, ix. 6, with Job ix. 8, 9, xxxviii. 31, xii. 15; Schloittmann, p. 109): a circumstance scarcely to be explained, considering the position and imperfect education of that prophet, excepting on the supposition that for some reason or other this book was peculiarly popular in that district. Some weight may also be attached to the observation (Sticke, p. 276; Schloittmann, p. 111) that the dialectic peculiarities of Southern Palæstine, especially the softening of the aspirates and exchanges of the sibilants, resemble the few divergencies from pure Hebrew which are noted in the book of Job.

The controversy about the authorship cannot ever be finally settled. From the introduction it may certainly be inferred that the writer lived many years after the death of Job. From the strongest internal evidence it is also clear that he must either have composed the work before the Law was promulgated, or under most peculiar circumstances which exempted him from its influence. The former of these two suppositions has nothing against it excepting the arguments, which have been shown to be far from conclusive, derived from language, composition, and indications of a high state of mental cultivation and general civilization. It has every other argument in its favor, while it is free from the great, and surely insuperable, difficulty that a devout Israelite, deeply interested in all religious speculations, should ignore the doctrines and institutions which were the peculiar glory of his nation: a supposition which, in addition to its intrinsic improbability, is scarcely consistent with any sound view of the inspiration of holy writ.

A complete list and fair estimate of all the preceding commentators on Job is given by Rosenmüller (Pdchelus Interp., Jobi. 1824). The best rabbinical commentators are — Jarchi, in the 12th century: Aben Ezra, a good Arabic as well as Hebrew scholar, & c. p. 1168; Levi ben Gershon, commonly known as Rallag, p. 1570; and Nachmaniides in the 13th century. Saadia, the well-known translator of the Pentateuch, has written a paraphrase of Job, and Tanhumah a good commentary, both in Arabic (Fawzi, Forer, p. xi.). The early Fathers contributed little to the explanation of the text: but some good remarks on the general argument are found in Chrysostom, Dulaanus Alexandrinus, and other Greek Fathers quoted in the Cateches of Nicerat, edited by Junius, London, fol., 1637 — a work chieflv valuable with reference to the Alexandrins credulity. Tulsus Justiniana, chiefly doctrinal and practical, vol. ii., Romans, 1740. The translation in the Latin Vulgate by Jerome is of great value; but the commentary ascribed to

\[\text{Job, vi. 10; \text{Job}, v. 11; \text{Job, vi. 8; \text{Job, vi. 10.}}\]
aim consists merely of excerpts from the work of Philip, one of Jerome's disciples (see Tillemont, Mem. Eccl. xii. 601): it is of little or no use for the interpretation. The great work of Gregory M. is through manuscript, and in the Rosenmuller says the German translation of Job by T. A. Delerse is one of the best in that language. The early Protestants, Bucer, Oecolampadius, and Calvin, contributed somewhat to the better understanding of the text; but by far the best commentary of that age is that prepared by C. Bertram, a disciple of Mercer, after the death of his master, from his MSS. notes. This work is well worth consulting. Mercer was a sound Hebrew scholar of Reuchlin's school, F. C. Cal, and a man of acute discernment and excellent judgment. The great work of Albert Schultens on Job (A. d. 1737) far surpasses all preceding and contemporary expositions, nor has the writer as yet been surpassed in knowledge of the Hebrew and cognate languages. He was the first who brought all the resources of Aramaic literature to bear upon the interpretation of Job. The fault of his book is diffuseness, especially in the statement of opinions long since rejected, and uninteresting to the student. The best works of the present century are those of Rosenmuller, 3 vols. 1824; and H. Ewald, whose translation and commentary are remarkable for accurate learning and originality of genius, but also for contempt of all who believe in the inspiration of Scripture. The Vorrede is most painful in tone. The commentaries of Umbreit, Vaihinger, Lange, Stiekel, Hahn, Hitzig, De Wette, Knobel, and Vatke are generally characterized by diligence and ingenuity; but have for the most part a strong rationalistic tendency, especially the three last. The most useful analysis is to be found in the introduction to K. Schloittmann's translation, Berlin, 1851; but his commentary is deficient in philological research. M. Renan has lately given an excellent translation in French (Le Livre de Job, 1864), with a long commentary, which, notwithstanding its thoroughly sceptical character, shows a genial appreciation of some characteristic excellences of this book. In England we have a great number of translations, commentaries, etc., of various merit; among which the highest rank must be assigned to the work of Dr. Lee, especially valuable for its copious illustrations from different sources.

* The personal character of Job, and his sentiments and conduct under his afflictions, are to be learned from the statements respecting them in the introductory and concluding chapters. These are to be taken as the complete exposition of his character and conduct. The whole is summed up in his memorable words (ch. i. 21), "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." The poetical portion, intervening between the introductory and concluding chapters, is the inspired writer's own discussion of the topics therein considered, under the names of Job and his friends. His immediate object, in this instructive discussion, is to exhibit, in strongest contrast, the antagonistic views suggested by observation of the moral government of God, in order to deduce from them the only practical lessons which that observation can teach, or is capable of comprehending. Hence it gives to these conflicting views the freest scope and the most impressioned expression, so as to exhibit their antagonisms in the strongest light. To impute to Job, personally, sentiments which the writer himself desired to express through one of the parties in the discussion, would be no less absurd, than it would be to regard the sublime poetry of this book as the verbatim report of an actual debate. But what is the object of the book, and what are the lessons which it teaches? To say (as above, p. 1400, col. 1) that the problem is, "Can goodness exist irrespective of reward," is to ignore the greater part of the discussion; for it takes a far wider range than this. It is justly said (on p. 1403, col. 2) that the object of the calamities inflicted on Job was "to try his sincerity;" but this throws no light on the object of the book and its discussions, to which the sufferings of Job only furnished the occasion.

Nor can it be said (as on p. 1404, col. 1) that the object is, "to show the effects of calamity, in its worst and most awful form, upon a truly religious spirit." If this were the object, it was already achieved in the record of Job's conduct given in the two introductory chapters. It is seen in his tender and faithful expostulation with his angry wife (ch. ii. 10), "shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we receive evil?" It is expressed in his grateful and submissive recognition of God's hand, in what he gives and what he withholds (ch. i. 21), "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." Here is seen "the effect of calamity on a truly religious spirit," and in all ages of the church it has been justly regarded as the highest and fullest attainment of the religious life. (Compare James v. 11.) This, moreover, is the historical record of Job's calamities, and of their effect on him. The poetical discussion, which follows, is of quite another character, and has a very different object.

The discussion, on the part of the human disputants, covers all which observation can attain, respecting the moral government of God, and (including the subject of the book) the true character of human existence. But all fails to solve the great problem of the divine government, in view of the apparently indiscriminate distribution of happiness and misery to the good and evil among men. Many facts of human life are correctly stated, as all experience proves, and much also that is false; many principles are avowed, that are true and just and substantial, as well as many that are false and injurious. The whole discussion is instructive, as exhibiting the various aspects under which the divine government may be viewed; and especially as showing the conflicts which may agitate the breast even of the good man, in view of the strange and unexplained distribution of good and evil in this life. It is no solution of the problem, that this life is fragmentary; that all will be rightly adjusted in another and a better existence. Nor if it would to make the distinction there between right and wrong, why is it not made here? a

a A very interesting and instructive discussion of this problem in one of its aspects, as it presented itself to the mind of an intelligent and reflecting heathen, is given in Plutarch's treatise On the Deity of
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By a skillful manœuvre, another disputant is now introduced. An important, though a subordinate, view of the subject still remains, which could not be considered in connection with the topics of the preceding discussion. To have presented it in the person of one equal or superior in age to those who had already spoken, would have given to him the appearance of an umpire, and to his views an importance not at all deserved; for they do not penetrate to the heart of the subject, and only offer certain partial suggestions, which might occur to the superficial observer, but are worthy to be taken into account. In the final arbitrament, they are passed over in silence, as something aside from the main issue. It is to a young man, therefore, that this part is fittingly assigned; and with admirable skill he is made to speak in character, both in the views ascribed to him, and in the manner of expressing them.

According to this speaker, the divine judgments are corrective in their design; the chastisement of a wise and tender parent, seeking to reclaim a wayward child. Such chastisement is an index, therefore, of the moral state of its subject. It must be graduated, consequently, to the necessities of the case, and its severity is an exact measure of the moral desert of the recipient. The view necessarily assumes, that a great sufferer must have been a great sinner; and consequently that Job, contrary to the whole tenor of his outward life, and to the express testimony of the Searcher of the heart, must have been secretly as eminent in sin as he was now in suffering.

Human wisdom is thus shown to be utterly at fault, in its efforts to comprehend the mystery of God's government on earth. Is there, then, no help? Is there no rest for the human spirit, no stable ground of trust and confiding submission, where it may find secure repose?

The sacred writer now breaks off the discussion, which has reached no satisfactory result, by the sudden manifestation of the Deity in the terrors of the storm. As the office had been assigned to Job of relating the false assumptions of the three friends, and of boldly questioning the rectitude of the divine practical wisdom, the answer of God is addressed directly to him. This answer demands special attention, as the key to the design and instructions of the book. That it is so, is clear; for why should the Deity be introduced at all, except as the supreme Arbiter, to whom the final decision is assigned? The introduction of the Almighty, the supreme Judge of all, for any less purpose, would have been a gross violation of every rule of probability in composition, and one with which the author of a work so perfect in design and execution should not be charged. These sublime discourses are justly regarded as the most fitting reply, on the part of the Supreme Ruler and Judge, to the presumptuous charges against his moral government. They do not descend to vindicate his ways, or attempt to make the reader see the matter; but the rebuke is so overpowering, that the opposition to it can be felt only by the overthrow of the Deity themselves, and the utter destruction of their followers. But the Deity is now punishing the wicked; "the Greek text, c. 15."

T. J. C.

The Deity in punishing the wicked; "the Greek text, c. 15."

T. J. C.

"It is one of the strange incongruities of Hengstenberg's theory of the design and teachings of the Book, that the Deity is made to appear, simply for the purpose of inculcating the opinions of the youthful he should be now punishing the wicked; "the Greek text, c. 15."

T. J. C.

The Deity in punishing the wicked; "the Greek text, c. 15."

T. J. C.
they are found; showing that they furnish no evidence against the genuineness of these dis
sources.


T. J. C.

JO'BA'B. 1. (יוֹבָּב [yôḇâḇ; and then place of deserta]; [in Gen.]. 10:8; [in 1 Chr., 1:8; 18:2]; [in 1. Kings., 5:1]; 1:3). The last in order of the sons of Joktan (Gen. x. 29; 1 Chr. i. 23). His name has not been discovered among the Arab names of places in Southern Arabia, where he ought to be found with the other sons of Joktan. But Piocmen mentions the 108ןבָּרְאֵת near the Suchalite; and Bochart (Phaleg, B. 21), followed by Salamin and Gesenius, suggests the reading 108ןבָּרְאֵת, by the common interchange of p and b. The identification is perhaps correct, but it has not been connected with an Arab name of a tribe or place; and Bochart’s conjecture of its being i. q. Arab.

"a desert," etc., from הֹבָּב, though regarded as probable by Gesenius and Michaelis, seems to be unworthy of acceptance. Kalisch (Com. on Gen.) says that it is "according to the etymology, a district in Arabia Deserta," in apparent ignorance of the famous desert near Hadrumiet, called the Aabf, of proverbial terror; and the more extensive waste on the northeast of the former, called the "deserted quarter," Er-Ruba el-Khaled, which is impassable in the summer, and fitter to be called desert Arabia than the country named deserta by the Greeks.

2. [Alex. in Gen. xxxvi. 33, 10:8; 1:8.] One of the "kings" of Edom (Gen. xxxvi. 33, 44; 1 Chr. i. 44, 45), enumerated after the sons of Canaan, and belonging to the northern chief among the phylarch descended from Esau. [Ezra.] He was "son of Zerah of Bozrah," and successor of Bela, the first king on the list. This is Jobab whom the LXX., quoting the Syriac, identify with Job, his father being Zerah son of Esau, and his mother, 108ןבָּרְאֵת.

3. [10:8; 1:8.] King of Madon; one of the northern chieftains who attempted to oppose Joseph’s conquest, and were routed by him at Meron (Josh. xi. 15).

(10:8; [Vat. Comp. Ald.] Alex. 1:8.; [in 1. Kings.]. The head of a Benjamite house (1 Chr. xviii. 9). [Jezz.] A. C. H. JOCHEBED (יוֹכָבֵד [yôcohâḇ; and then place of glory is Jehovah]; [in Num., 10:8; 1:8;] Jochabeth), the wife and at the same time the aunt of Amram, and the mother of Moses and Aaron (Ex. vi. 20). In order to avoid the apparent illegitimacy of the marriage between Amram and his aunt, the LXX. and Vulg. render the word 108ןבָּרְאֵת “cousin” instead of “aunt.” But this is unnecessary: the example of Abraham himself (Gen. xxv. 12) proves that in the pre-Mosaic age a greater latitude was permitted in regard to kinship in an later age. Moreover it is expressly stated elsewhere (Ex. ii. 1; Num. xxvi. 59), that Jochabeth
was the daughter of Levi, and consequently sister of Kohath, Amram's father.

W. L. B.

JO DA (Ioađ; [Vat. Iossâ; Vulg. omita]) = Judah the Levite, in a passage which is difficult to unravel (1 Esdr. v. 58; see Ezr. iii. 9). Some words are probably omitted. The name elsewhere appears in the A. V. in the forms Hesdâh (Ezr. vii. 40), Heshâv (Neh. vii. 43), Hoshâh (Neh. x. 10), and Sulâhas (1 Esdr. v. 28).

JOved (Jeroba is witness) = Ioađ, a Benjamite, the son of Pethahiah (Neh. xi. 7). Two of Kenemann's MSS. read ’3y'W, i.e. Jozeer, and two *y'y, i.e. Joel, confounding Joel with Joel the son of Pethahiah, the Manassite. The Syriac must have had 3y'y.

JOEL (Jehovah is God; or whose God is Jehovah, Ges.): Ioađ, Joel, and Jobel. 1. Elekst son of Samuel the prophet (1 Sam. viii. 2: 1 Chr. vi. 33, xv. 17), and father of Hanan the singer. He and his brother Abiah were nine judges in Beer-sheba when their father was old, and no longer able to go his accustomed rounds. But they disagreed both their office and their parenting by the corrupt way in which they took bribes and perverted judgment. Their grievous misconduct gave occasion to the change of the constitution of Israel to a monarchy. It is in the case of Joel that the singular corruption of the text of 1 Chr. v. 1 (28 A. V.) has taken place. Joel's name has dropped out; and Yehôa, which means "and the second," is descriptive of Abijah, but has been taken for a proper name.

2. [Jobel]. In 1 Chr. vi. 36, A. V., Joel seems to be merely a corruption of Shama at ver. 24.

A. C. H.

1. One of the twelve minor prophets; the son of Pethuel, or, according to the LXX, Bethuel. Beyond this fact all is conjecture as to the personal history of Joel. Pseudo-Epiphanus (ii. 245) recounts a tradition that he was of the tribe of Reuben, born and buried at Beth-lehem, between Jerusalem and Cæsarea. It is most likely that he lived in Judah, for his mission was to Judah, as that of Hossa had been to the ten tribes (St. Jerome, Comment. in Joel). He exhorts the priests, and makes frequent mention of Judah and Jerusalem. It has been made a question whether he were a priest himself (Winer, Re-buc), but there do not seem to be sufficient grounds for determining it in the affirmative, though some recent writers (e. g. Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 179) have taken this view. Many different opinions have been expressed about the date of Joel's prophecy. Trusler has placed it in the reign of Josiah, Berthold of Hezekiah, Kimchi, Jehu, etc. of Manasseh, and Cabnet of Nehemiah. The LXX. place Joel after Amos and Micah. But there seems no adequate reason for departing from the Hebrew order. The majority of critics and commentators (Amarland, Vitringa, Hengstenberg, Winer, etc.) fix upon the reign of Ezzed, thus making Joel nearly contemporaneous with Hosea and Amos. The principal reasons for this conclusion, besides the order of the books, are the special and exclusive mention of the Egyptians and Edomites as enemies of Judah, to allusion being made to the Assyrians or Babylonians, who arose at a later period. Nothing, says Hengstenberg, has yet been found to overthrow this conclusion, and it is confirmed on other grounds especially.

The nature, style, and contents of the prophecy

—We find, what we should expect on the supposition of Joel being the first prophet to Judah, only a broad outline of the whole terrible scene, which was to be depicted more and more in detail by subsequent prophets (Brown, Oso Seel, p. 691). The scope, therefore, is not any particular invasion, but the whole day of the Lord. "This book of Joel is a type of the early Jewish prophethical discourse, and may explain to us what distant events in the history of the land would expand it, and bring fresh discoveries within the sphere of the inspired man's vision" (Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 179).

The proximate event to which the prophecy related was a public calamity, then impending on Judah, of a twofold character: want of water, and a plague of locusts, continuing for several years. The prophet exhorts the people to turn to God with penitence, fasting, and prayer, and then (he says) the plague shall cease, and the rain descend in its season, and the land yield her accustomed fruit. Joel, the time will be a most joyful one; for God, by the outpouring of his spirit, will support his worshippers increased knowledge of Himself, and after the excision of the enemies of his people, will extend through them the blessings of true religion to heathen lands. This is the simple argument of the book: only that it is beautified and enriched with variety of ornament and pictorial description. The style of the original is perspicuous (except towards the end) and elegant, surpassing that of all other prophets, except Isaiah and Haggai, in sublimity.

Brown (Oso Seel, p. 662) regards the contents of the prophecy as embracing two visions, but it is better to consider it as one connected representation (Hengst., Winer). For its interpretation we must observe not isolated facts of history, but the idea. The swarm of locusts was the medium through which this idea, "the ruin upon the apostate church," was represented to the inward contemplation of the prophet. But, in one unbroken connection, the idea goes on to penitence, return, blessing, outpouring of the Spirit, judgments on the enemies of the Church (1 Pet. iv. 17), final establishment of God's kingdom. All prior destructions, judgments, and victories are like the smaller circles; the final consummation of all things, to which the prophecy reaches, being the outmost one of all.

The boasts of ch. ii. were regarded by many interpreters of the last century (Louth, Shaw, etc.) as figurative, and introduced by way of comparison to a hostile army of men from the north country. This view is now generally abandoned. Locusts are spoken of in Deut. xxviii. 38 as instruments of Divine vengeance: and the same seems implied in Joel ii. 14, 25. Maurice (Prophets and Kings, p. 190) strongly maintains the literal interpretation. And yet the plague continued a parable in it, which it was the prophet's mission to unfold. The four kinds or swarms of locusts (i. 4) have been supposed to indicate four Assurian invasions (Titubam, Bode Stabils), or four crises to the chosen people of God, the Babylonian, Syro-Macedonian, Roman, and Antichristian (Brown). In accordance with the literal (and certainly the primary) interpretation of the prophecy, we should render 3y'W, 3y'W, 3y'W, 3y'W.
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as in our A. V., 'the former rain,' with Rosenm. and the lexographers, rather than 'a (or the) teacher of righteousness,' with marg. of A. V., Hebrg., and others. The allusion to the Messiah, which Hebrg. finds in this word, or to the ideal teacher (Deut. xviii. 18), of whom Messiah was the chief, scarcely accords with the immediate context.

The נָנָסִים of ch. iii. 1 in the Hebrew, 'afterwards' ch. ii. 28 of the A. V., raises us to a higher level of vision, and brings into view Messianic times and scenes. Here, says Steudel, we have a Messianic prophecy altogether. If this prediction has ever yet been fulfilled, we must certainly refer the event to Acts ii. The best commentators are agreed upon this. We must not, however, interpret it thus to the exclusion of all reference to preparatory events under the earlier dispensation, and still less to the exclusion of later Messianic times. Acts ii. virtually contained the whole subsequent development. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the נָנָסִים, while the full accomplishment and the final reality are yet to come. But here both are blended in one, and the whole passage has therefore a double aspect. The passage is well quoted by E. Peter. He adopts the first prophet to the Jewish kingdom. And his quoting it shows that the Messianic reference was the prevailing one in his day; though Acts ii. 39 proves that he extended his reference to the end of the dispensation. The expression 'all flesh' (ii. 17) is explained by the following clauses, by which no principle of distribution is meant, but only that all classes, without respect of persons, will be the subjects of the Spirit's influence. All distinction of races, too, will be done away (cf. Joel ii. 32, with Rom. x. 12, 13). Lastly, the accompanying portents and judgments upon the enemies of God find their various solutions, according to the interpreters, in the repeated deportations of the Jews by neighboring merchants, and sale to the Macedonians (1 Mace. iii. 41, and Ez. xxvii. 13), followed by the sweeping away of the neighboring nations (Maurice); in the evanescence 'well quoted by St. Peter from the first prophet to the Jewish kingdom, in the breaking up of all human polities. But here again the idea includes all manifestations of judgment, ending with the last. The whole is shadowed forth in dim outline; and while some crises are past, others are yet to come (comp. iii. 13-21 with St. Matt. xxiv., and Rev. xix.).

Among the commentators on the book of Joel, enumerated by Rosenmiller, Salooh in Vit. Test., part 7, vol. i., may be specially mentioned Lewend's Joel Exegesis, Ulmri, 1657; Dr. Ewok. Pooock's Commentary on the Prophecy of Joel, Oxford, 1691; and A Paraphrasis and Critical Commentary on the Prophecy of Joel, by Samuel Chandler, London, 1735. See also Die Propheten des alten Blaues erklart, von Heinrich Ewald, Stuttgart, 1840 [Id. i. 20 Aug. 1875]; Praktischer Commentar über die Kleine Propheten, von Dr. Umbrecht, Hamburg, 1844; and Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets, by Dr. E. Henderson, London, 1845 [Amer. ed. 1890].

H. B.

* The principal commentators on Joel as one of the minor prophets (not mentioned above), are

Hitzig, Maurer, Keil, Noyes, and Cowles. For the titles of their works, see Harakkar (Amer. ed.)

To the other separate writers on this book may be added Fr. A. Holzhausen (1829), K. A. Crozons (1831), E. Meier (1841), and E. B. Pusey (1861) in pta. ii. and iii. of his Minor Prophets (not yet completed). Crozet's Der Prophet Joel übersetzt, etc., (pp. 316) is "a rich store-house of philological and historical illustration," but is deficient in method and a skillful use of the abundant material. The natural history of the locusts supplies much of the imagery of the book. Dr. Pusey, by his singular industry in the collection of illustrative facts, advances our knowledge on this subject far beyond all previous interpreters. For useful information here, see also Thomason's Land and Book, ii. 102-108. The Introductions to the O. T. (Haverneck, Scholz, De Wette, Welte-Herbst, Keil, Bleek, Davidson) treat, more or less fully, of the person and prophesies of our author. Ancheren has written on "Joel" in Herzog's Real-Encyk. vi. 719-721. Stanley describes this prophet as the 'connecting link between the older prophets who are known to us only through their actions and sayings, and the later who are known chiefly through their writings... With a glance that reached forward to the most distant ages... he foretold as the chiefest of blessings, that the day was at hand when the prophet's spirit should be made use of to be confirmed to this nation, but should be poured out on all humanity, on male and female, on old and young, even on the slaves and humblest inhabitants of Jerusalem" (Jewish Church, ii. 490).

Dr. Pusey adopts the figurative interpretation of the scourge of locusts. Though so many of the recent commentators, as remarked above, discard this view, it must be confessed that some of the arguments adduced for it are not easily set aside. Among these is the fact that in ii. 17 the prophet says, "Give not thy heritage to reproach that the heathen should rule over them." The connection here is obscure, unless we suppose that, having hitherto employed an allegory, the writer at this point rephrases the figure and passes over to its real import, namely, the devastation of the country by a swarm of locusts (cf. ii. 20, 25). It is clear, however, that who is to inflict the threatened calamity is called "the northern" or northman ("northern army," A. V.) (church), i.e. one who is to come from the north, which is not true of literal locusts; for they are not accustomed to invade Palestine from that quarter, nor could they be dispersed by any natural process in precisely opposite directions as there represented. A finger-sign appears also in i. 6: the locusts just spoken of are here "a heathen people" (יִדְרַךְ), who have come upon the land and inflicted on it the misery of which the prophet goes on to portray so fearful a picture. It is said that the pretences (i. 6 ff.) show that the locusts as literally understood have accomplished or at least begun the work of devastation, and therefore cannot prefigure another and future calamity. But on the other hand, it is possible that these pretences so called may be rhetorical merely; not historical: the act may be represented as past, in order to affirm with greater emphasis the certainty of the occurrence

a west wind into Persia, and with an east wind into Egypt. Similarly the Assyrian hordes would come from their country" (Natural History of the Bible Lond. 1897).
in due time. It agrees with this view that in i. 15 "the day of Jehovah is spoken of as not yet arrived; and "the day" is certainly identified with the visitation of the locusts with which the book opens.

The last five verses (28-32) of ch. ii. (A. V.) form a distinct chapter in the Hebrew Bible. In this division the A. V. follows the LXX. It may be remarked that the transition at this point arises from the relation of subjects, not of time. The prosperity of the ancient people of God if they repented and turned to Him, leads the prophet to speak of the still richer blessings which then awaited those who should believe on Christ under the new and last economy (Acts ii. 16 ff.). On this Messianic passage see especially Hengstenberg's Christology, iii. 125-141 (Keith's tr., 1839).

The style of Joel places him, in the judgment of the best critics, among the most classical of the Hebrew writers. His language is copious and polished; his paradigm regular and well balanced; his imagery bold and picturesque. His description of the warlike locusts—their march, onset and victory, as they spread themselves with irresistible might through the land—forms by universal consent one of the most graphic sketches of this nature to be found in the poetry of any language. The calamity was to come "like man spread upon the mountains" (ii. 2); i.e. suddenly and swiftly as the first teams of the runners in the circus gladiators race to the mountaintop to another. The brute creation suffers as well as men. The Hebrew (i. 29) puts before us a more distinct image than that presented in the A. V. The heat and drought penetrate into the recesses of the desert. The grass is withered; the streams are dried up. The suffering animals turn their eyes towards heaven, and by their silent agony implore relief from the hunger and thirst which they endure. For the battle-scene in Jerem. chapter (iii. 2 ff. or Hebr. iv. 2 ff.) see on that word (Amer. ed.). John's Apocalypse itself has reproduced more from Joel (compared with his extent) than from any other Hebrew poet. The closing verses (iii. 18 ff.) show us how natural it was to foreshadow the triumphs of Christianity under the symbols of Judaism (comp. Is. ii. 2; 3; Mic. iv. 1-5; Ezek. xl-xlviii).

4. (N.N.) "Joel." The head of one of the families of the Simeonites (1 Chr. iv. 35). He formed part of the expedition against the Hamites of Gezer in the reign of Hezekiah.

5. [Alex. Basa.] A descendant of Remren, Jaminus and Treemellus make him the son of Hanoch, while others trace his descent through Carmi (1 Chr. v. 4). The Syriac for Joel substitutes Carmi, but there is reason to believe that the genealogy is that of the eldest son. Barrington (Genentl. i. 53) maintains that the Joel mentioned in v. 8 was a descendant, not of Hanoch, but of one of his brethren, probably Carmi, as Jaminus and Treemellus print it in their genealogical table. But the passage "which he relies for support (ver. 7), as considering the genealogy of Hanoch, evidently refers to Bearah, the prince of the Renenites, whom the Assyrian king carried captive. There is, however, sufficient similarity between Shemaiah and Shema, who are both represented as sons of Joel, to render it probable that the latter is the same individual in both instances. Bertheau conjectures that he was contemporary with David, which would be apparently true if the genealogy were traced in each case from father to son.

6. (Amer. Basa.) Chief of the Gaddites, who dwelt in the land of Bashan (1 Chr. v. 12).

7. (Vat. corrupt: Jobel.) The son of Izrahiah, of the tribe of Issachar, and a chief of one of the troops of the host of the battle "who numbered in the days of David 36,000 men (1 Chr. vii. 3). Four of Kennicott's MSS. omit the words "and the sons of Izrahiah;" so that Joel appears as one of the five sons of Uzzi. The Syriac retains the present case, with the exception of reading "four" for "five."

8. The brother of Nathan of Zobah (1 Chr. xi. 38), and one of David's guards. He is called G.f.t. in 2 Sam. xxviii. 36; but Kennicott contends that in this case the latter passage is corrupt, though in other words it preserved the true reading.

9. The chief of the Gershonites in the reign of David, who sanctified themselves to bring up the ark from the house of Obededom (1 Chr. xv. 7; 11).

10. A Gershonite Levite in the reign of David, son of Jehiel, a descendant of Laadan, and probably the same as the preceding (1 Chr. xxiii. 8; xxvi. 2). He was one of the officers appointed to take charge of the treasures of the Temple.

11. The son of Pelatiah, and prince or chief of the tribe of Manasseh, west of Jordan, in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 20).

12. A Kohathite Levite in the reign of Hezekiah. He was the son of Azariah, and one of the two representatives of his branch of the tribe in the solemn purification by which the Levites prepared themselves for the restoration of the Temple (2 Chr. xxix. 12).

13. One of the sons of Nehemiah, who returned with Ezra, and later married a foreign wife (Ezr. x. 43). He is called Joel in 1 Esdr. ix. 35.

14. The son of Zichri, a Benjamite, placed in command over those of his own tribe and the tribe of Zabulon, which dwelt at Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. xi. 9).

W. A. W.
The Joanites and Jedidiah, having made his way towards the waste country in the southeast. Here, according to the scanty information we possess, Karkor would seem to have been situated. No trace of any name like Jobekhebah has yet been met with in the above, or any other direction.

G.

JOGLI (יְוַגֵל [zyg'el]: [Ezr. viii. 2]; Alex. EAU]: [Comp. 'Iyag'el] Johghi, the father of Bukki, a chief man among the Danites (Num. xxxiv. 22).

JOHIAH. 1. (יוֹהִיא [verb, Jehovah revives, brings to life]): 'Iydh: [Iam. iexva'yawv]: Alex. Ioyaw: John.) One of the sons of Beriah, the Benjamite, who was a chief of the fathers of the dwellers in Aijalon, and had put to flight the inhabitants of Gath (1 Chr. vii. 16). His family may possibly have founded a colony, like the Danites, within the limits of another tribe, where they were exposed, as the name of Ephraim had been, to the attacks of the Gittites. Such border-warfare was too common to render it necessary to suppose that the narratives in 1 Chr. vii. 21 and viii. 13 refer to the same encounter, although it is not a little singular that the name Beriah occurs in each.

2. ('Iyaw'; [Vat. FA.]: Alex. Ioyaw; [Comp. 'Iyaw'd]): The Vizite, one of David's guard [1 Chr. xii. 45]. Kennicott decides that he was the son of Shimi, as he is represented in the A. V., though in the margin the translators have put "Shimrite" for the son of Shimi to the name of his brother Jedidiah.

JOHAN'NAN (יוֹהָנָן [T.]: Iow'avaw: [Vat. Isawon, and so Alex. ver. 10: Johannah], a shortened form of Jehohanan [Jehovah's gift]. It is the same as John. [Johmihanan].

1. Son of Azariah [Azariah, 1], and grandson of Ahinnax the son of Zadok, and father of Azariah, 6 (1 Chr. vi. 9, 10, A. V.). In Josiphus (Ant. x. 8, § 6) the name is corrupted to Johanan, and in the Seder Olam to Johazah. The latter places him in the reign of Jehoshaphat; but merely because it begins by wrongly placing Zadok in the reign of Solomon. Shorn of his family name we know from 1 K. iv. 2, supported by 1 Chr. vi. 10, A. V., that Azariah the father of Johanan was high priest in Solomon's reign, and Amariah his grandson was in Jehoshaphat's reign, we may conclude without much doubt that Johanan's pontificate fell in the reign of Rehoboam. (See Hervey's Genealogies, etc., etc., ch. x.)

2. [Alex. Iowaw]: Son of Eleazar, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Simeas, in the line of Zerubbabel's heirs [Shelomai], (1 Chr. iii. 24).

A. C. H.

3. ('Iowaw in 2 K. [xxvi. 27], 'Iowaw in Jer.; Alex. Iowaw in 2 K., and Iowaw in Jer., except xlii. 11, xliii. 8, xliii. 2, 4, 5; [Vat. Iovaw in Jer. xlii. 8; FA. Iovaw in Jer. xlii. 15, Iowaw ver. 10: Johannah.] The son of Karah, and one of the captains of the scattered remnant of the army of Judah, who escaped in the final attack upon Jerusalem by the Chaldeans and, after the capture of the king, remained in the open country of Moab and the Ammonites, watching the tide of events. He was one of the first to repair to Mizpah, after the withdrawal of the hostile army, and tender his allegiance to the new governor appointed by the king of Babylon. From his acquaintance with the treacherous designs of Ishmael, against which Jedidiah was unhappily warned in vain, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he may have been a companion of Ishmael in his exile at the court of Baalis king of the Ammonites, the promotor of the plot (Jer. xi. 8-16). After the murder of Gedaliah, Johanan was one of the foremost in the pursuit of his assassin, and rescued the captives he had carried off from Mizpah (Jer. xii. 11-16). Fearing the vengeance of the Chaldeans for the treachery of Ishmael, the captains, with Johanan at their head, halted by the Kean of Chaldea, on the road to Egypt, with the intention of seeking refuge there; and, notwithstanding the warnings of Jeremiah, settled in a body at Tahpanhes. They were afterwards scattered throughout the country, in Migdol, Noph, and Pathros, and from this time we lose sight of Johanan and his fellow-captains.

4. (Iowawv: [H. Iowawv]): The firstborn son of Josiah king of Judah (1 Chr. iii. 17) to either die before his father, or fall with him at Megido. Junius, without any authority, identifies him with Zaneeas, mentioned 1 Esdr. i. 38.

5. A valiant Benjamite, one of David's captains, who joined him at Ziklag (1 Chr. xii. 4).

6. (Alex. Iowaw: [Vat. FA.]: Iowaw) The eighth in number of the lion-faced warriors of Gad, who left their tribe to follow the fortunes of David, and spread the terror of their arms beyond Jordan in the month of its overflow (1 Chr. xii. 12).

7. (Iowawv: [Alex. Iowawv]): The father of Azariah, an Ephrahite in the time of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxviii. 12).


9. (Iowawv: [FA.3 in Ezr., Iowaw]): The son of Eliakim, one of the chief Levites (Neh. xiii. 20) to whose kinsman (or "tutor," according to the LXX.) Ezra retired to mourn over the foreign marriages which the people had contracted (Ezr. x. 6). He is called Johanan in 1 Esdr. ix. 1; and some have supposed him to be the same with Jonathan, descendant of another Eliakim, who was afterwards high-priest (Neh. xii. 11). [JOATHAN, 10.]

10. (Iowawv: [Alex. Iowarav, FA.3 Iowaw]: The son of Tobiah the Ammonite, who had married the daughter of Messhahill the priest (Neh. vii. 18).

W. A. W.

JOHAN'NES (יוֹהָנָנ [T.]: Iowawv: [Vat. Iowawv]; JOANES). Son of Belai (1 Esdr. ix. 29; comp. Ezr. x. 28). [Johmihanan, 4.] *JOHAN'NES (יוֹהָנָנ [T.]: JOANES; JOANES), son of Acan or Hakkatan, 1 Esdr. viii. 38. See JOHANAN, 8. A.

JOHN (Iowawv [see below]: [JOANES]), names in the Apocrypha. 1. The father of Mattathias, and grandfather of the Maccabean family (1 Macc. i. 11).

2. The eldest son of Mattathias (Iowawv: [Sin. Alex. Iowawv]), surnamed Addis (Καθάς), (viz. Grimn, n't 1 Macc. ii. 2), who was slain by "the children of Jambri" [JAMHIRI] (1 Macc. ii. 2, ix. 38-38). In 2 Macc. vi. 22 he is called Joseph, by a common confusion of name. [MACABEES.]

3. The father of Eupolemus, one of the envoy of whom Judas the Maccabees sent to Rome (1 Macc. viii. 17: 2 Macc. iv. 11).

4. The son of Simon, the brother of Judas Mac-
JOHN.

JOHN, THE APOSTLE.

The name John precedes that of James which in John viii. 51 and Acts i. 13 in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tiemann, and Tregelles. A.

1. Before the call to the disciples.—We have no data for settling with any exactitude the time of the Apostles' birth. The general impression left on us by the Gospel-narrative is that he was younger than the brother whose name commonly precedes his (Matt. iv. 21, x. 2, xviii. 1, &c.; but comp. Luke iv. 28, where the order is inverted); younger than his friend Peter, possibly also than his Master. The life which was protracted to the time of Trajan (Euseb. H. E. iii. 23, following Eucumenus) can hardly have begun before the year n. c. 4 of the Dionysian era. The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedaeus (Matt. iv. 21) and his mother Salome (Matt. xxvii. 56, compared with Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1). Of the former we know nothing more. The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphanius, Hær. 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first wife, and consequently half-sister to our Lord. By some recent critics she has been identified with the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, in John xxi. 25 (Wieseler, Stud. u. Krit. 1840, p. 648). They lived, it may be inferred from John i. 44, in or near Bethany (Matt. xxvii. 3). They were afterwards the companions and partners of their children. There, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, the Apostle and his brother grew up. The mention of the "hired servants" (Mark i. 29), of his mother's "substance" (and τῶν ὄπωρχων, Luke viii. 3), of "his own house" (τὸ ἴδιον, John xix. 27), implies a position removed by at least some strata of society from absolute poverty. The fact that the Apostle was known to the high-priest Caiaphas, as that knowledge was hardly likely to have begun after he had avowed himself the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two men or their families. The name which the parents gave to their younger child was too common to serve as the ground of any special inference; but it deserves notice (1) that the name appears among the kindred of Caliphas (Acts iv. 6); (2) that it was given to another priestly child, the son of Zacharias (Luke i. 13), as the embodiment and symbol of Messianic hopes. The frequent occurrence of the name at this period, unconnected as it was with any of the great deeds of the old heroic days of Israel, is indeed in itself significant as a sign of that yearning and expectation in which characterized, not only the more faithful and devout (Luke ii. 25, 28), but the whole people. The prominence given to it by the wonders connected with the birth of the future Baptist may have given a meaning to it for the parents of the future Evangelist which it would not otherwise have had. Of the character of Zebedaeus we have hardly the slightest trace. He interposes no refusal when his sons are called on to leave him (Matt. iv. 21). After this he disappears from the scene of the Gospel-history, and we are led to infer that he had died before his wife followed her children in their work of ministration. His character meets us as presenting the same marked features as those which were conspicuous in her son. From her, who followed Jesus and ministered to Him of her substance (Luke viii. 3), who sought for her two sons that they might sit on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom (Matt. xx. 22), he might well derive his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom. The early years of the Apostle we may believe to have passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyphood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life, liable to the reproach of having no recognized position as a teacher, no rabbinical education (Acts iv. 13), he would yet be taught to read the Law and observe its precepts, to feed on the writings of the prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off. For him too, as bound by the Law, there would be, at the age of thirteen, the periodical pilgrimages to Jerusalem. He would become familiar with the stately worship of the Temple with the sacrifice, the incense, the altar, etc. 

Baptist, were of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, more sober critics, like Neander (Pflanz. u. Leit. p. 600, 4th ed.), and Lücke (Joannea, i. p. 9), reject both the tradition and the conjecture.

C. With his own hypothesis that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the

a * The name John precedes that of James which in John viii. 51 and Acts i. 13 in the critical editions of Lachmann, Tiemann, and Tregelles.

b Ewald (Gesch. Israels, v. p. 171) adopts Wieseler's conjecture, that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the
and the priestly robes. May we not conjecture that they were not made for use but for the occasion? The impression was first made which never afterwards wore off? Assuming that there is some harmony between the previous training of a prophet and the form of the visions presented to him, may we not recognize them in the rich liturgical imagery of the Apocalypse—in that union in one wonderful vision of all that was most wonderful and glorious in the predictions of the other prophets? Consequently the vision here would be also the boy's outward life as sharing in his father's work. The great political changes which agitated the whole of Palestine in such a degree made themselves felt even in the village-town in which he grew up. The Galilean fisherman must have heard, possibly with some sympathy, of the efforts made (when he was too young to join in them) by Judas of Gamala, as the great aspirer of the freedom of Israel against their Roman rulers. Like other Jews he would grow up with strong and bitter feelings against the neighboring Samaritans. Lastly, before we pass into a period of greater certainty, we must not forget to take into account that to this period of his life belongs the commencement of that intimate fellowship with Simon Bar-jonah of which we afterwards find so many proofs. That friendship may even then have been, in countless ways, fruitful for good upon the hearts of both. 

II. From the Call to the Discipleship to the Departure from Jerusalem. — The ordinary life of the fisherman of the Sea of Galilee was at last broken in upon by the news that a prophet had once more appeared. The voice of John the Baptist was heard in the wilderness of Judaea, and the publicans, peasants, drovers, and fishermen of Galilee gathered round him. Among these were the two sons of Zebedee and their friends. With them, perhaps, was One whom as yet they knew not. They heard, it may be, of his protests against the vices of their own ruler—against the hypocrisy of Pharisees and Scribes. But they heard also, it is clear, words which spoke to them of their own sins—of their own need of a deliverer. The words, "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world," implied that those who heard them would enter into the blessedness of which they spoke. Assuming that the unnamed disciple of John i. 37-40 was the Evangelist himself, we are led to think of that meeting, of the lengthened interview that followed it, as the starting-point of the entire devotion of heart and soul which lasted through his whole life. Then Jesus loved him as He loved all earnest seekers after righteousness and truth (comp. Mark v. 21). The words of that evening, though unrecorded, were mighty in their effect. The disciples (John apparently among them) followed their new teacher to Galilee (John i. 44), were with him, as such, at the marriage-feast of Cana (ii. 2), journeyed with him to Capernaum, and thence to Jerusalem (ii. 12, 23), came back through Samaria (iv. 8), and thence, for some uncertain interval of time, returned to their former occupations. The uncertainty which hangs over the narratives of Matt. iv. 18, and Luke v. 1-11 (comp. the arguments for and against their relating to the same events in Lampe, Comment. ed. John. i. 20), leaves us in doubt whether they received a special call to become "fishers of men" once only or twice. In either case they gave up the employment of their life and went to do a work like it, and yet unlike, in God's spiritual kingdom. From this time they take their place among the company of disciples. Only here and there are there traces of individual character, of special turning-points in their lives. Soon they find themselves in the number of the Twelve who are chosen, not as disciples only, but as their Lord's deputies—Apostles. In all the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Jonah and Zebedee stand foremost. They come within the innermost circle of their Lord's friends, and are as the ἀποστόλοι, ἀποστόλων. The three, Peter, James, and John, are with him when none else are in the chamber of death (Mark v. 37), in the glory of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1), when he forewarns them of the destruction of the Holy City (Mark xiii. 3, Andrew, in this instance, with them), in the agony of Gethsemane. St. Peter is throughout the leader of that band; to John belongs the yet more memorable distinction of being the disciple whom Jesus loved. This love is returned with a more single undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the πάντως ἀμφιβλητός, John is the πάντως ἀληθινός (Grotius, Proleg. in Johm.). Some striking facts indicate this; but the character was which was thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth. They hardly sustain the popular notion, fostered by the received types of Christian art, of a nature gentle, yielding, feminine. The name Boanerges (Mark iii. 17) implies a vehemence, zeal, intensity, which gave to those who had it the name of Sons of Thunder. That spirit broke out, once and again, when their Saviour laid their mother in asking for the highest places in the kingdom of their Master, and declared that they were ready to face the dark terrors of the cup that he drank and the baptism that he was baptized with (Matt. xx. 23-24; Mark x. 35-41) when they rebuked one who cast out devils in their Lord's name because he was not one of their company (Luke iv. 39) when they sought to call down fire from heaven upon a village of the Samaritans (Luke ix. 54). About this time Salome, as if her husband had died, takes her place among the women who followed Jesus in Galilee (Luke viii. 3), ministering to him of their substance, and went with him in his last journey to Jerusalem (Luke xxi. 55). Through her, we may well believe, St. John first came to know that Mary Magdalen whose character he depicts with such a life-like touch, and that other Mary to whom he was afterwards to stand in so close and special a relation. The fullness of his narrative of what the other Evangelists omit (John xxi.) leads to the conclusion that he was united also by some special ties of intimacy to the family of Bethany. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the familiar history of the Last Supper. What is characteristic is that he is there, as ever, the disciple whom Jesus loved; and, as the chosen and favored friend, reclines at table with his head upon his Master's breast (John xiii. 23). To him the eager Peter—they had been sent together to prepare the supper (Luke xxii. 8) makes signs of impatient questioning that he should ask what was not likely to be answered if it came from any other (John xiii. 24). As they go out to the Mount of

---

a The consensus of patristic interpretation sees in his name the prophecy of their work as preachers of the Gospel. This, however, would deprive the outlook of all distinguishing force. (Comp. Bucer, Thesaurus, s. v. ἀπόστολος; and Lampe, i. 267)
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Olives the chosen three are nearest to their Master. They only are within sight or hearing of the conflict in the temple (Matt. xxvii. 55). When the betrayal is accomplished, Peter and John, after the first moment of confusion, follow afar off, while the others simply seek safety in a hasty flight (John xviii. 15). The personal acquaintance which existed between John and Caiaphas enabled him to gain access both for himself and Peter, but the latter remains in the porch with the officers and servants, while John himself apparently is admitted to the council-chamber, and follows therefrom even to the pronouncement of the Roman Procurator (John xvi. 16, 19, 28). Thence, as if the desire to see the end, and the love which was stronger than death, sustained him through all the terrors and sorrows of that day, he followed—accompanied probably by his own mother, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene—to the place of crucifixion. The Teacher who had been to him as a brother leaves to him a brother's duty. He is to be as a son to the mother who is left desolate (John xix. 26-27). The Sabbath that followed was spent, it would appear, in the same company. He receives Peter, in spite of his denial, on the old terms of friendship. It is to them that Mary Magdalene first runs with the tidings of the emptied sepulchre (John xx. 1): they are the first to go together to see what the strange words meant. Not without some bearing on their respective characters is the fact that John is the more impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock-tomb; Peter, the least restrained by awe, the first to enter in and look (John xx. 4-6). For at least eight days they continued in Jerusalem (John xx. 25). Then, in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension, we find them still together on the sea of Galilee (John xx. 1), as though they would calm the eager suspense of that period of expectation by a return to their old calling and their old familiar haunts. Here, too, there is a characteristic difference. John is the first to recognize in the dim form seen in the morning twilight the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge into the water and swim towards the shore where He stood calling to them (John xxi. 7). The last words of John are recorded as a means of the other's attention which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question—"And what shall this man do?" (John xxi. 21). The history of the Acts shows the same union. They are of course together at the ascension and on the day of Pentecost. Together they enter the Temple as worshippers (Acts iii. 1) and protest against the threats of the Sadducees (iv. 13). They are fellow-workers in the great first step of the Church's expansion. The Apostle whose wrath had been roused by the unbelief of the Samaritans, overcomes his national exclusiveness, and receives them as his brethren (viii. 14). The persecution which was pushed on by Saul of Tarsus did not drive him or any of the Apostles from their post (viii. 1). When the persecutor came back as the convert, he, it is true, did not see him (Gal. i. 19), but this of course does not preclude that it was the same that he had left Jerusalem. The sharper though shorter act (xxvii. 2). The incident which followed under Herod Agrippa brought a great sorrow to him in the martyrdom of his brother (Acts xii. 2). His friend was driven to seek safety in flight. Fifteen years after St. Paul's first visit he was still at Jerusalem, and helped to take part in the great settlement of the controversy between the Jewish and the gentile Christians (Acts xxi. 20). His position and resources were those of one ranking among the chief "pillars" of the Church (Gal. ii. 9). Of the work of the Apostle during this period we have hardly the slightest trace. There may have been special calls to mission-work like that which drew him to Samaria. There may have been the work of teaching, organizing, exhorting the churches of Judea. His fulness of the solemn charge intrusted to him may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel sure that it was a time in which the natural elements of his character, with all their fiery energy, were being purified and mollified, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. Here, too, we may, without much hesitation, accept the traditions of the Church as recording a historic fact when they ascribe to him a life of edicity (Tertull. de Monog. c. 13). The absence of his name from 1 Cor. i.x. 5 tends to the same conclusion. It harmonizes with all we know of his character to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and divine love that there was no room left for the lower and the human.

III. From his Departure from Jerusalem to his Death.—The traditions of a later age come in, with more or less show of likelihood, to fill up the great gap which separates the Apostle of Jerusalem from the Bishop of Ephesus. It was a natural conjecture to suppose that he remained in Judea till the death of the Virgin released him from his trust.6 When this took place we can only conjecture. There are no signs of his being at Jerusalem at the ascension. There are none of his remaining at Jerusalem when the Apostle to the Gentiles was sent by the Church to the Gentiles. Whether in the time of Augusteine (Quatt. Rom. ii. 19), and embodied in some MSS. of the N. T., represented the 1st Epistle of St. John as addressed to the Parthians, and so far implied that his Apostolic work had brought him into contact with them. When the form of the aged disciple meets us again, in the twilight of the Apostolic age, we

---

6 "In the earlier tradition which made the Apostle formally partition out the world known to them, Par- thia falls to the lot of Thomas, while John receives the Procuratorial Asia." Euseb. H. E. iii. 1. In one of the legends connected with the Apostolic Creed Peter contributes the first article, John the second, but the tradition appears with great variations as to time and order (comp. Pseudo-August. Serm. cxciv.

cxviii.).
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are still left in great doubt as to the extent of his work and the circumstances of his outward life. Assuming the authorship of the Epistles and the Revelation to be his, the facts which the N. T. writings assert or imply are—(1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos (Rev. i. 9); (2) that the seven churches, of which seven agencies of the Episcopalians were the special objects of his solicitude (Rev. i. 11): that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested (1 John iv. 1; 2 John 7), and others who, with a railing and malignant temper, disputed his authority (5 John 9, 10). If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all of those who had been the friends and companions even of his earlier years—that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality (John xxi. 23) — that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus” (Rev. xxii. 20)—that from some who spoke with authority he received a solemn assurance of the confidence they reposed in him (John xxi. 24)—we have stated all that has any claim to the character of historical truth. The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus (Simeon Metaph. in viit. John. c. 2; Laume. i. 47), and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heresies which sprang up after St. Paul’s departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius (Hieron. de Vir. Hist. c. 17). In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. The boiling oil into which he is thrown has no power to hurt him (Tertull. de Prescritp. c. 36). He is then sent to labor in the mines, and Patmos is the place of his exile (Victorinus in Apoc. i. x.; Laume. l. 96). The acceptance of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canon of the Gospel-history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting (Euseb. H. E. ii. 24). The elders of the Church are gathered together, and he, as by a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening; “In the beginning was

THE word” (Hieron. de Vr. Illust. c. 29). Heresies continue to show themselves, but he meets them with the strongest possible protest. He refuses to pass under the same roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus) as their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them (Iren. iii. 3; Euseb. H. E. iii. 22, iv. 14). Through his agency of the example of Artemas, is at last nipt of its magnificence, and even (?) leveled with the ground (Cyril. Alex. Orat. de Mer. Virg.; Nicephor. H. E. ii. 42; Laume. i. 90). He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating the Easter feast (Euseb. H. E. iii. 3). At Ephesus, if not before, as one who was a true priest of the Lord, bearing on his brow the plate of gold (nephalion; comp. Suicer. Thes. s. v.), with the sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiff (Polytretes, in Euseb. H. E. iii. 21, v. 24). In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition tells how the old man used to find pleasure in the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and defended himself against the charge of unworthy trifling by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be bent (Comp. Euseb. Coloss. xxix. c. 3). More true to the N. T. character of the Apostle is the story, told with so much power and beauty by Clement of Alexandria (Quis divae, c. 42), of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock; of his eagerness and courage in the attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the outlaw-chief whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance, is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life—part of a story which is, in Clement’s words, ov μίθος, ἀλλὰ λαγός. Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as the last act of his life. When all capacity to work and teach is gone—when there is no strength even to stand—the spirit still retains its power to love, and the lips are still opened to repeat, without change and variation, the command which summed up all his Master’s will, “Little children, love one another” (Hieron. in Col. vi.). Other stories, more apocryphal and less interesting, we may pass over rapidly. That he put forth his power to raise the dead to life (Euseb. H. E. v. 18); that he drank the cup of hemlock which was intended to cause his death, and suffered no harm from it (Ps.-August. Sollog.; Isid. Hispal.

* Here again the hypotheses of commentators range from Claudius to Domitian, the consensus of patristic tradition preponderating in favor of the latter. [Comp. Revelation.]

1 The scene of the supposed miracle was outside the Porta Aboriginum and hence the Western Church commonly remembers it by the special festival of St. John Port. Latin on May 6th.

2 Eusebius and Irenæus make Cerinthus the heretic. In Epiphanius (Herr. xxx. c. 24) Eilen is the hero of the story. To modern feelings the anecdote may seem at variance with the character of the Apostle of Love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2 John 1). To the mind of Epiphanius there was difficulty of another kind. Nothing less that a special inspiration could account for such a departure from an ascetic life as going to a bath at all.

3 The story of the nephalion is perhaps the most perplexing of all the traditions as to the age of the Apostles. What makes it still stranger is the appearance of a like tradition (Hegesippos in Euseb. H. E. ii. 23; Epiph. Herr. 78) about James the Just. Measured by our notions, the statement seems altogether improbable, and yet how can we account for its appearance at so early a date? Is it possible that this was the symbol that the old exclusive priesthood had passed down as a secret? If so, there is a strong presumption of some perverted statement as to the new priesthood was misinterpreted, and that rhetoric passed rapidly into legend? [Comp. Neum. Phaph. u. Leyt. p. 613; Stanley, Sermons and Essays on Apostolate Age, p. 283.] Ewald (l. c.) finds in it an evidence in support of the hypothesis above referred to.

4 The authority of Cassian is but slender in such a case; but the story is hardly to be rejected, on a priori grounds, as incompatible with the dignity of an Apostle. Does it not illustrate the truth—

“Hie praeysth best who lovesth best
All things both great and small”?

5 The memory of this deliverance is preserved in the symbolic cup, with the serpents issuing from it, which appears in the medieval representations of the
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* See also Lardner, Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists, ch. ix. (Works, vol. v. ed. of 1822); Francis Trench, Life and Character of St. John the Evangelist, Lond. 1850; and, on the legends respecting the Apostle, Mrs. Jamieson's Sacred and Legendary Art, i. 157-172, 5th ed.

A.

JOHN THE BAPTIST (Iouan'n, δ ὄδηγος [and δ ὄδηγ of], a saint more signaly honored of God than any other whose name is recorded in either the O. or the N. T. John was of the priestly race by both parents, for his father Zecharias was himself a priest of the course of Abia, or Aliajah (1 Chr. xxiv. 10), offering incense at the very time when a son was promised to him; and Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron (Luke i. 5). Both, too, were devout persons — walking in the commandments of God, and waiting for the fulfillment of his promise to Israel. The divine mission of John was the subject of prophecy many centuries before his birth, for St. Matthew (iii. 3) tells us that it was John who was forefigured by Isaiah as "the Voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Is. xi. 3), while by the prophet Malachi the spirit announces more definitely, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me" (iii. 1). His birth — a birth not according to the ordinary laws of nature, but through the miraculous interposition of Almighty power — was foretold by an angel sent from God, who announced it as an occasion of joy and gladness to many — and at the same time assigned to him the name of John to signify either that he was to be born of God's especial favor, or, perhaps metae," et seq., is familiar to most students as the motto prefixed by Olshausen to his commentary on St John's gospel. The whole hymn is to be found in Trench's Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 71; also in Daniel, Theaurae Homiliae, ii. 109, and Mowe's Latinische Hymnen des Mittelalters, iii. 118.)

JOHN THE BAPTIST

de Morte Sanct. c. 73) that when he felt his death approaching he gave orders for the construction of his own sepulchre, and when it was finished calmly laid himself down in it and died (Augustin. Tract. in Joann. exxiv.); that after his interment there were strange movements in the earth that covered him (Trench, op. cit.); that when the whole was subse-

mental reminiscences of the Christ, kara σάμασα, in his most distinctively human characteristics. It was this union of the two aspects of the Truth which made him so truly the "Theologus" of the whole company of the Apostles, the instinctive opponent of all forms of a mystical, or logical, or legalistic, or Gnosticising. It was a true feeling which led the later interpreters of the mysterious forms of the four living creatures round the throne (Rev. iv. 7) — departing in this instance from the earlier tradition — to see in him the eagle that soars to the highest heaven and looks upon the uncloaked sun. It will be well to end with the noble words from the hymn of Adam of St. Victor, in which that feeling is embodied:

"Caelum transit, ver rotam Solis visib, ibi totam Mensis ignes acen ; Speculator spiritualis Quasi seraphin sub alis, Dei visit faciens."

sonal reminiscences of the Christ, kara σάμασα, in his most distinctively human characteristics. It was this union of the two aspects of the Truth which made him so truly the "Theologus" of the whole company of the Apostles, the instinctive opponent of all forms of a mystical, or logical, or legalistic, or Gnosticising. It was a true feeling which led the later interpreters of the mysterious forms of the four living creatures round the throne (Rev. iv. 7) — departing in this instance from the earlier tradition — to see in him the eagle that soars to the highest heaven and looks upon the uncloaked sun. It will be well to end with the noble words from the hymn of Adam of St. Victor, in which that feeling is embodied:

"Caelum transit, ver rotam Solis visib, ibi totam Mensis ignes acen ; Speculator spiritualis Quasi seraphin sub alis, Dei visit faciens."

Theological or -

recorded and the personal with ing that shadows of it current. The time of his death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history, and the dates that have been assigned for it range from A. D. 89 to A. D. 120 (Lampe, i. 92).

The result of all this accumulation of apocryphal materials is, from one point of view, disappointing enough. We strain our sight in vain to distinguish between the false and the true — between the shadows with which the gloom is peeped, and the living forms of which we are in search. We find it better and more satisfying to turn again, for all our confusions of the Apostle's mind and character, to the scanty records of the N. T., and to the writings which he himself has left. The truth sought that we can attain to is still that he was "the disciple whom Jesus loved" — ὁ ἐπισκόπων Ἐρατο — returning that love with a deep, absorbing, unwavering devotion. One aspect of that feeling is seen in the zeal for his Master's glory, the burning indignation against all that seemed to outrage it, which runs, with its fiery gloom, through his whole life, and makes him, from first to last, one of the Sons of Thunder. To him, more than to any other disciple, there is no neutrality between Christ and Antichrist. The spirit of such a man is intolerant of compromises and concessions. The same strong personal affection shows itself, in another form, in the chief characteristics of his Gospel. While the other Evangelists record primarily the discourses and parables which were spoken to the multitude, he treasures up every word and accept of dialogues and conversations, which must have seemed to most men less conspicuous. In the absence of any recorded narrative of his work as a preacher, in the silence which he appears to have kept for so many years, he comes before us as one who lives in the unseen eternal world, rather than in that of secular, or spiritual actualities. If there is less apparent power to enter into the minds and hearts of men of different temperament and education, less ability to become all things to all men than there is in St. Paul, there is a perfection of another kind. The image mirrored in his soul is that of the Son of Man, who is also the Son of God. He is the Apostle of Love, not because he starts from the easy temper of a general benevolence, nor again as being of a character soft, yielding, feminine, but because he has grown, ever more and more, into the likeness of Him whom he loved so truly. Nowhere is the vision of the Eternal Word, the glory of as the only-begotten of the Father, so uncloaked; nowhere are there such distinctively per-
that he was to be the harbinger of grace. The angel Gabriel moreover proclaimed the character and office of this wonderful child even before his conception, foretelling that he would be filled with the Holy Ghost from the first moment of his existence, and appear as the great reformer of his countrymen — another Elijah in the boldness with which he would speak truth and rebuke vice — but, above all, as the chosen forerunner and herald of the long-expected Messiah.

These marvelous revelations as to the character and career of the son, for whom he had so long prayed in vain, were too much for the faith of the aged Zacharias; and when he sought some assurance of the certainty of the promised blessing, God gave it to him in a judgment — the privation of speech — until the event foretold should happen — a judgment intended to serve at once as a token of God's truth, and a rebuke of his own incredulity. And now the Lord's gracious promise tarried not — Elizabeth, for greater privacy, retired into the hill-country, whither she was soon afterwards followed by her kinswoman Mary, who was herself the object and channel of divine grace beyond measure greater and more mysterious. The two cousins, who were thus honored above all the mothers of Israel, came together in a meeting of the Holy Ghost, all surprise, at the home of the Hebron, by others (Jutta), and immediately God's purpose was confirmed to them by a miraculous sign; for as soon as Elizabeth heard the salutations of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb, thus acknowledging, as it were even before birth, the presence of his Lord (Luke i. 43. 44). Three months after this, and while Mary still remained with her, Elizabeth was delivered of a son. The birth of John preceded by six months that of our blessed Lord. [Respecting this date, see Jesus Christ, p. 1381.] On the eighth day the child of promise was, in conformity with the law of Moses (Lev. xii. 3), brought to the priest for circumcision, and as the performance of this rite was the accustomed time for naming a child, the friends of the family proposed to call him Zacharias after the name of his father. The mother, however, required that he should be called John — a decision which Zacharias, still speechless, confirmed by writing on a tablet, "his name is John." The judgment on his want of faith was then at once withdrawn, and the first use which he made of his recovered speech was to praise Jehovah for his faithfulness and mercy (Luke i. 64). God's wonderful interposition in the birth of John had impressed the minds of many with a certain solemn awe and expectation (Luke iii. 15). God was surely again visiting his people. His providence, so long hidden, seemed once more about to manifest itself. The child thus supernaturally born must doubtless be commissioned to perform some important part in the history of the chosen people. Could it be the Messiah? Could it be Elijah? Was the era of their old prophets about to be restored? With such grave thoughts were the minds of the people occupied, as they paused on the events which had been passing under their eyes, and said one to another, "What manner of child shall this be?" while Zacharias himself, "filled with the Holy Ghost," broke forth in that glorious strain of praise and prophecy so familiar to us in the morning service of our church — a strain in which it is to be observed that the father, before speaking of his own child, blesses God for remunerating his covenant and promise, in the redemption and salvation of his people through Him, of whom his own son was the prophet and forerunner. A single verse contains all that we know of John's history for a space of thirty years — the whole period which elapsed between his birth and the commencement of his public ministry.

"The child grew and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Luke i. 80). John, it will be remembered, was ordained to be a Nazarite (see Num. vi. 21), from his birth, for the words of the angel were, "He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink" (Luke i. 15). What we are to understand by this brief announcement is probably this: The chosen forerunner of the Messiah and herald of his kingdom was required to forego the ordinary pleasures and indulgences of the world, and live a life of the strictest self-denial in retirement and solitude.

It was thus that the holy Nazarite, dwelling by himself in the wild and thinly peopled region westward of the Dead Sea, called "Desert" in the text, prepared himself by self-discipline, and by constant communion with God, for the wonderful office to which he had been divinely called. Here year after year of his stern probation passed by, till at length the time for the fulfillment of his mission arrived. During the very appearance of the phantom of itself a lesson to his countrymen; his dress was that of the old prophets — a garment woven of camel's hair (2 K. i. 8), attached to the body by a leathern girdle. His food was such as the desert afforded — locusts (Lev. xi. 22) and wild honey (Ps. lxxvi. 16).

And now the long secluded hermit came forth to the discharge of his office. His supernatural birth — his hard ascetic life — his reputation for extraordinary sanctity — and the generally prevailing expectation that some great one was about to appear — these causes, without the aid of miraculous power, for "John did no miracle" (John x. 41), were sufficient to attract to him a great multitude from "every quarter" (Matt. iii. 5). Brief and startling was his first exhortation to them — "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Some soundly wise may have found in this the rebuke of John's preaching, and the sum of it all is repentance; not mere legal ablation or expiation, but a change of heart and life. Herein John, though exhibiting a marked contrast to the Scribes and Pharisees of his own time, was but repeating with the stimulus of a new and powerful motive the lessons which had been again and again impressed upon them by their ancient prophets (cf. Is. i. 16, 17, iv. 7; Jer. vii. 3-7; Ez. xviii. 19-32, xxxvi. 23-27; Joel ii. 12, 13; Mic. vi. 8; Zech. i. 3, 4). But while such was his solemn admonition to the multitude at large, he adopted towards the leading sects of the Jews a severer tone, denouncing Pharisaics and Saducees alike as "a generation of vipers," and warning them of the folly of trusting to external privileges as descendants of Abraham (Luke iii. 8). Now at last he warns them that "the axe was laid to the root of the tree" — that formal righteousness would be tolerated no longer, and that none would be acknowledged for children of Abraham but such as did the works of Abraham (cf. John viii. 39). Such alarming declarations produced their effect, and many of every class pressed forward to confess their sins and to be baptized.

What then was the baptism which John administered? Not altogether a new rite, for it was the custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes to their
religion— not an ordinance in itself conveying remission of sins, but rather a token and symbol of that remission which was an indispensable condition of forgiveness through Him, whom John pointed out as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." Still less did the baptism of John impart the grace of regeneration—of a new spiritual birth. This was to be the mysterious effect of baptism "with the Holy Ghost," which was to be ordained by that "Mightier One," whose coming he proclaimed. The preparatory baptism of John was a visible sign to the people, and a distinct acknowledgment by them, that a hearty renunciation of sin and a real amendment of life were necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist proclaimed to be at hand. But the fundamental distinction between John's baptism unto repentance, and that baptism accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit which our Lord afterwards ordained, is clearly marked by John himself (Matt. iii. 11, 12).

As a preacher, John was eminently practical and discriminating. Self-love and covetousness were the prevalent sins of the people at large: on them therefore he enjoined charity, and consideration for others, which were the chief means of being prepared for the reception of the Holy Spirit. For instance, the soldiers against violence and plunder. His answers to them are, no doubt, to be regarded as instances of the appropriate warning and advice which he addressed to every class.

The mission of the Baptist—an extraordinary one for an extraordinary purpose—was not limited to those who had openly forsaken the covenant of God, and so forfeited its principles. It was to the whole people alike. This we must infer from the baptism of one who had no confession to make, and no sins to wash away. Jesus Himself came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, on the special ground that it became Him "to fulfill all righteousness," and, as man, to submit the customs and ordinances which were binding upon the rest of the Jewish people. John, however, naturally at first shrank from offering the symbols of purity to the sinless Son of God. But here a difficult question arises—How is John's acknowledgment of Jesus at the moment of his presenting Himself for baptism compatible with his subsequent assertion that he knew Him not, save by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him, which took place after his baptism? If it be difficult to imagine that the two courses were not personally acquainted with each other, it must be borne in mind that their places of residence were at the two extremities of the country, with but little means of communication between them. Perhaps, too, John's special destination and mode of life may have kept him from the stated festivals of his countrymen at Jerusalem. It is possible therefore that the Saviour and the Baptist had never before met. It was certainly of the utmost importance that there should be no occasion of concert or collusion between them. John, however, must assuredly have seen in daily expectation of Christ's manifestation to Israel, and so a word or sign would have sufficed to reveal to him the person and presence of our Lord, though we may well suppose such a fact to be made known by a direct communication from God, as in the case of Ninian (Luke ii. 26; cf. Jackson "in the Creed"; Wilkins, Ox. ed. vi. 404). At all events it is wholly inconceivable that John should have been permitted to baptize the Son of God without being enabled to distinguish Him from any of the ordinary multitudes. Upon the whole, the true meaning of the words καὶ ἐχθρὸν ήπον ἰδεῖν ὁ θεός οὐδεὶς would seem to be as follows: And I, even I, standing in so near a relation to Him, both personally and ministerially, had no assured knowledge of Him or the Messiah. I did not know Him, and I had not authority to proclaim Him as such, till I saw the predicted sign in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Him. It must be borne in mind that John had no means of knowing by previous announcement, whether this wonderful acknowledgment of the Divine Son would be consoled to his forerunner at his baptism, or at any other time (see Dr. Mill's Hist. Character of St. Luke's Gospel, and the authorities quoted by him).

With the baptism of Jesus John's more especial office ceased. The king had come to his kingdom. The function of the herald was discharged. It was this that John had with singular humility and self-renunciation announced beforehand: "He must increase, but I must decrease."

John, however, still continued to present himself to his countrymen in the capacity of witness to Jesus. Especially did he bear testimony to Him at Bethany beyond Jordan (for Bethany, not Beth-"hem), the birthplace of the Messiah. Moreover, it seems that John had not, in his different appearances of the kind mentioned, shirked the difficulties. For if we consider (see John iii. 23, iv. 1; Acts xiv. 3), we gather also that John instructed his disciples in certain moral and religious duties, as fasting (Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33) and prayer (Luke xi. 1).

But shortly after he had given his testimony to the Messiah, John's public ministry was brought to a close. He had at the beginning of it condemned the hypocrisy and worldliness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and he now had occasion to denounce the lust of a king. In daring disregard of the divine laws, Herod Antipas had taken to himself the wife of his brother Philip; and when John reproved him for this, as well as for other sins (Luke iii. 19), Herod cast him into prison. The place of his confinement was the castle of Machærus—a fortress on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea. It was here that reports reached him of the miracles which our Lord was working in Judæa—miracles which, doubtless, were to John's mind but the confirmation of what he expected to hear as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. But if Christ's kingdom were indeed established, it was the duty of John's own disciples no less than of all others to acknowledge it. They, however, would naturally cling to their true leader, and be slow to conform to a change of allegiance to another. With a view therefore to overcome their scruples, John sent two of them to Jesus Himself to ask the question, "Art Thou He that should come?" They were answered not by words, but by a series of miracles wrought before their eyes—the very miracles which prophecy had specified as the distinguishing credentials of the Messiah (Is. xxxv. 5, lix. 1); and, while Jesus had the two messengers carry back to John as his only answer the report of what they had seen and heard, He took occasion to guard the multitude who surrounded Him against supposing that the Baptist himself was shaken in mind, by a direct
Witsius, the so and undoubtedly his instructions ask. The humility, not possessed, characterizes the body only and must be acknowledged to acknowledge that one so incured to a life of hardness and privation was not affected by being subject to the ordinary torments of a prison. But our Lord not only vindicates his forerunner from any suspicion of impiety, but goes on to proclaim him a prophet, and more than a prophet, nay, inferior to none born of woman, though in respect to spiritual privileges behind the least of those who were to be born of the Spirit and admitted into the fellowship of Christ's body (Matt. xi. 11). It should be noted that the expression δὲ μακρότερος, κ.τ.λ. is understood by Chrysostom, Augustin, Hilary, and some modern commentators, to mean Christ Himself, but this interpretation is less agreeable to the spirit and tone of our Lord's discourse.

Jesus further proceeds to declare that John was, according to the true meaning of the prophecy, the Elijah of the new covenant, foretold by Malachi (iii. 4). The event indeed proved that John was to Herod what Elijah had been to Ahab, and a prison was deemed too light a punishment for his boldness in asserting God's law before the face of a king and a queen. Nothing but the death of the Baptist would satisfy the resentment of Herodias. Though fooled once, she continued to watch her opportunity, which at length arrived. A court festival was kept at Machaerus [see THEODORUS] in honor of the king's birthday. After supper [or during it, Mark vi. 21, 22], the daughter of Herodias came in and danced before the company, and so charmed was the king by her grace that he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask.

Salome, prompted by her abandoned mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. The promise had been given in the hearing of his distinguished guests, and so Herod, though loth to be made the instrument of so bloody a work, gave instructions to an officer of his guard, who went and executed John in the prison, and his head was brought and presented to the eyes of the adulteress whose sins he had denounced.

Thus was John added to that glorious army of martyrs who have suffered for righteousness' sake. His death is supposed to have occurred just before the third Passover in the course of the Lord's ministry. It is by Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5, § 2) attributed to the jealousy with which Herod regarded his growing influence with the people. Herod undoubtedly looked upon him as some extraordinary person. "For no sooner did he hear of the miracles of Jesus than, though a Saducee himself, and as such a disbeliever in the Resurrection, he ascribed them to John, whom he supposed to be risen from the dead. Holy Scripture tells us that the body of the Baptist was laid in the tomb by his disciples, and ecclesiastical history records the honors which successive generations paid to his memory."

The brief history of John's life is marked throughout by his character. He knew his calling, and, being burdened with a denial, humility, and holy courage. So great indeed was his abstinance that worldly men considered him possessed. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he hath a devil." His humility was such that he had again and again to disavow the character, and decline the honors which admiring multitude almost forced upon him. To their questions he answered plainly, he was not the Christ, nor the Elijah, but the prophet, nor one of their old prophets. He was no other—a voice merely—the Voice of God calling his people to repentance in preparation for the coming of Him whose shoe latchet he was not worthy to unloose.

For his boldness in speaking truth, he went a willing victim to prison and to death.

The student may consult the following works, where he will find numerous references to ancient and modern commentators: Tilmont, Hist. Ecles.; Witsius, Mss., vol. iv.; Thomas Aquinas, Cottana Aurea, Oxford, 1842; Neander, Life of Christ; Le Bas, Scripture Biography; Taylor, Life of Christ; Olsenaus, Comm. on the Gospels.

E. H.—s."

JOHN, GOSPEL OF. 1. Authority.—No doubt has been entertained at any time in the Church, either of the canonical authority of this Gospel, or of its being written by St. John. The text 2 Pet. i. 14 is not indeed sufficient to support the inference that St. Peter and his readers were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, and recognized its authority. But still no other book of the N. T. is authenticated by testimony of so early a date as that of the disciples which is embodied in the Gospel itself (xxii. 24, 25). Among the Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius appears to have known and recognized this Gospel. His declaration,"I desire that they who are the children of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God . . . and I desire the drink of God, his blood, which is incorruptible love" (ad Rom. c. 7; Cureton, Corpus Ignatianum, p. 231), could scarcely have been written by one who had not read St. John vii. 52, &c. And in the €p. ad Philadelphos, c. 7 (which, however, is not contained in Mr. Cureton's Syriac MSS.), the same writer says, "The Holy Spirit knoweth whence He cometh and whither He goeth, and reproveth the things which are hidden:" this is surely more than an accidental verbal coincidence with St. John iii. 8 and xvi. 8. The fact that this Gospel is not quoted by Clement of Rome (A. P. 68 or 96) serves, as Dean Alford suggests, merely to confirm the statement that it is a very late production of the Apostolic age. Polycarp in his short epistle, Hermas, and Barnabas do not refer to it. But its phraseology may be clearly traced in the Epistle to Diognetus (Christian dwell in the world, but they are not of the world;" comp. John xvii. 11, 14, 16; "He sent his only-begotten Son . . . as loving, notcondemning;" comp. John iii. 16, 17), and in Justin Martyr, A. D. 150 ("Christ said, Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; and it is manifest to all that it is impossible for those who have been once born to enter into the wombs of those that bare them:" Apol. c. 61; comp. John iii. 3, 5; and again, "His blood having been produced, not of human seed, but of the will of God:" Trypho, c. 63; comp. John i. 13, &c.). Tatian, A. D. 170, wrote a harmony of the four Gospels: and he quotes St. John's Gospel in his only extant work; so do his contemporaries Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Athenagoras, and the writer of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians. The Docetists and Valentinians made great use of it; and one of their sect, Heracleom, wrote a commentary on it. Yet its authority among orthodox Christians was so
furnished to be shaken thereby. Theophilus of Antioch (of Antiochus, ii.) expressly ascribes this Gospel to St. John; and he wrote, according to Jerome (Ep. 54, ad Alfeus.), a harmonized commentary on the four Gospels. And, to close the list of writers of the second century, the numerous and full testimonies of Irenaeus in Gaul and Tertullian at Carthage, with the obscure but weighty testimony of the Roman writer of the Muratorian Fragment on the Canon, sufficiently show the authority attributed in the Western Church to this Gospel. The fourth century introduces a fresh testimony from the Fathers of the Alexandrian Church, Clement and Origen, which it is unnecessary here to quote at length.

Cerdon, Marcion, the Montanists, and other ancient heretics (see Lampe, Commentarius, i. 136), did not deny that St. John was the author of the Gospel, but they held that the Apostle was mistaken, or that his Gospel had been interpolated in those passages which are opposed to their tenets. The Allogi, a sect in the beginning of the third century, were singular in rejecting the writings of St. John. Gneirke (Einleitung in N. T. p. 303) enumerates later opponents of the Gospel, beginning with an Englishman, Edw. Evanson, On the Dissuance of the Four Evangelists, Iepwch, 1792, and closing with Bretschneider's Probabilita de Evangelii, etc., originis, Lips. 1829. His arguments are characterized by Gneirke as strong in comparison with those of his predecessors. They are grounded chiefly on the strangeness of such language and thought as those of St. John coming from a Galilean fisherman, and on the difference between the representations of our Lord's person and of his manner of speech given by St. John and the other Evangelists. Gneirke answers Bretschneider's arguments in detail. The skepticism of more recent times has found its fullest, and, according to Bleek, its most important, expression in a treatise by Liitzenberger on the tradition respecting the Apostle John and his writings (1840). His arguments are recapitulated and answered by Dr. Davidson (Introduction to the N. T., 1818, vol. i. p. 244, &c.). It may suffice to mention one specimen. St. Paul's expression (Gal. ii. 6), agnoscit me, is translated by Liitzenberger, "whencever they [Peter, James, and John] were formerly." he discovers therein an implied assertion that all three were not living when the Epistle to the Galatians was written, and infers that since Peter and James were undoubtedly alive, John must have been dead, and therefore the tradition which ascribes to him the residence at Ephesus, and the composition, after A. D. 60, of various writings, must confound him with another John. Still more recently the objections of Baur to St. John's Gospel have been answered by Ebrard, Das Evangelium Johannis, etc., Zürich, 1845.

2. Place and Time at which it was written.—Ephesus and Patmos are the two places mentioned by early writers: and the weight of evidence seems to preponderate in favor of Ephesus, 60. The third century introduces another place (Jerome, Proc. in Matth., vi. 6) where the Church of Ephesus was, mentioned as a church of Asia. He seems to have dwelt in Ephesus of Asia. Jerome (Proc. in Matth.) states that John was in Asia when he compiled with the request of the bishops of Asia and others to write more profoundly concerning the Divinity of Christ. The whole of Meopnesta (Proc. in Ιονηνην) relates that John was living at Ephesus when he was moved by his disciples to write his Gospel.

The evidence in favor of Patmos comes from two anonymous writers. The author of the Synopsis of Scripture, printed in the works of Athanasius, states that the Gospel was dictated by St. John in Patmos, and published afterwards in Ephesus. The author of the work De XII. Apostolis, printed in the Appendix to Fabricius's Hagiopolis (p. 952. ed. Mige), states that John was banished by Domitian to Patmos, where he wrote his Gospel. The later date of these unknown writers, and the seeming inconsistency of their testimony with St. John's self-evident position, in the second century, distinctly shows, that he had previously borne record of the Word of God, render their testimony of little weight.

Attempts have been made to elicit from the language of the Gospel itself some argument which should decide the question whether it was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. But considering that the present tense "is" is used in v. 2, and the past tense "was" in xi. 18, xviii. 1, xix. 41, it would seem reasonable to conclude that these passages throw no light upon the question.

Clement of Alexandria (cphil. Eusib. ii. 6, vi 14) speaks of St. John as the latest of the Evan- gelists. The Apostle's sojourn at Ephesus probably began after St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians was written, i.e. after A. D. 62. Eusibius (E.H. iii. 20) specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, i.e. A. D. 92, as the year of his banishment to Patmos. Probably the date of the Gospel may lie about midway between these two, about A. D. 78. The reference to it in the First Epistle and the Revelation lead to the supposition that it was written decidedly before those two books; and the tradition of its supplementary character would lead us to place it some little time after the Apostle had fixed his abode at Ephesus.

3. Occasion and Scope.—After the destruction of Jerusalem A. D. 69, Ephesus probably became the centre of the active life of Eastern Christendom. Even Antioch, the original source of missions to the Gentiles, and the future metropolis of the Christian patriarch, appears, for a time, less conspicuous in the obscurity of early church history than Ephesus, to which St. Paul inscribed his latest Epistle, which shows that John founded a church there, and left it in a state of peace and a tomb. This half-Greek, half Oriental city, "visited by ships from all parts of the Mediterranean, and united by great roads with the markets of the interior, was the common meeting-place of various characters and classes of men" (O'Byrne and Howson's St. Paul, ch. xiv.). It contained a large church of faithful Christians, a multitude of zeal, an intelligent population devoted to the worship of a strange thing whose image (Iren., Prof. in Ephe.) was borrowed from the East, its name from the West: in the Ystatus of Ephesus, free-thinking philosophers of all nations disputed over their favorite tenets (Justin, Trypho, ec. 1, 7). It was the place to which Cerinthus chose to bring the doctrines which he devised or learned at Alexandria (Necander, Church History, ii. 42, ed. John). In this city of a strange and holy image (Jerome, a.D. 31) was engaged in extending the Christian Church, when, for the greater edification of that Church, his Gospel was written. It was obviously addressed primarily to Christians, not to heathens; and the Apostle himself tells us (xx. 31) what was the end to which he looked forward in all his teaching.

Modern criticism has indulged in much curious
speculation as to the exclusive or the principal motive which induced the Apostle to write. His design, as the historian of his times understood it, was to meet the deficiencies of the earlier three Gospels; according to others, to confute the Nicolaitans and Cerinthians; according to others, to state the true doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. But let it be borne in mind first of all that the inspiring, directing impulse given to St. John was that by which all "prophecy came in old time," when *holy men of God spake*, "not by the will of man," but as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. We cannot feel confident of our own capacity to analyze the motives and circumscribe the views of a mind under the influence of Divine inspiration. The Gospel of St. John is a boon to all ages, and to men in an infinite variety of circumstances. Something of the feelings of the chronicler, or the polemic, or the catechist may have been in the heart of the Apostle, but let us not imagine that his motives were limited to any, or to all of these.

It has indeed been pronounced by high critical authority that the supplementary theory is entirely untenable; "and so it becomes if put forth in its most rigid form, and as showing the whole design of St. John. But even Dr. Davidson, while pronouncing it unsupported by either external tradition or internal grounds, acknowledges that some truths lie upon it. Those who hold the theory in its extreme and exclusive form will find it hard to account for the fact that St. John has many things in common with his predecessors; and those who repudiate the theory entirely will find it hard to account for his omission, e. g. of such an event as the Transfiguration, which he was admitted to see, and which would have been within the scope (under any other theory) of his Gospel. Luthardt concludes most judiciously that, though St. John may not have written with direct reference to the earlier three Evangelists, he did not write without any reference to them.

And in like manner, though so able a critic as Lücke speaks of the anti-Gnostic reference of St. John as prevailing throughout his Gospel, while Luthardt is for limiting such reference to his first verses and the first scenes of the Lord; and though other writers have shown much ingenuity in discovering, and perhaps exaggerating, references to Docetism, Ebionitism, and Sabellianism; yet, when controversial references are set forth as the principal design of the Apostle, it is well to bear in mind the cautious opinion expressed by Dr. Davidson: "Designed polenical opposition to one of those errors, or to all of them, does not lie in the contents of the Gospel itself: and yet that they were not unnoticed by St. John. He intended to set forth the faith alone, and in so doing he has written passages that do confute those erroneous tendencies."

There is no intrinsic improbability in the early tradition as to the occasion and scope of this Gospel, which is most fully related in the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia, to the effect that while St. John lived at Ephesus, and visited all parts of Asia, the writings of Matthew, Mark, and even Luke came into the hands of the Christians, and were diligently circulated everywhere. Then it occurred to the Christians of Asia that St. John was a more credible witness than all others, forasmuch as from the beginning, even before Matthew, he was with the Lord, and enjoyed more abundant grace through the love which the Lord bore to him.

And they brought him the books, and sought to know his opinion of them. Then he praised the writers for their veracity, and said that a few things had been omitted by them, and that all but a little of the teaching of the most important miracles was recorded. And he added that they who discourse of the coming of Christ in the flesh ought not to omit to speak of his Divinity, lest in course of time men who are used to such discourses might suppose that Christ was only what He appeared to be. Therefore the brethren exhorted him to write at once the things which he judged the most important for instruction, and which he saw omitted by the others. And he did so. And therefore from the beginning he discoursed about the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, judging this to be the necessary beginning of the Gospel, and from it he went on to the incarnation. [See above, p. 1428.]

4. **Contents and Integrity.** — Luthardt says that there is no book in the N. T. which more strongly than the fourth Gospel impresses the reader with the notion of its unity and integrity. And yet it does not appear to be written with such close adherence to a preconceived plan as a western writer would show in developing and illustrating some one leading idea. The preface, the break at the end of the twelfth chapter, and the supplementary chapter, are divisions which will occur to every reader. The ingenious analysis of Bengel and the thought of one of Luthardt are worthy of attention. But none is so elaborate and minute as that of Lampen, of which the following is an abridgment:—

A. The Prologue, i. 1–18.

B. The History, i. 19–xx. 29.

1. Various events relating to our Lord’s ministry, narrated in connection with seven journeys, i. 19–xii. 50:—

1. First journey into Judæa and beginning of his ministry, i. 19–ii. 12.

2. Second journey, at the Passover in the first year of his ministry, ii. 13–iv. (The manifestation of his glory in Jerusalem, ii. 13–iii. 21, and in the journey back, iii. 22–iv.)

3. Third journey, in the second year of his ministry, about the Passover, v. 1–vii. 30: the Passover, in the third year of his ministry, beyond Jordan, vi. (His glory shown by the multiplication of the loaves, and by his walking on the sea, and by the discourses with the Jews, his disciples and his Apostles.)

5. Fifth journey, six months before his death, begun at the Feast of Tabernacles, vii. vi. 21. (Circumstances in which the journey was undertaken, vi. 1–13: five signs of his glory shown at Jerusalem, vii. 14–x.)

6. Sixth journey, about the Feast of Dedication, x. 22–42. (His testimony in Solomon’s porch, and his departure beyond Jordan.)

7. Seventh journey into Judæa towards Bethany, xi. 1–54. (The raising of Lazarus and its consequences.)

8. Eighth journey, before his last Passover, xi. 55–xii. (Plots of the Jews, his entry into Jerusalem, and into the Temple, and the manifestation of his glory there.)

b. History of the Death of Christ, xii.–xx. 29.

1. Preparation for his Passion, xiii.–xvii. (Last Supper, discourse to his disciples, his communicative prayer.)

2. The circumstances of his Passion and Death, xviii. xix. (His apprehension, trial, and crucifixion.)
completely answered in a note in Gérard's *L'Inri-
tany*, p. 310 (or Neutett, *Iespokik*, 5th Aufl. 1863, p. 225 f.), and are given up with one exception by Lücke. Other objections, though urged by Lücke, are exceedingly trivial and artificial. It is true that the reference to the author in verse 20 is un-
like the manner of St. John: that xx. 30, 31 would have been placed at the end of xxi. by St. John if he had written both chapters: that the narrative descends to strangely minute circumstances, etc.

The 25th verse and the latter half of the 24th of ch. xxi. are generally received as an undisguised fabrication, probably by the author of the Episcopalian Church, where the Gospel was first published.

There is an early tradition recorded by the au-
 thor of the Synopsis of Scripture in Athanasian,
that this Gospel was written many years before
the Apostle permitted its general circulation. This
fact — rather improbable in itself — is rendered less
so by the obviously supplementary character of the
latter part, or perhaps the whole of ch. xxi. *Ewald
Grundz. der Velle Iteral., vii. 261*, less skeptical
herein than many of his countrymen, comes to the
conclusion that the first 20 chapters of this Gospel,
having been written by the Apostle, about A. D.
80, at the request, and with the help of his more
advanced Christian friends, were not made public
 till a short time before his death, and that ch. xxi.
was a later addition by his own hand.3

5. Literature. — The principal Commentators

\(^{a}\) A distinction should be made between these
passages. The genuineness of John v. 3 (or rather v.
4, with the last clause of ver. 3) and vii. 11 (or more
accurately vii. 8–vii. 11) is a question of textual
criticism, these verses being wanting in the oldest and
most important manuscripts, and in other authorities.
They are accordingly regarded as interpolations or as
of very doubtful genuineness, not only by the writers
mentioned above, but by Griesbach, Knapp, Schott,
Tittmann, Thiele, Lammann (John vii. 9–vii. 11
omitted), Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, de Wette, Brück-
er, Meyer, Lücke, Tholuck, Olschanski, Neumüller,
Luther, Kaezal, Baunlein, Bzel, Gnodt, Norton,
Porter, Davidson, Green, Scrivener, and many other
critics, except that some of these receive the last clause
of v. 11 as genuine. But there is no external evidence
against the genuineness of the other passages referred to.

\(^{b}\) This account of Ewald's view is not entirely
entirely correct. He regards the 21st chapter as
reducing substantially from the Apostolic, but as betray-
ing here and there (as in vv. 24, 24, 25), even more
than the main body of the Gospel, the hand of friends
who aided him in committing its redactions to
writing. *Der prin., Neutett*, i. 55 ff.) The main
object of the addition he supposes to have been to
correct the erroneous report referred to in ver. 23 re-
specting the exemption of the beloved disciple from
death.

Anticipating the two last verses of the 21st chapter (as
rather ver 25 and the last clause of ver. 24) he has
the air of an editorial note is obvious. The extravagant
hyperbole in ver. 25, and the use of several words
(see, if this is the true reading, for *δια*, *et*, *cum*),
are also foreign from the style of John. Perhaps
there is no supposition respecting these verses more probable
than that of Mr. Norton, who observes: 'According
to ancient accounts, St. John wrote his Gospel at
Ephesus — it is not improbable, before his death.
It is circulation had been confined to the mem-
bers of that church. Thrice copies of it would be
afterwards obtained; and the copies provided for trans-
mission was, we may suppose, accompanied by the
strong attendance which we now find, given by the
men, or the elders of the church, to their full faith
in the accounts which it contained, and by the con-
cluding remark made by the writer of this attestation
in his own person' (*Genuineness of the Gospels*, 23
ed., vol. i. Add. Notes, p. xxvii.; for a fuller discussion
see G. A. *Gesch. Comm. sur l'Évang. de St. Jean*, 52 ff.)

On the supposition that the Gospel is genuine, this
view of the last two verses removes all objections
of any real weight to the acceptance of the remainder
of the chapter of the Apostle John. The weakness of
most of these objections is fully recognized even by Baur
(*Das kanon. Evangelize*, p. 255 ff.): and Cremer, who
contends against the genuineness of the chapter, admits
that "it exhibits almost all the peculiarities of John's
style." *Gesch., der Entwicklung*, vol. 1. 417 On this dif-
fERENCE which have been urged are altogether insignific-
ificant in comparison with the striking agreement,
not merely in phraseology, but in manner, and in the
structure and connection of sentences; not especially
the *en jambes*, *x. 10, 11, 12
bisse, 13, 15, bis* 16, ter* 17, (ter* 23, 25, and the
frequent use of *eü*. On the supposition, however, that the Gospel is not
genuine, this Appendix presents a problem which seems to admit of no solution. What motive
could there have been for adding such a supplement
 to a spurious work after the middle of the second
century? Was it needful, fifty years or more after
the Apostle's death, to correct a false report that it
was promised him that he should not die? Or what
imaginative purpose could this addition serve? And
how is its discontinuity of detail, and its extraordinary
agreement in style with the rest of the Gospel to be ex-
plained? It may be said that it was designed to give
credit to the forged Gospel by a pretended attestation.
But was the whole chapter needed for this? And
what credit could a fictitious work of that period derive
from an anonymous testimony? Had such been the
object, moreover, how strange that the Apostle John
should not be named as the author? The only plausible
explanation, then, of vv. 24, 25, seems to be, that they are an attestation of the trust-
worthiness of the Gospel by those who first put it into
general circulation — companions and friends of the
author, and well known to those to whom it was com-
JOHN, GOSPEL OF


Until very lately the English reader had no better critical help in the study of St. John’s Gospel than those which were provided for him by Hammond, Lightfoot, and Whiby. He now has access through the learned Commentaries of Canon Wordsworth and Dean Alford to the interpretations and explanations of the ancient Fathers, and several English theologians, and to those of all the eminent German critics. The Commentaries of Chrysostom and Augustine have been translated into English in the Oxford Library of the Fathers [Chrysostom, vol. xxvii., xxxvi., Augustine, vol. xxix.] (Parker, 1848). English translations have been published also of the Commentaries of Bengel and Olshausen. And the Rev. F. D. Maurice has published an original and devout Commentary under the title of Discourses on the Gospel of St. John, 1857. W. T. B.

*GENUINENESS.—Since the rise of the Tubingen critical school, the question of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel has been much discussed. The opponents of the Johannine authorship are far from being agreed among themselves respecting the date which they assign to the book. Baur placed it at about 160, Hilgenfeld at from 120 to 110, Schenkel at from 110 to 120, and Renan in his 13th ed. [Paris, 1867] before 100. The position of the Tubingen school on this question is a part of their general theory concerning the rise of Catholic Christianity, which they attribute to the gradual pacifying of the supposed antagonism of the Jewish-Christian or Petrine, and Gentile-Christian or Pauline, branches of the Church. As the book of Acts was an earlier one, the fourth Gospel was a later product of this compromising tendency. The writer of it assumed the name of John in order to give an Apostolic sanction to his higher theological platform, on which love takes the place of faith, and the Jewish system is shown to be fulfilled, and so abolished, by the offering of Christ, who is represented as the true Paschal lamb. The history is artificially contrived as the symbolical vestment of ideas, such as the idea of unbelief culminating in the crucifixion of the self-manifested Christ, and the idea of faith as not real and genuine so far as it rests on miracles. Renan differs from most of the German critics in receiving as authentic much more of the narrative portion of the Gospel. He conceives the work to have been composed by some disciple of the Evangelist John, who derived from the latter much of his information. In particular Renan accepts as historical the belief in the resurrection of Lazarus (which, however, he holds to have been a counterfeit miracle, the result of collusion), and much besides which John records in connection with the closing scenes of the life of Jesus.

We shall now review the principal arguments which bear on the main question. That John spent the latter part of his life, and died at an advanced age, is the testimony of his contemporaries, and of those who knew him personally. His death was a well-attested fact. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus near the close of the second century, who had become a Christian as early as 131, and seven of whose kinmen had been bishops or presbyters, says that John died and was buried in that place (Euseb. H. E. v. 24; cf. ii. 31). Ireneaus, who was born in Asia, says of those old presbyters, immediate discipies of the Apostles, whom he had known, that they had been personally conversant with John, and that he had remained among them up to the time of Trajan, whose reign was from 98 to 117. (See Irex. adv. Haer. ii. 22, al. 39, § 5.) That his informants were mistaken on such a point as the duration of the Saviour’s ministry does not invalidate their testimony in regard to the duration of John’s life, about which they could not well be mistaken. His Gospel, according to Ireneaus, Clemens of Alexandria, and others, was the last written of the four, and the tradition placed its composition near the end of his life.

In support of this proposition, we have the testimony of Jerome and Eusebius, both diligent inquirers, and knowing how to discriminate between books universally received and those which had been questioned. In an argument which depends for its force partly on an accumulation of particulars, their authority is not without weight. We may begin, however, with the indisputable fact that in the last quarter of the second century, the fourth Gospel was received in every part of Christendom

municated; and the only plausible account of the first 23 verses of the chapter is, that they are a supplementary addition, which proceeded directly from the pen of the apostle himself, from the dictation of the author of the rest of the Gospel. It should further be noted that Tischendorf, in the 24th edition of his Synopsis Evangelicae (1864), brackets ver. 23 as spurious, chiefly on the ground of its omission in the Codex Sinaiticus a prima manu. The part of Tischendorf’s 8th critical edition of the N. T. containing the Gospel of John has not yet appeared.) The verse stands at present in the Codex Sinaiticus, but Tischendorf believes that the color of the ink and slight difference in the handwriting show that it did not proceed from the original scribe, but was added by a contemporary reviser of the manuscript. On this palaeographical question, however, Tregelles differs from him in Procesural Asia, in particular at Ephesus (Codex, pp. xxxviii., lxxvi. 38), has been erroneously cited as omitting the verse (see Scrivener’s Full Collation of the Cod. Sin., p. Ixx, note). The scholia of many MSS. however, speak of it as regarded by some as an addition by a foreign hand; and a scholion to this effect, ascribed in one manuscript to Theodorus of Mopsuestia, is given in Carol. Mai’s edition of the Commentaries of this father (Nova Patr. Bibl. vii. 407, or Migne’s Patrool. lixiv. 730 f.). A.
as the work of the Apostle John. The prominent witnesses are Tertullian in North Africa, Clement in Alexandria, and Irenaeus in Gaul. Tertullian, in his treatise against Marcion, written in 207 or 208, appeals in behalf of the exclusive authority of the four canonical Gospels, to tradition coming down from the Apostles—to historical evidence. (Adr. Marcion, iv. 2, 5.) Clement, an erudite and travelled scholar, not only ascribed to the Four Gospels exclusively canonical authority (Strom. iii. 13), but also, in his last work, the "Institutions," quoted by Eusebius (xi. 14), gave a tradition concerning the order of the Gospels which he had received from presbyters of more ancient times: "that is, concerning the chronological order of their composition. He became the head of the Alexandrian school about the year 190. But the testimony of Irenaeus has the highest importance, and is, in truth, when it is properly considered, of decisive weight on the main question. He was a Greek, born in Asia Minor about 140. He after wards went to Lyons in Gaul, where he first held the office of presbyter, and then, a. d. 178, that of bishop; and was therefore acquainted with the Church both in the East and the West. He had in his youth known Polycarp, the immediate disciple of John, and retained a vivid recollection of his person and words. Irenaeus not only testifies to the faithfulness of the four Gospels, but testifies that he argues fancifully that there must be four, and only four, as there are four winds, etc. This fanciful analogy, so far from impairing the force of his testimony, only serves to show how finely settled was his faith, and that of others, in the exclusive authority of the canonical Gospels. (Adv. Her. iii. 1, § 4, and iii. 11, § 8.) If the occasional use of fanciful reasoning, or similar violations of logic, were to discredit a witness, nearly all of the Fathers would be at once excluded from court. If Irenaeus had, to any extent, devised his belief in the Gospels from his reasoning, the objection to his testimony might have some solidity; but such was not the fact. The objection of Scholten and others that he misdated the Apocalypse, attributing it to the time of Domitian, does not materially affect the value of his statement on the point. A very slight error in placing a verse or adding a sentence, could not make Irenaeus express himself in this way, in case John's Gospel had first made its appearance during his lifetime, or shortly before. His relation to Polycarp—not to speak of other Christians likewise older than himself—forsakes the supposition, moreover, that this Gospel was a fictitious product of any part of the second century. Polycarp visited Rome and conferred with Anicetus, about the year 150. Several years probably elapsed after this, before he was put to death. But at the date of that visit Irenaeus had reached the age of 20, that John's Gospel was universally received at that time, might be safely inferred from what Irenaeus says in the passages referred to above, even if there were no other proof in the case. Polycarp must have been among the number of those who were present at a general synod concerning the canonical Gospel. Irenaeus's testimony, considering his relation to Polycarp and the length of Polycarp's life, affords well-nigh as strong evidence in favor of the Johannine authorship as if we had the distinct and direct assertion of the fact from that very disciple of John. The ample learning and critical spirit of Origen, though his theological career is later than that of the Fathers just named, give to his testimony to the universal reception of this Gospel much weight. If he was not free from mistakes, it should be remembered that an error on a topic of engrossing interest and capital importance, and lying in the direct line of his researches, was not likely to be committed by him; so that his judgment on the question before us goes beyond the mere fact of the reception of the Gospel by the generation just before him. In the same category with Irenaeus, Irenas, and Tertullian, is the Canon of Muratori and the Peshito version, in both of which it is stated, in the words of Origen, that Polycrates, too, in his letter to Victor (A. D. 196), characterizes the Apostle John in words borrowed from the Gospel (Euseb. v. 24). His own life, as a Christian, began, as we have said, in 131, and with that of his kinsmen, also officers of the Church, covered the century. His home was at Ephesus, the very spot where John died, and where the Gospel, if he was the author of it, first appeared.

Looking about among the fragments of Christian literature that have come down to us from the second half of the second century, we meet with Tertullian, said to have been a pupil of Justin Martyr, though after Justin's death he swerved from his teaching. It is conceded by Baur and Zeller that in the Oratio ad Graecos he quotes repeatedly from the fourth Gospel. (See cc. 13, 19, 5, 4.) In the section in which Tatian's Diatessaron is mentioned, and others, that since Tatian does not mention the name of the author of the Gospel, we cannot be certain that he referred to it John. But he quotes as from an authoritative Scripture, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose that he differed from his contemporaries on the question, who was its author. This work was written not far from A. D. 170. He also composed a sort of exegetical harmony on the basis of our four Gospels. Eusebius says (H. E. iv. 29), that "having formed a certain body or collection of Gospels, I know not how, he has given this the title Diatessaron, that is, the Gospel by the Four, or the Gospel formed of the Four, which is in the possession of certain persons now." From his manner of speaking, it would seem that Eusebius had not seen the book. But, at the beginning of the fifth century, Theodoret, in his works, mentions two books of Tatian's work, of which the Gospel of John stands preeminent. And Tatian's works were in circulation, and had taken them away, substituting for them the four Gospels. Theodoret adds that the genealogies and the descent from David were left out of Tatian's work. (H. E. iv. 5.) And, of course, the fact from Eusebius, that Tatian named his book Diatessaron, and the fact from Theodoret, that he found it in use among Catholicon Christians, in the room of the Gospels. These facts, together with the known use of the fourth Gospel by Tatian, as seen in his other work, would justify the conclusion that this Gospel was one of the four at the basis of the Diatessaron. But an early Syriac translation of this work, began, according to Bar Salibi, with the opening words of the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word." If the Diatessaron is really a translation by Tatian, this occasioned confusion by Syriacs with the Harmony of Ammonius, this was not done by Bar Salibi, who distinguishes the two works. The objections of Scholten (Die altchrist. Zeugnisse, etc., p. 95 ff.), which are partly repeated by Davidso, (Introduction to the New Testament, 1868, p. 396 ff.), are sufficiently met by the remarks of Bleek, and by the observations of Riegenbach (Das Zeugnis fur das Ev. Johann, etc., p. 47 ff.). Ther-
writings of the O. T. prophets serve as the foundation of exhortations to the people (Apol. i. 67). Nearly all of Justin's numerous allusions to the sayings of Christ and events of his life correspond to passages in our canonical Gospels. There is no citation from the Memoirs, which is not found in the canonical Gospels; for there is no such reference either in c. 103 or c. 88 of the Did. c. Tryph. (See Westcott, Canon of the N. T. 2d ed., p. 137 l.) Justin may have been acquainted with the Gospel of the Hebrews; but this cannot be established. That it formed one of the authoritative memoirs of which he speaks, is extremely improbable. Having attained to such an authority, how could it be thrown out and discarded without an audible word of opposition? How could this be done, if Irenaeus had already reached his manhood?—for he had attained to this age before Justin died.

In the long list of passages collected by Semisch (Die Erlaubnikeiten des Martyrs Justinus) and by other writers, there are some which are obviously taken from the fourth Gospel. One of these is the passage relative to John the Baptist (Did. c. Tryph. c. 88), which is from John i. 20, 23. Another is the passage on regeneration (Apol. i. 61) from John iii. 3—5. The occurrence of this passage respecting regeneration in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (Hom. xi. 26) shows that however the same deviations from John that are found in Justin's quotation, has been made an argument to prove that both writers must have taken it from some other Gospel—the Gospel of the Hebrews. But the addition to the passage in the Homilies, and the omission of the part concerning the impossibility of a second physical birth,—points of difference between Justin and the Homilies,—are quite as marked as the points of resemblance, which may be an accidental coincidence. The deviations in Justin's citation from the original in John are chiefly due to the confusion of the phraseology of this passage with that of Matt. xviii. 3— than which nothing was more natural. Similar inaccuracies, and from a similar cause, is quoted in John iii. 3 or 5, are not uncommon now. a That Justin uses the compound word ἄρρενογις, is because he had found occasion to use the same word but in the context, and because this had become the current term to designate regeneration. b

---

a For example, Jeremy Taylor quotes the passage thus: "Unless a man be born of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." (Works, ii. 240, ed. Heber, Lond. 1829.)

b * Clement of Alexandria (Cohort. ad Grat. c. 9, Opp. p. 62, ed. Potter) has apparently confused the passages John iii. 5 and Matt. xviii. 3 in a manner similar to that of Justin. The two principal deviations of Justin from the text of John—the use of ἄρρενογις or ἄρρενογις καί τιμίων (c. 90) and ἄρρενογις καί τιμίων (c. 100)—are both found in Irenaeus, who quotes the passage thus: "εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀρρενογιαί sunt, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ὄροις (Iren. xxxv. ed. Stieren). So also in Epiphanius (op. cit. 3d ed. Migne. 336), and in Euseb. (Epiphanius, c. 167), and in the Catechismi Synagogarum (Comm. in I. ii. 16, 17, Opp. vii. 93 ed. Migne). "Ἀρρενογιαῖ" in ver. 5 is also the reading of the Old Latin and Vulgate versions (veniunt fuere), and occurs in Athanasius (De Iren. c. 11), Eusebius Syrianus (De Patr. Opp. iii. 153), and Chrysostom (Hom. in 1 Cor. xx. 25). The reading ἄρρενογιαῖ in the Greek is not found in Iren. and Euseb. as above (see also Euseb. in ih. iii. 1, 2) but also in Hippolytus (quoting from the Deoteor, the Apostol. Constitut. Orig. lat. int.) Ephemeris of Syrus, Chrysostom (at least 5 times), Basil of Selcicia (Orant. xxviii. 83), Pseudo-Athanasius (Questiones ad Antiochum, c. 101), and Theodoret (Quest. in Num. 53); in Tertullian, Jerome, Philastrius, Augustine, and other Latin fathers; and in the Codex Sinaiticus with two other Greek manuscripts, and is even adopted as genuine by Tischendorf in the 21 ed. of his Synopsis Evangelicae (1854). Chrysostom in his Homilies on John iii. quotes the verse 5 times with the reading ἄρρενογιαῖ (Opp. vii. 134B, 141, ed. Mont), and 5 times with the reading ἄρρενογιαῖ. (Opp. viii. 134A, 144, see also Opp. iv. 6814, xi. 259e). These facts show how natural such variations were, and how little ground they afford for the supposition that Justin derived the passage from the Homilies or from some other source than the Gospel of John. The change from the infdefinite singular to the definite plural is made in John itself in the immediate context (ver. 1): "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." The length of this note may be partly excused by the fact that most of the passages of the fathers here referred to in illustration of the variations from the common text in Justin's quotation do not appear to have been noticed in any critical edition of the Greek Testament.
Baur, in one place, adduces John iii. 4 as an instance of the fictitious ascription to the Jews, on the part of the author of this Gospel, of incredible misunderstandings of the words of Jesus. If this be so, surely Justin must be indebted to this Gospel for the passage. Anxious to avoid this conclusion, and apparently forgetting what he had said before, Baur in another passage of the same work affirms that this same expression is borrowed alike by the author of John and by Justin from the Gospel of the Hebrews! (See Baur's Kriton. Evang. pp. 236, 300, compared with pp. 352, 353.) The mention of the three other citations, however, in the Homilies, in which the same deviations are found as in corresponding citations in Justin. But if this circumstance lent any plausibility to the pretense that these passages in Justin were drawn from some other document than the canonical John, this plausibility vanished and the question was really set at rest by the publication of Dressel's edition of the Homilies. This edition gives the corresponding portion, not found in Cotelieris, and we are thus furnished (Dressel, xix. 22: comp. John ix. 2, 3) with an unembodied and undeniable quotation from John. This makes it evident that Hom. iii. 52 is a quotation from John x. 9, 27, and also removes all doubt as to the source whence the quotation of John iii. 3-5 was derived. The similarity of the Homilies to Justin, in the few quotations referred to above, is probably accidental. If not, it simply proves that Justin was in the hands of their author. This may easily be supposed. The date of the Homilies is in the neighborhood of 170. (See, on these points, Meyer, Einl. p. 10; Bleek, p. 228; Semisch, p. 193 ff.)

The objections of the skeptical critics, drawn from Justin's habit of quoting ad se numina, and from his not naming the authors of the Memoirs, are without force, as all scholars must see. His manner of citation was not unusual, and he was writing to heathen who knew nothing of the Evangelists. The supposition that Justin borrowed the passages, to which we have referred, from the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, which Hilgenfeld and others have advocated, hardly deserves a refutation. It is supported partly by the misinterpreted passage in Tryph. 106 (see Otto's note, ad loc.), and partly by conjectures respecting this apocryphal book, for which no historical value has been claimed. Justin's doctrine of the Logos and of the Incarnation must have been derived from some authoritative source, and this could only be the fourth Gospel. In one passage (Diss. c. Tryph. 105), he directly appeals for the truth of the Incarnation, "that Christ becames man by the Virgin," to the Memoirs. Scholten has labored to prove that a general similarity exists between Justin's conception of the Logos and that which is found in the Gospel; but there is no greater difference than might easily exist between an author and a somewhat inexact theological interpreter.

That Justin used our four Gospels and designates these as the Memoirs, Norton has cogently argued (Ian. of the Gospels. p. 237-239).

Papias, whom Irenæus calls "an ancient man," says: "The Logos was in the beginning with God, and the Logos was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It is, according to the same Father, heard the Apostle John. Eusebius supposes that Irenæus is mistaken in this, and that it was the Presbyter John whom Papias personally knew. This, however, is doubtful; and the very existence of such a personage as the Presbyter John, in distinction from the Apostle of the same name, is an open question. However this may be, Eusebius states that Papias "made use of testimonies from the first Epistle of John." Whether he quoted from the Gospel or not, Eusebius does not state. If it were shown that he did not so his silence could not be turned into an argument against its genuineness, as we do not know the particular end he had in view in making its citations. But the First Epistle was written by the author of the Gospel. (See De Wette, Einl. in das N. Testament, § 177 a.) So that the testimony of Papias to the First Epistle is likewise a testimony to the genuineness of the Gospel.

Justin, in the Apologies, finds that others, we find not a few expressions, especially in the Ignatian Epistles, which remind us of passages peculiar to John. In one instance, such a reference can scarcely be avoided. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, says: "Παύς ἐν χρόνοις ἤπειρος Ἀρσενίου Ἑβραίων ἐπαρίσσῃ ἔρχοντα ἀντικριστός ἐστιν" (c. 7). It is much more probable that this thought was taken from 1 John iv. 3, than that it was derived from any other writer. We have been led to regard this as a most important text in the case, when it is remembered that Polycarp was a disciple of John. John xxii. 24, coming from another hand than that of the author of the Gospel, is also a testimony to its genuineness.

The Armentines, the party of Unitarians at Rome near the end of the second century, did not think of disputing the canonical authority of the fourth Gospel. Marcion was acquainted with it, but rejected it for the reason that he did not acknowledge any Apostles but Paul and Tertullian. Adv. Marc. iv. 3, 2, 5. De Corne Christi. 3. For other passages to the same effect from Irenæus and Tertullian, see De Wette, Einl. in das N. Testament, § 72 c, Ann. d.) The Valentinian Gnostics admitted the genuineness of this Gospel, and used it much (Irenæus, Adv. Her. iii. 11, § 7). Tertullian, a follower of Valentine's doctrine, explicitly acknowledges this Gospel (Epist. ad Florum. e. 1, ap. Epiph. Her. xxxii. 3. See Grabe, Spicilegium, ii. 79, 2d ed., or Stierens's ed. of Irenæus, i. 924). Heracleon, another follower, wrote a commentary on it, which Origen frequently quotes (Grabe, Spicilegium, vol. ii., and Stierens's ed. of Irenæus, i. 958-967). Scholten has attempted to show that Heracleon was late in the century. One of his arguments, that Heracleon would not have mentioned him, is, as Grabe remarks, "a burlet," who produces from Irenæus a passage in which he is named in connection with Tertullian. The use of the fourth Gospel by leading followers of Valentinians, and the need they have to apply a perverse interpretation to the statements of the Gospel, render it probable that their master also acknowledged the Gospel as genuine. This is implied by Tertullian (De Praescription Heræt. c. 39, "It Valentine," says Tertullian, "appears (videretur) to make use of the entire instrument" — that is, the four Gospels, — he has done violence to the truth," etc.). The "videretur" may be the reluctant concession of an adversary, but the word is frequently used by Tertullian in the sense, to be seen, to be fully apparent (comp. Tert. adv. Præ. c. 29, 29.; adv. Val. c. 19.; Tert. adv. Marc. c. 21.; adv. Marc. c. 1.; adv. Jud. c. 5, quoted from Irenæus, ii. 12.) Such is probably its meaning here. But Hippolytus, explaining the tenets of Valentine, writes as follows: "All the prophets and the law spoke from the Penning, a foolish god, he says — feet, knowing nothing. On this account it is, he says, that the Saviour says: "All that came before me are
In considering the Internal Evidence for the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, we notice the following points:—

1. The Gospel claims to be the work of the Apostle John, and the manner of this claim is a testimony to its truth. The author declares himself an eye-witness of the transactions recorded in the Gospel, and refers to the distinctives of the Valentinian sect and the phases of opinion that respectively belong to them. In the place referred to, he is speaking of the founder of the sect himself. A similar remark is to be made of Basilides and of the passages of Hippolytus relating to his use of John (cf. Pler. Herr. vi. 22, 27). The early date of Basilides is shown by various proofs. (See Höffdste de Groot, "Basilides als eerst Zeuge," etc., Leipzig, 1868.) The work of Basilides "on the Gospel" (Enseh. H. E. iv. 7) was not improbably a commentary on the four Gospels (see Norton, Gen. of the Gospels, iii. 238). How widely extended was the knowledge and use of the fourth Gospel among the heretics of the second century, is further illustrated by the numerous quotations that were made from it by the Ophites or Naxasseni, and the Perate, which are preserved by Hippolytus (v. 7, 8, 9, 12, 16). The insignificant party of the Alogi is an argument for, rather than against, the genuineness of the Gospel. (Iren. iii. 11, § 9). We assume, what is most probable, that the party referred to by Irenaeus is the same which Epiphanius designates by this name. Their opposition shows the general acceptance of the Gospel not long after the middle of the second century. Moreover, they attributed the Gospel to Cerinthus, a contemporary of John— a testimony to its age. They rejected, also, the Apocalypse, which even the Tubingen school holds to be the work of John. (See, on the character of the Alogi, Schneider, p. 38 f.) Celsus refers to circumstances in the Evangelical history which are recorded only in John's Gospel. (For the passages, see Lardner, Works, vii. 220, 221, 223.)

The great doctrinal battle of the Church in the second century was with Gnosticism. The struggle began early. The germ of it is discovered in the Apostolic age. At the middle of the second century, the conflict with these elaborate systems of error was raging. We find that the Valentinians, the Basilichians, the Marcionites (followers either of Marcus or of Marcion) are denominated aswarmly by Justin Martyr as by Irenaeus and his contemporaries. (Dial. c. Trypho. c. 32.) By both of the parties in this wide-spread conflict, by the Gnostics and by the Church theologians, the fourth Gospel is accepted as the work of John, without a lap of opposition or of doubt. In that distracted period, with what incredible skill must an anonymous counterfeiter have proceeded, to be able to frame a system which should not immediately excite hostility and cause his false pretensions to be challenged! The particular testimonies to the recognition of the fourth Gospel in the second century simply afford a glimpse of the universal, undisputed tradition on which that acceptance rested. From this point of view their significance and weight must be estimated. The Church of the second century was so situated that it could not be deceived on a question of this momentous nature. It was a great community, all of whose members were deeply interested in the life of the Lord for whom they were making so great sacrifices, and which comprised within its pale men of literary cultivation and critical judgment.
the fourth Gospel, as to its contents, with the other three, we have to notice the apparent discrepancy upon the date of the crucifixion, and also the critical controversies of the second century, in their bearing upon the point of chronology. The Synoptists appear to place the Lord’s Supper on the evening when the Jews ate the Passover-meal, the 14th Nisan (or, according to the Jewish reckoning, the 15th); John, on the evening before.

Dr. F. Robinson, Tholuck, Norton, Böhlmen, Hugenbach, and others believe themselves able to harmonize the statements of John with those of the other three. (See the question very fully discussed in Tholuck, “Das Auge der Welt,” p. 17; and in Bleek, p. 314.) If they are successful in this, there is no discrepancy to be explained. Assuming here, with most of the later critics, that there is a real difference, Bleek draws a strong argument in favor of the fourth Gospel.

No sufficient motive can be assigned why a 5ioir6ou should deviate from the accepted view on this subject. The probability that the fourth Gospel is correct, is strengthened by the fact that it has been brought forward by the Synoptists themselves (Matt. xxvi. 5, xxvii. 59 ff.; Mark xv. 42, 46; Luke xxiii. 50). See Elliott, Life of Christ (Amer. ed.), p. 292, n. 3.

The so-called Quartodecimans of Asia Minor observed a festival on the 14th of Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might occur. Roman and other Christians kept up, on the contrary, the preparatory fast until Easter Sunday. Hence the dispute on the occasion of Polycarp’s visit to Asia Minor about the year 169; then ten years later, in which Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, and Melito of Sardis took part; and especially at the end of the second century, when Victor of Rome was attacked by Irenaeus for his intolerance. The Asia Minor bishops, in these controversies, appealed to the authority of the Apostle John, who had lived in the midst of them. But what did the Quartodecimans commemorate on the 14th of Nisan? The Tubingensia and the Last Supper, and infer that John could not have written the Gospel that bears his name. But, to say the least, it is equally probable that the Quartodecimans commemorated the crucifixion of Jesus, the true passover-lamb; or that the theory of Bleek is correct, that their festival was originally the Jewish Passover, and that the Synoptists in the latter part of the first century, who took on naturally an association with the Last Supper, and with which John did not interfere. We should add that not improbably Apollinaris was himself a Quartodecimian, and was opposing a Judaizing faction of the party, who dissented from their common view. We do not find that Victor, the Roman opponent of Polycrates, appeared to be familiar with the Synoptists, although he must have been familiar with it; and the course taken by the disputants on both sides at the end of the second century, shows that if it was written with the design which the negative critics affirm, it failed of its end. Had the Quartodecimans been called upon to receive a new Gospel, purporting to be from John, of which they had not before heard, and which was partly designed to destroy the foundation of their favorite observance, would they not have promptly rejected such a document, or, at least, called in question its genuineness?

4. The discourses of Christ in the fourth Gospel have been used as an argument against its apostolic origin. But the contrast between them and the teachings of Christ recorded by the Synoptists may be explained on the supposition that each of the disciples apprehended Jesus from his own point of view, according to the measure of his own individuality. Jesus did not confine himself in his teaching to generalities and parables (Matt. xiii. 10 ff.). The Synoptists occasionally express views which are strikingly in the Johannine style (Matt. xi. 25, comp. Luke xi. 21). On the contrary, the apologetic style is met with in the reports of the fourth Gospel (John xii. 24, 26; xiv. 16, 20). Essentially the same conception of Christ is found in the fourth Gospel as in the other three (Matt. xi. 7; also Matt. xii. 41 ff.; compared with Mark xiv. 58). But in all these passages, which belong to this point, Bown’s Jesus of the Evangelists, London, 1868, p. 217 f. The resemblance of the style of the discourses and of the narrative portion of the book is accounted for, if we suppose that the teachings of Jesus were fully assimilated and freshly reproduced by the Evangelist, after the lapse of a considerable period of time. Here and there, in the discourses, are indicated expressions which mark the fidelity of the Evangelist, as John xii. 31. His interpretations alluded to sayings of Christ are an argument in the same direction (John ii. 19; xii. 32).

5. The Hel lenic culture and the theological point of view of the author of the fourth Gospel are made an objection to the Johannine authorship.

The author’s mode of speaking of the Jews (ii. 6; iii. 13; iv. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2; xi. 50) is accounted for by the fact that the Gospel was written late in the apostolic age, and by a writer who was himself outside of Palestine, among Gentiles and Hellenic Christians. For the special proofs that the writer was of Jewish and Palestinian extraction, see Bleek, First p. 207 f. The probability is that “Synch” was a name of the town from distinctly from Sichem, though near it. That the writer did not misplace Bethany where Lazarus dwelt, is demonstrated by John xi. 18. The book indicates no greater acquaintance with the Greek culture than John, from the circumstances of his early life and his long residence in Asia, may well be supposed to have gained. The Christology of the fourth Gospel, especially the use of the term Logos, constitutes no valid objection to its genuineness. Even if this term was taken up by John from the current speculations of the day, and deliberately adopted by him, he has preserved his conception of the Son in his relation to the Father. After the first few verses, which define the term, we hear no more of the Logos. No allusion to the Logos is introduced into the report of the discourses of Christ. The free and liberal spirit of the fourth Gospel towards the Gentiles would be natural to the Apostle at the time, and under the circumstances, in which his work was composed. The objection, that the allusions drawn from this characteristic of the Gospel, rests also upon their untenable and false assumption of a radical antagonism between the original Apostle and Paul. The differences between the Apocalypse and the Gospel, in regard to style and contents, have been much urged by the opponents of the genuineness of the latter. But a long interval elapsed between the composition of the two books. The state of the author’s mind and feeling in the two cases was widely different. And Baur himself regards the Gospel as so far resembling the Apocalypse that the former is a general transmutation or spiritualization of the latter. If the community of authorship between the two works were disproved, the weight of evidence would be in favor of the
genuineness of the Gospel. But the difficulty of supposing a common author has been greatly magnified.

See Gieseler, K. G. bk. i. § 127, n. 8.

The special theory of the Tübingen school in reference to the character and aim of the fourth Gospel is only sustained by an artificial and indefensible excess of its contents. On this branch of the subject, we may refer to the acute and candid criticisms of Drucker in his edition of De Wette's Compendium on the Gospel.

On the whole, the external evidence for the genuineness of this book is strong and unanswerable; and the proofs derived from its internal characteristics, notwithstanding minor difficulties, are equally convincing. They who consider a miracle to be something impossible, and therefore utterly incredible, will of course deny that the book had an Apostle for its author. But those who approach the inquiry with minds free from this unphilosophical bias, may reasonably rest with confidence in the opposite conclusion.

G. F. P.

* LITERATURE. — It will be convenient to arrange the more recent literature relating to the Gospel of John under several heads.

1. Genuineness and Credibility. — In addition to the works referred to above, and under the art. Gospel, Tübingen school, there is in the field of the New Testament.


JOHN, FIRST EPISTLE OF 1435


On John's doctrine of the Logos one may also see E. G. Beugel, Obs. de Lgeo einand. Part i. 1824 (in his Oeuv. Acad. 1844, pp. 407-426).


JOHN, THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL. OF. Its Authenticity. — The external evidence of is the most satisfactory nature. Eusebius places it in his list of the διακολογηθέντα [see above, p. 373], and we have ample proof that it was acknowledged and received as the production of the Apostle John in the writings of Polycarp (Ep. ad Philipp. c. 7); Papias, as quoted by Eusebius (ff. E. iii. 39); Irenæus (Adv. Henv. iii. 18); Origen (apud Eus. H. E. vi. 25); Clement of Alexandria (Strom. lib. ii.); Tertullian (Adv. Pros. c. 15); Cyprian (Epist. xxvii.); and there is no voice in antiquity raised to the contrary.

On the grounds of internal evidence it has been questioned by [S. G.] Lange (Die Schrift. Johannis übersetzt und erklärt, vol. iii.); Chaldis (Urn- schichten des Christenthums); Decastri (Proba- bilia de Evang. et epist. Joan. Ap. inbole et origine); Zeller (Theologische Jahrbücher for 1845). The objections made by these critics are too slight to be worth mentioning. On the other hand the internal evidence for its being the work of St. John from its similarity in style, language, and doctrine to the Gospel is overwhelming. Macknight (Preface to First Epistle of John) has drawn out a list of nineteen passages in the epistle which are so similar to an equal number of passages in the Gospel that we cannot but conclude that the two writings emanated from the same mind, or that one author was a strangely successful copyist both of the words and of the sentiments of the other. The allusion again of the writer to himself is such as would suit St. John the Apostle, and very few but St. John (1 Ep. i. 1).

Thus we see that the high probability of the authorship is established both by the internal evidence and by the external evidence taken apart. Unite them, and this probability rises to a moral certainty.

With regard to the time at which St. John wrote the epistle (for an epistle it essentially is, though not commencing or concluding in the epistolary form) there is considerable diversity of opinion. Grotius, Wetstein, and Witsius might fix a date previous to the destruction of Jerusalem understanding (but probably not correctly) the ex
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question of their authenticity is argued at length by Mill (note at the end of 1 John v.), and Horne (Introduction to H. S. iv. p. 418, Lond. 1834 [or 10th ed., 1856, pp. 355 ff.]). It would appear without doubt that they are not genuine. The latter passage is contained in four only of the 150 (250) MSS. of the epistle, the Codex Guelphobibliothek of the seventeenth century, the Codex Ravennas, a forgery subsequent to the year 1514, the Codex Britannicus or Montfortii of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and the Codex Ottobonians of the fifteenth century. It is not found in the Syriac versions, in the Coptic, the Sahidic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Arabic, the Shavonic, nor in any ancient version except the Latin; and the best editions of even the Latin version omit it. It was not quoted by one Greek Father or writer previous to the 14th century. It was not inserted in Erasmus's editions of the Greek Testament, published in 1516 and 1519, nor in that of Aldus, 1518: nor in that of Germainus, 1521; nor of Cephalis, 1524: nor of Colinius, 1534: nor in Luther's version of 1546.

Against such an amount of external testimony no internal evidence, however weighty, could be of avail. For the exposition of the passage as containing the words in question, see (as quoted by Bishop Horby's New Enquiry) The same passage interpreted without the disputed words, see Sir Isaac Newton's Historia of Two Texts (Works, v. p. 528, Lond. 1779). See also Emilys Enquiry, etc., Lond. 1717. See further, Travis (Letters to Gibbon, Lond. 1783); Person (Letters to Travis, Lond. 1790); Bishop Marsh (Letters to Travis, Lond. 1793); Michaelis (Intro. to New Test. iv. p. 412, Lond. 1802); Griesbach (Dissert. ad Jo. i. 4. (Diatribe ad Jo. i. 4.); Butler (Horae Biblicae, ii. p. 245, Lond. 1807); Clarke (Succession, etc., i. p. 71, Lond. 1807); Bishop Burgess (Introduction of 1 John v. 7, Lond. 1822 and 1823: Authorities Milli, etc., 1822; Letter to the Clergy of St. David's, 1825; Two Letters to Mrs. Joanna Brewis, 1831, 1835), to which may be added a dissertation in the Life of Bp. Burgess, Lond. 1847.

It is far from correct to speak of the last clause of 1 John ii. 23 as "dothfful," and even, as is done above, to include it in the same category with 1 John v. 7, as "without doubt . . . not genuine." The clause in question, though omitted in the so-called "received text," is supported by decisive evidence, and is regarded as genuine by all critics of any note. Its omission in some manuscripts was obviously occasioned by the like rendering (in the original) of the preceding clause.

To prevent a mistake which has often been made, it may be well to say explicitly that the whole of 1 John v. 7 is not spurious, but the words which follow "bear record," together with the first clause of ver. 8, "and there are three that bear witness in earth," the genuine text of vv. 7, 8 reads simply, "If there be a word that bear record, or rather bear witness," as the same verb is rendered in ver. 6,1 the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and the three agree in one."

For a full account of the controversy on this famous passage, one may consult the Rev. William Orme's Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses, published under the name of "Criticus," Lond. 1830; new edition with notes and an Appendix, bringing the history of the discussion down to the present time, by E. Abbot New York, 1866. To the list of publications o
the controversy given above the following deserves to be added for its signal ability, and the valuable information it contains: A Indication of the Literary Character of Professor Paton, from the Aniadingen of the Rev. Thomas Burgess, by Crito Controverticus, Cambridge, 1827. The author was Dr. Thomas Turner, afterwards Bishop of Ely; and to him are probably to be ascribed the able articles which had previously appeared on the subject in the Quarterly Review for March 1832, and Dec. 1835. On the other side may be mentioned Cardinal Wiseman’s Two Letters on some Parts of the Controversy concerning the Genuineness of John v. 7, in the Cath. Mag. for 1832 and 1833, reprinted in vol. i. of his Essays, Lond. 1853. These letters relate almost wholly to the reading of the passage in the Old Latin version. For an answer, see Dr. William Wright’s Appendix to his translation of Seller’s Bibl. Hermeneuticae (1835), pp. 633 ff.; Tregelles in Horne’s introd., 10th ed., p. 363 ff.; and the Appendix to the American edition of Orme’s Memoir, pp. 186–191. Dr. Tregelles, in the Journ. of Soc. Lit. for April, 1858, p. 167 ff., has exposed the extraordinary misstatements of Dr. Joseph Turnbull in relation to this passage. The free Place and Role of John the Apostle in the Gospels of the Three Hebrew Witnesses, by the Rev. Charles Forster, London, 1867, deserves notice only as a literary and psychological curiosity.


On the doctrine of the epistle, see L. Thomas, Études de la première épître de Jean, Genève, 1848, and there referred to in the addition under JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

JOHN, THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF. Their Authenticity.—These two epistles are placed by Eusebius in the class of ἄπαθα γέγραπτα, and he appears himself to be doubtful whether they were written by the Evangelist, or by some other John (H. E. iii. 25). The evidence of antiquity in their favor is not very strong, but yet it is considerable. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the First Epistle as the larger (Strom. lib. ii. c. 15, p. 464, ed. Potter), and if the Admurians are his, he bears direct testimony to the Second Epistle (Admur. p. 1011, ed. Potter). Origen appears to have had the same doubts as Eusebius (opus Euseb. H. E. vi. 25). Dionysius (opus Euseb. H. E. vii. 25) and Alexander of Alexandria (opus Soc. H. E. i. 6) attribute them to St. John. So does Ireneus (John. Hær. i. 16). [The Muratorian canon mentions two epistles of John.] Aurelius quoted them in the Council of Carthage, a. 259, as St. John’s writing (Cyprian, Opp. Hier. p. 120, ed. Oberthür). Eunomius Synec. speaks of them in the same way in the fourth cen-
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The Second Epistle is addressed to Gaius or Caius. We have no reason for identifying him with Caius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), or with Caius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), or with Caius of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 14), or with Caius Bishop of Ephesus, or with Caius Bishop of Thessalonica, or with Caius Bishop of Pergamum. He was probably a convert of St. John (Ep. iii. 4), and a layman of wealth and distinction (Ep. iii. 5) in some city near Ephesus.

The object of St. John in writing the Second Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basileides and his followers, by perhaps an undue kindness displayed by her towards the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the Apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the producing cause of love, and therefore of love itself. This is the secret of St. John's strong designation of the doctrine, whom he designates as "anti-Christ." Love is with him the essence of Christianity; but love can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief therefore destroys love and with it Christianity. Therefore says he, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (1 John ii. 10).

The Third Epistle was written for the purpose of commending to the kindness and hospitality of Cains some Christians who were strangers in the place where he lived. It is probable that these Christians carried this letter with them to Caius as their introduction. It would appear that the object of the travellers was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without profit (2 Cor. xi. 7). St. John had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place (2 Pet. ii. 10, 11; 3 John, v. 9, not "scripissimus," (Acts xvi. 10): but they, at the instigation of Diotrephes, had refused to receive the missionary brethren, and therefore the Apostle now commends them to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrephes was a leading presbyter who held Juniaizing views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. Whether Penetratus (ver. 12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example St. John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrephes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine. The latter supposition is the more probable.

We may conjecture that the two epistles were written by St. John some time after the First Epistle to the "Ephesians." They both apply to individual cases of conduct the principles which had been laid down in their fullness in the First Epistle.

The title Catholic does not properly belong to the Second and Third Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the First Epistle.

F. M. - On the Second and Third Epistles of John

1442
the works most worthy of notice are referred to in the addition to the article on the First Epistle. The following may also be mentioned: J. B. Carpzov, Comm. in Ep. sec. Johannis, and Brevis Exordium in Joan. Apost. epist. terrae, appended to his edition of F. Rappe's Theologia sioniae. Lips. 1688, also in his Theologia Exegyt

f. luth. Theol. 1855, p. 219 ff. (comp. his Neuest. Studien, p. 137) takes Kupia to represent the Latin Curia, not Cyprus; and Gunlecke, Neuest. Isagoe
gy, 3e Anfl. (1868), p. 477, regards this as unquestionable.

On the Third Epistle, C. A. Heu
dman, Diss. exhibens Comn. in Jorn. Epist. terr.
asis, Gotting. 1742, reprinted in his Nova Synpylo
diss., etc. (1752), i. 216 ff. A.

JOYADA (יֹוְיָדַא) [Jehovah knows]: Jos, 13; Josh. 13; [Vat. Néb. xii. 10, 11, Iuda.] Alex. [Iwaša], Iwâša (and so F.A. in Néb. xii. 22): Josh. high priest after his father Elhasib, but whether in the lifetime of Nehemiah is not clear, as it is doubtful whether the title in Néb. xii. 23 applies to him or his father. One of his sons married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite. He was succeeded in the high-priestly office by his son Jonathan, or Johanan (Néb. xii. 11, 22). Josephus calls this Jehovah, Judas. A. C. H.

JOYAKIM (יֹיָּאֵיכָּם) [Jehovah establishes]: [Vat. Alex. F.A. Iwâša:] Josia, a high priest, son of the renowned Jeshua who was joint leader with Zerubabel of the first return from Babylon. His son and successor was Eliashib (Néb. xii. 10). In Néb. xii. 12-20 is preserved a catalogue of the heads of the various families of priests and Levites during the high-priesthood of Jeshua.
The name is a contracted form of JEHOLIKIM.

JOYARIB (יֹוְיָרֵיב) [Jehovah defends]: [Vat. Iwaša; Alex. Iwâša; Josiá], Joyriá. A layman who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr. viii. 10).

2. [Néb. xii. 10, Iwaša; Vat. Joyriá; Alex. Iwâša: Joyriá]: F.A. Iwaša in Néb. xii. 6, 19, Vat. Alex. F.A. omit, and so Rom. in ver. 6: Joyriá, Joyriá. The founder of the one of the courses of priests, elsewhere called in full JEHOLIKIM. His descendants after the Captivity are given in Néb. xii. 6, 19, and also in xii. 10; though it is possible that in this passage another person is intended.

3. [Iwaša; Vat. Joyriá; F.A. Iwaša, corr. Iwaša; Alex. Joyriá; Joyriá]: A Shikinito — i.e. probably a descendant of Shilah the son of Judah — named in the genealogy of Massiah, the then head of the family (Néb. xii. 5).

JOKDEAM (יוֹדְקְדֶּאֶם) [possessed by the people]: [Vat. Iwâša; Alex. Iwâša; Iwaša; Iwaša]; Iwâša; Iwaša; [Josephus, Jokdeam, Jecopam, Jecopam, Jecopam, Jecopam, Jecopam]; a city of the tribe of Zebulun, allotted with its suburbs to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi. 34), but entirely omitted in the catalogue of 1 Chr. vi. (comp. ver. 77). It is not clear whether the names, interchangeably named in connection with the boundaries of the tribe — "the torrent which faces Jokdeam" (xix. 11), and as the Canaanite town, whose king was killed by Joshua — "Jok
deam of Carmel" (xii. 22). The requirements of these passages are sufficiently met by the modern site Tell Keifam, an eminence which stands just below the eastern termination of Carmel, with the Kishon at its foot, and had a mill. Dr. Robinson has shown (R. B. iii. 115, note) that the modern name is legitimately descended from the ancient: the CYAMON of Jud. vii. 3 being a step in the pedigree. (See also Van de Velde, i. 331, and Memoire, 326.) Jokdeam is found in the A. V.
The native traditions respecting Joktan commence with a difficulty. The ancestor of the great southern peoples were called Khaftun, who, say the Arabs, was the same as Joktan. To this some European critics have objected that there is no good reason to account for the change of name, and that the identification of Kahtun with Joktan is evidently a Jewish tradition adopted by Mohammed or his followers, and consequently at or after the promulgation of the Koran. M. Cauvin de Percevaux commences his essay on the history of Yemen (Jesuit, i. 30) with this assertion, and adds, "Le nom de Cahtun, disent-ils [les Arabes], est le nom de Yeetan, légèremealt en passant d'une langue à l'autre dans la langue arabe." In reply to these objections, we may state:

1. The Kabbals hold a tradition that Joktan settled in India (see Joseph. Ant. i. 6, § 4), and the supposition of a Jewish influence in the Arab traditions respecting him is therefore untenable. In the present case, even were this not so, there is an absence of motive for Mohammed's adopting traditions which alienate from the race of Ishmael many tribes of Arabia; the influence here suspected may rather be found in the contradictory assertion, put forward by a few of the Arabs, and rejected by the great majority, and the most judicious, of their historians, that Khaftun was descended from Ishmael.

2. That the traditions in question are post-Mohammedan cannot be proved; the same may be said of everything which Arab writers tell us dates before the Prophet's time; for then oral tradition alone existed, if we except the rock-cut inscriptions of the Himyrites, which are too few, and our knowledge of them is too slight, to admit of much weight attaching to them.

3. A passage in the Mir'at ez-Zaman, hitherto unpublished, throws new light on the point. It is as follows: "Ibn-El-Kellay says, Yutkan [whose name is also written Yuktan] is the same as Khaftun son of 'Abir," i.e. El-El, and so say the generality of the Arabs. El-Delhibiyyah says, People differ as to what Khaftun was; some say he is the same as Yuktan, who is mentioned in the Pentateuch; but the Arabs arabized his name, and said Khaftun the son of Hood [because they identified their prophet Hood with Elker, whom they call 'Abir]; and some say, of Es-Seneyfa,' or as is said in one place by the author here quoted, "El-Heneysa," the son of Nebit [or Nobit, i.e. Nebiath], the son of Ismael; i.e. Ismael. He then proceeds, in continuation of the former passage, "Alsoo-Haneefeh Ed-Denewaray says, He is Khaftun the son of 'Abir: and was named Khaftun only because of his suffering from drought" [which is termed in Arabic Kaht]. (Mir'at ez-Zamin, account of the sons of Shem.) Of similar changes of names by the Arabs there are numerous instances. Thus it is evident that the name of "Saul" ( שאול) was changed by the Arabs to "Tilodotu" (תִּלּוּדְתּוּ), because of his tallness, from "טִלְוָל ה" (tallness) or "גַּלֵּל ה" (he was tall); al-

a See addition to CYRAN (Amst. ed.) Nothing but the name (T'ul Kaufnan) and the mouth "too regular, be natural," remains to attest the ancient site (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 119, 2d ed.). H.

b It is remarkable that in historical questions, the Rabbinists are singularly wide of the truth, displaying a deficiency of the critical faculty that is characteristic of Shemitic races.
though the latter name, being imperfectly declinable, is not to be considered as Arabic (which several Arabian writers assert it to be), but as a variation of a foreign name. (See the remarks on this name, as occurring in M. Le Roi, in ch. ii. 248, in the Exposition of Ez-Zamakhsherie and El-Beydawee.) We thus obtain a reason for the change of name which appears to be satisfactory, whereas the theory of its being arabicized is not readily to be explained unless we suppose the term "arabicized" to be loosely employed in this instance.

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

The settlements of the sons of Joktan are examined in the separate articles bearing their names, and generally in Arabia. They colonized the whole of the south of the peninsula, the old "Arabia Felix," into the Yemen, and as far as they could, and a wide significance in early times, stretching, according to the Arabs (and there is in this case no ground for doubting their general correctness), to Mekkeh, on the northwest, and along nearly the whole of the southern coast eastwards, and far inland. At Mekkeh, tradition connects the two great races of Joktan and Ishmael, by the marriage of a daughter of Jurhum the Joktanite with Ishmael. It is necessary in mentioning this Jurhum, who is called a "son" of Joktan (Kahtan), to observe that "son" in these cases must be regarded as signifying "descendant" (cf. CHRONOLOGY) in Hebrew generations, and that many generations (though how many, or in what order, is not known) are missing from the existing list between Kahtan (embracing the most important time of the Joktanites), and the establishment of the comparatively modern H wymyrite kingdom; from this latter date, stated by Caussin, Essai, i. 64, at n. c. c. 100, the succession of the Tubabians is apparently preserved to us. At Mekkeh, the tribe of Jurhum long held the office of guardians of the Kaeeleh, or temple, and the sacred enclosure, until they were expelled by the Ismaelites (Kuth-ed-Deen, Hist. of Mekkeh, ed. Wustenfeld, pp. 35 and 39 ff.; and Caussin, Essai, i. 194). But it was at Seba, the Biblical Sheba, that the kingdom of Joktan attained its greatest extent. In the southwestern angle of the peninsula, San'a (Uzal), Seba (Sheba), and Hadramaut (Hazaraveh), all closely neighboring, formed together the principal known settlements of the Joktanites. Here arose the kingdom of Sheba, followed in later times by that of Himyar. The dominant tribe from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the Sheba of the Greeks): while the family of Himyar (Hamiyeh) held the first place in the tribe. This kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phasis of the old Sheba, dating, both in its rise and its name, only shortly before our era.

In Arabia we have alluded to certain curious indications in the names of Himyar, Ophir, Phoenicians, and the Erythraean Sea, and the traces of their westward spread, which would well repay a careful investigation; as well as the obscure relations of a connection with Chaldea and Assyria, found in Berosus and other ancient writers, and strengthened by presumptive evidence of a connection closer than that of commerce, in religion, etc. between those countries and Arabia. An equally interesting and more touching subject, is the apparently proved settlement of Cushite races along the coast, on the ground also occupied by Joktanites, involving intermarriages between these peoples, and explaining the Cyclopean masonry of the so-called Himyrite ruins which bear no mark of a Semite's hand, the vigorous character of the Joktanites and their sea-faring propensities (both qualities not usually found in Semites), and the Cushite elements in the ancient inscriptions on the "Hymyrite" language.

Next in importance to the tribe of Seba was that of Hadramiwt, which, till the fall of the Himyrite power, maintained a position of independence and a direct line of rulers from Kahtan (Caussin, l. 135-6). Joktanite tribes also passed northwards, to Heerch, in El-Iirk, and to Ghasün, near Damascus. The emigration of these and other tribes took place on the occasion of the capture of a great dyke (the Dyke of El-Arim), above the metropolis of Seba; a catastrophe which appears, from the concurrent testimony of Arab writers, to have devastated a great extent of country, and destroyed the city Ma-ril or Seba. This event forms the commencement of an era; the dates of which exist in the inscriptions on the Dyke and elsewhere; but when we should place that commencement is still quite an open question. (See the extracts from El-Mos'oodie and other authorities, edited by Schultens; Caussin, i. 84 ff.; and Arabia.)

The position which the Joktanites hold (in native traditions) among the successive races who are said to have inhabited the peninsula has been fully stated in art. Arabia: to which the reader is referred for a sketch of the inhabitants generally, their descent, history, religion, and language. There are some existing places named after Joktan and Kahtan (El-Bireesce, ed. Jaubert; Niebuhr, Descr. 248); but there seems to be no safe ground for attaching to them any special importance, or for supposing that the name is ancient, when we remember that the whole country is full of the traditions of Joktan.

E. S. P.
JONAH

Jonah to the cliff (מִשְׁכָּן, A. V. Sehah) — the stronghold of the Edomites — after he had captured it from them (2 K. xiv. 7). The parallel narrative of 2 Chr. xxv. 11-13 supplies fuller details. From it we learn that, having beaten the Edomite army with a great slaughter in the " Valley of Salt," the valley south of the Dead Sea — Jonah took those who were not slain to the cliff, and threw them headlong over it. This cliff is asserted by Eusebius (Onomasticon, κράτα) to be "a city of Edom, also called by the Assyrians Rekan," by which there is no doubt that he intended Petra (see Onomasticon, Περσία, and the quotations in Stanley's S. of P., 94, note). The title thus bestowed is said to have continued "unto this day." This, Keil remarks, is a proof that the history was nearly contemporary with the event, because Jonah's conquest was lost again by Ahaz less than a century afterwards (2 Chr. xxviii. 17).

JONAX (Jonas [see below]), the father of the Apostle Peter (John i. 42 [Gr. 43]), who is hence addressed as Simon Barjona in Matt. xvii. 17. In the A. V. of John xxi. 15-17 he is called Jona, though the Greek is Ἰωάνης, and the Vulg. Johannes throughout. The name in either form would be the equivalent of the Hebrew Johanan.

* In all the passages in John the received text reads Ἰωάννης, for which Lachm. and Treg. adopt the reading Ἰωάννα, Lisc. Ἰωάννα. The Leningr. Vulg. has Ἰωάννης in John i. 42, but the Cod. Amiatinus reads Johannes, and the Sixtine edition Iōnōn. The reading of the received text would have been in our translation by John's Jewish contemporaries.

JONADAB. 1. (יונָדָב), and once יונהדב (Jonahdab; יונהדב: Jonahab), son of Shimeah and nephew of David. He is described as " very subtil " (鬷ָדוֹב סְפָר יָבָד: the word is that usually translated +wise," as in the case of Solomon, 2 Sam. xii. 3). He seems to have been one of those characters who, in the midst of great or royal families, pride themselves, and are esteemed, for being acquainted with the secrets of the whole circle in which they move. His age naturally made him the friend of his cousin Amnon, heir to the throne (2 Sam. xii. 3). He perceived from the prince's altered appearance that there was some unknown grief — " Why art thou, the king's son, so lean? " — and, when he had warned him out, he gave him the fatal advice, for endangering his sister Tamar (3, 6).

Again, when, in a later stage of the same tragedy, Amnon was murdered by Absalom, and the exasperated report reached David that all the princes were slain, Jonadab was already aware of the real state of the case. He was with the king, and was able at once to reassure him (2 Sam. xxii. 32, 33).

2. Jer. xxxv. 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, in which it represents sometimes the long, sometimes the short Heb. form of the name. [JEHOADAB].

JONAH (יֹנָה) [dorc]: יַרְאוּס, I.XX. and Matt. xii. 39); a prophet, son of Amittai (whose name, compounded with יָדָב, used by the widow of Zarephath, 1 K. xvii. 21, has given rise to an old tradition, recorded by Jerome, that Jonah was her son, and that Amittai was a prophet himself). We further learn from 2 K. xiv. 25, he was of Gath-hepher, a town of Lower Galilee, in Zebulun. This verse enables us to approximate to the time at which Jonah lived. It was plainly after the reign of Jehu, when the losses of Israel (2 K. x. 32) began; and it may not have been till the latter part of the reign of Jereboam II. The general opinion is that Jonah was the first of the prophets (Rosem., Bp. Lloyd, Davison, Browne, Drake); Hengstenberg would place him after Amos and Hosea, and indeed adheres to the order of the books in the canon for the chronology. The king of Nineveh at this time is supposed (Ussher and others) to have been Pul, who is placed by Layard (Nine. and Bab. 624) at n. c. 824 before an edomite king, Adonibezek II., n. c. 810, is regarded more probable by Drake. Our English Bible gives n. c. 802.

The personal history of Jonah is brief, and well known; but is of such an exceptional and extraordinary character, as to have been set down by many German critics to fiction, either in whole or in part. The book, say they, was composed, or compounded, some time after the death of the prophet, perhaps (Rosem.) at the kitter part of the Jewish kingdom, during the reign of Josiah (S. Sharpe), or even later. The supposed improbabilities are accounted for by them in a variety of ways; e. g. as merely fabulous, or fanciful ornaments to a true history, or allegorical, or paradoxical and moral, both in their origin and design. A list of the critics who have advanced these several opinions may be seen in Davidson's Introduction, p. 556. Rosenmüller (Prophec. in Jonnus) reduces them in detail; and then propounds his own, which is equally hazardous. Like them, he begins with proposing to escape the difficulties of the history, but ends in a mere theory, open to still greater difficulties. "The fable of Hercules," he says, "deceived and then restored by a sea-monster, was the foundation on which the Hebrew prophet built up the story. Nothing was really true in it." We feel ourselves precluded from any doubt of the reality of the transactions recorded in this book, by the simplicity of the language itself; by the historical allusions in Tob. iv. 6-15; and Joseph. Ant. ix. 10, § 2; by the accordance by other authorities of the historical and geographical notices; ("Quod aut annua divina miracula credenda non sint, aut hoc non credatur causa nullis sit," Aug. Epp. cit. in Quodl. 6 de Jonn, ii. 294; cf. Cyril. Alex. Comment. in Jonn., iii. 367-380; above all, by the explicit words and teaching of our Blessed Lord Himself (Matt. xxii. 39, 41, xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29), and by the correspondence of the miracles in the histories of Jonah and of the Messiah.

We shall derive additional arguments for the same conclusion from the history and meaning of the prophet's mission. Having already, as it seems from 1 iun. 1, propounded to Israel, he was sent to Nineveh. The time was one of political revival in Israel: but ere long the Assyrians were to be employed by God as a scourge upon them. The Israelites consequently viewed them with repugnance; and the prophet, in accordance with his name (יֹנָה, a dorv), out of timidity and love for his country, shrunk from a commission which he felt sure would result (iv. 2) in the spiring of a hostile city. He attempted therefore to escape to Tarshish, either Tartessus in Spain (Bochart, Tzitom)
and, or more probably (Drake) Tarus in Cilicia, a port of commercial intercourse.

The providence of God, however, watched over him, first in a storm, and then in his being swallowed by a large fish (תיה החירה) for the space of three days and three nights. We need not multiply miracles by supposing a great fish to have been created for the occasion, for Bochart (Hier. ii. pp. 752-754) has shown that there is a sort of shark which devoura man entire, as this did Jonah while cast into the water (August. Ep. 49, ii. 284).

After his deliverance, Jonah executed his commission; and the king, "believing him to be a minister from the supreme deity of the nation" (Layard's Nineveh and Babylon), and having heard of his miraculous deliverance (Dean Jackson On the Creed, bk. ix. c. 42), ordered a general fast, and averted the threatened judgment. But the prophet, not from personal but national feelings, grudged the mercy shown to a heathen nation. He was therefore taught, by the significant lesson of the "gourd," whose growth and decay (a known fact to naturals, Layard's Nineveh, i. 128, 124) brought home to the king the truth that the house of Jonah, whom he was sent to testify by deed, as other prophets would afterwards testify by word, the capacity of Gentiles for salvation, and the design of God to make them partakers of it. This was "the sign of the prophet Jonas" which was given to a proud and perverse generation of Jews after the ascension of Christ by the preaching of His Apostles. (Luke xi. 29, 30; Jackson's Comm. on the Creed, ix. c. 42.)

But the resurrection of Christ itself was also shadowed forth in the history of the prophets, as is made certain to us by the words of our Saviour. (See Jackson, as above, bk. ix. c. 40.) Tictomb (Bible Studies, p. 237, n.) sees a correspondence between Jon. i. 17 and Hosea vi. 2. Besides which, the fact and the faith of Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish betokened to the nation of Israel the intimation of a resurrection and of immortality.

We thus see distinct purposes which the mission of Jonah was designed to serve in the Divine economy; and in these we have the reason of the history's being placed in the prophetic canon. It was highly symbolical. The facts contained a concealed prophecy. Hence, too, only so much of the prophet's personal history is told us as suffices for setting forth the symbols divinely intended, which accounts for its fragmentary aspect. Exclude the symbolical meaning, and you have no adequate reason to give of this history: admit it, and you have images here of the highest facts and doctrines of Christianity. (Davison, On Prophecy, p. 275.)

For the extent of the site of Nineveh, see NINEVEH.

The old tradition made the burial-place of Jonah to be Gath-hepher; the modern tradition places it at Nino, Tanaus, opposite Mosul. See the account of the excavations in Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, pp. 596, 597. And consult Drake's Notes on Jonah (Macmillan and Co., 1853).


- The passages in which our Lord asserts the truth of the story of Jonah, and the Divine authority of his book, and its intimate connection with himself, are full and explicit. See especially Matt. xii. 39–41, xvi. i. 14, Luke xi. 29–32. It was one great object of our Lord's mission to interpret and confirm the Old Testament (Matt. v. 17–19). Much of his time was spent in explaining the O. T. to his disciples. We read, for example, that "Beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (See Luke xxiv. 27–32, 45.)

His authority on this subject is just as good as it is on any other; and if we reject his sanctions and interpretations of the O. T., we reject his whole mission. No one can say, without absurdity and self-contradiction, "I admit that Christ brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel; but I do not admit that he understood the O. T. or was an accurate and safe interpreter of it." A miracle is always a direct exertion of creative power; and so far as the physical fact is concerned, one miracle is just as easy, and just as probable, and just as natural, as another. There is no question of hard or easy, natural or unnatural, probable or improbable, in regard to a real miracle. The exertion of creative power is to the Creator always natural; the possibility of the creative act may be; there can, in such a problem, be no necessity or proportion in regard to the actual facts. The only question must be a moral one, whether the alleged fact has a purpose worthy of God, and is appropriate to the object intended; and this question we are authorized and required by God himself to ask. (See Deut. xili. 1–5.)

The country which was the scene of Jonah's activity is by no means analogous to his story, which seem to rest on some basis of actual facts which once occurred among the people of that region.

Neptune sent a monstrous serpent to ravage the coast in the neighborhood of Joppa (whence Jonah sailed), and there was no remedy but to expose Andromeda, the daughter of king Cepheus, to be devoured. As she stood chained to the rocks awaiting her fate, Perseus, who was returning through the air from his exploit against the Gorgon Medusa, captivated by her beauty, turned the monster into a rock by showing him Medusa's head, and then liberated and married the maiden. Jerome informs us that the very rock, outside the port of Joppa, was in his day pointed out to travellers.

At Troy, more northerly, on the same Mediterranean coast, Neptune in anger sent out a devouring sea-monster, which with every returning tide committed fearful ravages on the people. There was no help till king Laomedon gave up his beautiful daughter Hesione to be devoured. While the monster with extended jaws was approaching her chained to the rocks, Hercules, sword in hand, leaped into his throat, and for three days and three nights maintained a tremendous conflict in the monster's bowels, from which he at length emerged victorious and unmanned, except with the loss of his hair, which the heat of the animal had loosened from the scalp. For this exploit Hercules was named Τριέρεως (Three-nights).

Aia, the daughter of the king of Beirôt, a city north of Joppa, on the same coast, for the salvation of her country was about to be devoured by a frightful dragon. St. George, in full armor, assaulted the dragon, and after an obstinate conflict of several days' continuance, slew him and delivered
the princes. He is the patron saint of Aramaea and England, of the Franciscan and Swabian knights, and of the crusades generally.

According to Babylonian tradition, a fish-god or fish-man, named Oannes, was divinely sent to that country, the region of the Emperates and Tigris, to teach the inhabitants the fear of God and good morals, to instruct them in astronomy and agriculture, the sciences and useful arts, legislation and other utilities. He came from the sea and spoke with a man’s voice, teaching only in the daytime, and returning again every night to the sea. Sculptures of this fish-god are frequently found among the ruins of Nineveh. The head and face of a dignified and noble-looking man are seen just below the mouth of the fish, the hands and arms project from the posterior fins, and the feet and ankles from the ventral; and there are other forms, but it is always a man in a fish.

The Assyrian Ninevites were of the same race as the Hebrews, and spoke a language very like the Hebrew. The Greek name Oannes may be derived from the oriental Jonah, just as Emperates is derived from the oriental Thuth. For a fuller discussion of these oriental traditions illustrative of the book of Jonah, the reader may see an essay by the Rev. Dr. Sisson in the Bibl. Sacra for October, 1853. Consult especially Groenzer, Sybaritische Mythologie der Alten Volker, ii. 22, 74-81, &c.

Jonah was probably born about 850 B.C., and prophesied during the reign of Jeroboam II., from 825 to 789 B.C. He was a child when Hosea was an old blind bard singing his rhapsodies on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean; a contemporary of the Spartan hawgiver, Lycurgus; by a century the senior of Isaiah, and four centuries more ancient than Herodotus. He is the oldest of the prophets, any of whose writings have reached our times. This hoary antiquity, the rough manners of the time, and the simplicity of the people who were his contemporaries, must be taken into consideration in an estimate of the book. It is throughout in keeping, eminently appropriate to the times and circumstances in which it claims to have originated. God always adapts his revelations to the character and circumstances of those to whom he makes them, and never stands on dignity as men do. Human notions of dignity are a small matter with him; his field of observation is so large that he is not much affected by triftes of this sort.

Jonah was evidently a man of hypochondriac temperament, easily discouraged and easily elated; timid and courageous at rapid intervals; in his ideas of God a good deal under the influence of the heathenism of his time; yet a God-fearing man, a patriotic lover of his own people, and an earnest hater of their idolatrous oppressors, the Ninevite Assyrians. A consideration of these traits explains the oddities of his history, and illustrates the condescension and patience of his God.

The Chronicon of the Mediterranean is of sufficiency with the Bible. See A. T. iv. 340, 341.

C. E. S.

their king should be alarmed by a threat from the God of the Hebrews; and their mode of fasting and repenting, and manifesting sorrow, is just what we find described by other ancient authors, such as Herodotus, Plutarch, Virgil, etc. (Herod. ii. 27).

The plant which shaded Jonah is treated in the story as miraculous. Such rapidly growing and suddenly withering plants, however, are still found in the east, and have been well described by our American missionaries, and more truly than by Nichbr [Goren]. The castor-oil bean, cultivated in some of our gardens, will give us a good idea of the kind of plant referred to.

The Orientals have always had a high regard for Jonah, and his tomb is still shown with veneration near the ruins of Nineveh, as well as at Gath-hepher. The Kabbins, who make two Messiahs, one the son of David, and the other the son of Joseph, affirm that Jonah was the Messiah the son of Joseph. The respect shown to him by the Mohammedans is also remarkable. In the Koran one entire chapter is inscribed with his name.

In one passage he is called Dech'ham, that is, the dredler in the fish; and in the thirty-seventh chapter the following narrative is given of him: "Jonah was one of our ambassadors. When he was cast in the fully laden ship, the sailors cast lots, and by that he was condemned: and then the fish swallowed him, because he merited punishment. We cast him upon the naked shore, and he felt himself sick; and therefore we caused a vine to grow over him, and sent him to a hundred thousand men, or more; and when they believed, we granted them their lives for a definite time." In the twenty-first chapter it is said: "Remember Pharaoh (the dredler in the fish, that is, Jonah), how he departed from us in wrath and believed that we could exercise no power over him. And in the darkness he prayed to us in these words: 'There is no god but thee. Honour and glory be to thee. Truly I have been a sinner, but thou art merciful beyond all the power of language to express.' And we heard him, and delivered him from his distress; as we are always accustomed to deliver the believers." This story is one of those which the Koran, not as a history, but as a moral, in which the later Mohammedans, uttering in the belly of the fish, the Mohammedans regard as one of the holiest and most efficacious of all prayers, and they often use it in their own devotions. Certainly it is simple, expressive, and beautiful, and reminds us of the prayer of the publican in the Gospel. The tenth chapter of the Koran says: "It is only the people of Jonah, whom we, after they had believed, did deliver from the punishment of shame in this world, and granted them the enjoyment of their goods for a certain time."

The Mohammedan writers say that the ship in which Jonah had embarked stood still in the sea and would not be moved. The seamen, therefore, cast lots, and the lot falling upon Jonah, he cried out, 'I am the frogfish, and threw himself into the water' (for the fish swallowed him. The time he remained in the fish is differently stated by them as three, seven, twenty, or forty days; but when he was thrown upon the land he was in a state of great suffering and distress, his body having become like that of a new-born infant. When he went to Nineveh, the inhabitants at first treated him harshly, so that he was obliged to flee, after
he had declared that the city should be destroyed within three days, or, as some say, forty. As the time approached, a black cloud, shooting forth fire and smoke, rolled itself directly over the city; and put the inhabitants into dreadful consternation, so that they proclaimed a fast and repented, and God spared them.

From all the oriental traditions on the subject, it is very plain that the men of the old East, the men of the country where Jonah lived, who were acquainted with the manners and modes of thought there prevalent, never felt any of those objections to the prophet's narrative, which have so much stultified the men of other nations and other times. God deals with men just as their peculiar circumstances and habits of thought require; and the sailors and fishermen of Palestine, three thousand years ago, are not to be judged of by the standard of culture at the present day; and a mode of treatment might have been very suitable for them, which would be quite inappropriate to modern fashionable society; and they, we doubt not, in the sight of God, were of quite as much importance in their time as we are in ours. Christ himself so far honors Jonah as to make his history a type of His own resurrection.

The charge of the book in the Hebrew Canon in the time of Christ, and in all previous and all subsequent time, is unquestionable and unquestioned. See the apocryphal book of Tobit, xiv. 7, 8.

A consideration of the real state of both the heathen and the Jewish mind, at that time and in that land, will show the utter groundlessness of the objection sometimes made to the credibility of the book of Jonah, because it represents a Hebrew prophet as being sent to a heathen city, and preaching there with great acceptance and power. Compare 1 K. xx. 23–33; 2 K. viii. 7–10, xvi. 10–15; 2 Chr. xxxi. 31; Am. iv. 7, 8.

To understand the feelings of the prophet in regard to Nineveh, and the failure of his prophecy, we must call to mind the circumstances in which he lived. He was a native of Gath-hepher, in the northern part of Israel, where the people had been greatly corrupted by constant intercourse with idolatry; and they were consequently much exposed to the cruelty and oppression of their northern and eastern neighbors, especially from the powerful empire of Nineveh, by which they had been greatly injured.

Among the prophetic utterances of Moses, God had declared in respect to his people (Deut. xxvii. 21): “I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.” This they understood to imply that the time would come when the Israelites would be rejected for their sins, and some Pagan nation received to favor instead of them; and this is the use which the Apostle Paul makes of the text in Rom. x. 19. Jonah had seen enough of the sins of the Israelites to know that they deserved rejection; and the favor which God showed to the Ninevites, on their repentance, might have led him to fear that the event so long before predicted by Moses was now about to occur, and that too by his instrumentality. Israel would be rejected, and the proud, oppressive, hateful Nineveh, odious to the Israelites for a thousand cruelties (2 K. xx. 19, 20), might then be received, on their repentance and reformation, as the people of God. He was to him a thought insupportably painful, and God had made him unwillingly the means of bringing this about. He thought he did well to be angry — to be displeased, grieved, distressed — for such is the import of the original phrase in Jon. iv. 1, 9.

Alone, unprotected, at the hazard of his life, and most reluctantly, he had, on his credit as a prophet, made a solemn declaration of the Divine purpose in regard to that city, and God was now about to falsify it. Why should he not be distressed, the poor hypocochondriac, and pray to die rather than see it? Everybody is against him; everything goes against him; God himself exposes him to disgrace and disregards his feelings. So he feels; so every hypocochondriac would feel in like circumstances. He cannot bear to remain an hour in the hated city; he retires to the neighboring field, exposed to the dreadful burning of the sun, which is so intolerable that the inhabitants of the cities on the Tigris find it necessary, at the present day, to construct apartments under ground to protect themselves from the noon-day heat. God causes a spacious, unrameous plant to spread its broad leaves over the booth and afford him the needed shelter. He rejoices in its shade; but before the second day has dawned, the shade is gone; the sirocco of the desert beats upon him, with the next noon-day sun, he is distracted with pains in his head, he faints with the insupportable heat, and alone, disconsolate, unriended, thinking that everybody despises him and scorns him as a lying prophet, hypocochondriac-like, he again wishes himself dead. Prophetic inspiration changed no man's natural temperament or character. The prophets, just like other men, had to struggle with their natural infirmities and disabilities, with only such Divine aid as is within the reach of all religious men. The whole representation in regard to Jonah is in perfect keeping; it is as true to nature as any scene in Shakespeare, and represents hypocondria as graphically as Othello represents jealousy or Lear madness.

Jonah is not peculiarly wicked, but peculiarly uncomfortable, and to none so much so as to himself; and his kind and forgiving God does not hastily condemn him, but pities and expostulates, and by the most significant of illustrations justifies his forbearance towards the repentant Ninevite.

The prophet, living in the time of the Punic warious mission, often came to places in which they felt as if it would be better for them to die rather than live. For example, of Elijah, who was of a very different temperament from Jonah, far more cheerful and self-relying, we have a similar narrative in 1 K. xix. 4–10.

Dr. Pusey has given us an excellent commentary on Jonah. There is a more ancient one of great value by John King, D. D., and some excellent suggestions in regard to the book may be found in Davison on Prophecy, disc. vi. pt. 2. — Friedrichsen's Kritische Übersicht der verschiedenen Ansichten von dem Buche Jonas, etc. (Leipz. 1841) is a useful work. The commentaries on the book are well-nigh immeasurable. A formidable catalogue of them is given in Rosenmüller's Scholia in Vet. Test. For the later writers on Jonah as one of the minor prophets, see Habakkuk (Amer. ed.).

JOYAN (Joseph [Tisch. Treg. 'Tovaid] Joner), son of Eliaim, in the genealogy of Christ, in the 7th generation after David, i.e. about the time of king Jehoram (Luke iii. 30). The name is probably only another form of Johanan, which occurs so frequently in this genealogy. The sequence of names, Jonan, Joseph, Juda, Simeon,
Levi, Mattath, is singularly like that in vv. 29, 27, Joann, Judah, Joseph, Semei - Mattathias.

A. C. H.

JOANAS. 1. (Jonas; [Vat. Jonas].) Alex. 

JONAS. 2. (Jonas.] The prophet Jonah (2 Esdr. xiv. 29; Tob. xiv. 4; Matt. xii. 39, 30, 41, xvi. 1-3.

JONATHAN (יוֹנָתָן, i. e. Jehonathan, and יְוֹנָתָן; the two forms are used almost alternately; יְוֹנָדָה, Jos. יְוֹנָדָה: Jonathan), the eldest son of king Saul. The name (the gift of Jehovah, corresponding to Theodorus in Greek) seems to have been common at that period possi-

ble from the example of Saul's son (see JONATHAN, the nephew of David, JONATHAN, the son of Abiathar, JONATHAN, the son of Shage, and NATHAN the prophet).

He first appears some time after his father's ac-

cession (1 Sam. xiii. 2). If his younger brother Ishboseth was 40 at the time of Saul's death (2 Sam. ii. 8, Jonathan must have been at least 30, which is first mentioned. Of his own family we

know nothing, except the birth of one son, 5 years before his death (2 Sam. iv. 4). He was regarded in his father's lifetime as heir to the throne. Like Saul, he was a man of great strength and activity (2 Sam. i. 23), of which the exploit at Michmash was a proof. He was also famous for the peculiar martial exercises in which his tribe excelled - archery and slingling (1 Chr. xii. 2). His bow was to him what the spear was to his father: "the bow of Jonathan turned not back" (2 Sam. i. 22). It was always about him (1 Sam. xviii. 4, xx. 53). It is through his relation with David that he is chiefly known to us, probably as related by his

descendants at David's court. But there is a back-
ground, not so clearly given, of his relation with his father. From the time that he first appears he is Saul's constant companion. He was always present at his father's meals. As Abner and David seem to have occupied the places afterwards called the captainships of "the host" and "of the guard," so he seems to have been (as Hushai afterwards) "the friend" (comp. 1 Sam. xx. 25; 2 Sam. xv. 37). The whole story implies, without expressing, the deep attachment of the father and son. Jon-

athan can only go on his dangerous expedition (1 Sam. xiv. 1) by concealing it from Saul. Saul's

vow is confirmed, and its tragic effect deepened, by his feeling for his son, "though it be Jonathan my son" (ib. xiv. 39). "Tell me what thou hast done" (ib. xiv. 43). Jonathan cannot bear to believe his father's enmity to David, "my father will do nothing great or small, but that he will show it to me: and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so" (1 Sam. xx. 2). To him, of all men, the king was imme-

nable - "Saul hearkened unto the voice of Jonathan" (1 Sam. xix. 4). Their mutual affection was indeed interrupted by the growth of Saul's insularity. Twice the father would have sacrificed the son: once in consequence of his vow (1 Sam. xiv.); the second time, more deliberately, on the discovery of David's flight: and on this last occasion, a momentary glimpse is given of some darker history. Were the phrases "son of a perverse rebellions woman," "shame on thy mother's nakedness" (1 Sam. xx. 30, 31), mere frantic in-

creases? or is there something in the expression of Abimelech or Zizgah which we do not know? In fierce anger "Jonathan left the royal presence (ib. 34). But he cast his lot with his father's decline, not with his friend's rise, and "in death they were not divided" (2 Sam. i. 23; 1 Sam. xxiii. 16).

His life may be divided into two main parts.

1. The war with the Philistines: commonly called, from its locality, the "war of Michmash," as the last years of the Philomessian War were called for a similar reason "the war of Deceba" (1 Sam. xiii. 22, LXX.). In the previous war with the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi. 4-15) there is no mention of him; and his abrupt appearance, without explanation, in xii. 2, may seem to imply that some part of the narrative has been lost.

He is already of great importance in the state. The chief fact is the miracle of Saul's son's army which was formed (xii. 22; xvi. 1, 2), 1,000 men were under the command of Jonathan at Gilgal. The Philistines were still in the general command of the country: an officer was stationed at Gaba, either the same as Jonathan's position or close to it. In a sudden act of youthful daring, as when, Tell rose against Gessor, or as in sacred history Moses rose against the Egyptians, Jonathan slew this officer, and thus gave the signal for a general revolt. Saul took advantage of it, and the whole population rose. But it was a premature attempt. The Philistines poured in from the plain, and the tyranny became more deeply rooted than ever. [Saul.] Saul and Jonathan (with their immediate attendants) alone had arms, amidst the general weakness and disarming of the people (1 Sam. xiii. 22). They were encamped at Gath, with a small body of men: in their presence or as they looked down from that height on the misfortunes of their coun-

try, and of their native tribe especially, they wept aloud (i.e. LXX., 1 Sam. xiii. 16).

From this oppression, as Jonathan by his former act had been the first to provoke it, so now he was the first to deliver his people. On the former occasion Saul had been equally with himself involved in the responsibility of the deed. Saul "blew the trumpet;" Saul had "sumitted the officer of the Philistines" (xiii. 3, 4). But now it would seem that Jonathan was resolved to undertake the whole risk himself. "The day," the day fixed by him (קֵיַד; ἡ ἡμέρα, LXX.; 1 Sam. xiv. 1) approached: and without communicating his project to any one, except the young man, whom, like all the chiefs of that age, he retained as his personal bearer, he summoned a thousand of whom he dashed against the garrison of the Philistines stationed on the other side of the steep defile of Michmash (xiv. 1). His words are short, but they breathe exactly the an-
cient and peculiar spirit of the Israelite warrior. "Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that Jehovah will work for us: for there is no restraint to Jehovah

(a. V., "Garrison") εἰς ἄγαμος, LXX.; 1 Sam. xiii. 3, 4. See Ewald, ii. 476.)
to save by many or by few." The answer is no less characteristic of the close friendship of the two young men: already like to that which afterwards sprang up between Jonathan and David. "Do all that is in thine heart; . . . behold, I am with thee; as thy heart is my heart (LXX.; 1 Sam. xiv. 7)." After the manner of the time (and the more, probably, from having taken no counsel of the high-priest or any prophet before his departure) Jonathan proposed to draw an omen from his own heart, or what he hoped of the issue of the enterprise. If the garrison, on seeing them, gave intimations of descending upon them, they would remain in the valley; if, on the other hand, they raised a challenge to advance, they were to accept it. The latter turned out to be the case. The first appearance of the two warriors from behind the rocks was taken by the Philistines as a prudent apparition of the Hebrews coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves; and they were welcomed with a scolding invitation (such as the Jebusites afterwards offered to David), "Come up, and we will show you a thing" (xiv. 4-12). Jonathan immediately took them at their word. Strong and active as he was, "as strong as a lion, and swift as an eagle" (2 Sam. i. 25), he was fully equal to the adventure of climbing on his hands and feet up the face of the cliff. When he came directly in view of them, with his armor-bearer behind him, they both, after the manner of their tribe (1 Chr. xii. 2) discharged a flight of arrows, stones, and pEBBLES, from their bows, crossbows, and slings, with such effect that 20 men fell at the first onset [AHMS, vol. i. p. 169 b]. A panic seized the garrison, thence spread to the camp, and thence to the surrounding hordes of marauders; an earthquake combined with the terror of the moment; the confusion increased; the Israelites who had been taken slaves by the Philistines during the last 3 days (LXX.) rose in mutiny: the Israelites who lay hid in the numerous caverns and deep holes in which the rocks of the neighborhood abound, sprang out of their subterranean dwellings. Saul and his little band had watched in astonishment the wild retreat from the heights of Gilboa — he now joined in the pursuit, which led him through the woods, over the rugged plateau of Bethel, and down the pass of Beth-horon to Ajalon (xvii. 31). [GILKIH, p. 915.] The father and son had not met on that day: Saul only conjectured his son's absence from not finding him when he numbered the people. Jonathan had not heard of the rash curse (xv. 24) which Saul invoked on any one who ate before the evening. In the dizziness and darkness (Hebrew, LXX., xiv. 27) that came on after his desperate exertions, he put forth the staff which apparently had (with his sling and bow) been his chief weapon, and tasted the honey which lay on the ground as they passed through the forest. The pursuers in general were restrained even from this slight indulgence by fear of the royal curse: but the moment that the day, with its enforced fast, was over, they flew, like Muslims at sunset during the fast of Ramadan, on the captured cattle, and devoured them, even to the brutal neglect of the law which forbade the disembowelling of the fresh carcasses with the blood. This violation of the law Saul endeavored to prevent and to expiate by erecting a large stone, which served both as a rude table and as an altar: the first altar that was raised under the monarchy. It was in the dead of night after this wild revel was over that he proposed that the pursuit should be continued till dawn; and then, when the silence of the oracle of the high-priest indicated that something had occurred to intercept the Divine favor, the lot was tried, and Jonathan appeared as the culprit. Jephthah's dreadful sacrifice would have been repeated; but the people interposed in behalf of the hero of that great day; and Jonathan was saved [xv. 24-46].

2. This is the only great exploit of Jonathan's life. But the chief interest of his career is derived from the friendship with David, which began on the day of David's return from the victory over the champion of Gath, and continued till his death. It is the first Biblical instance of a romantic friendship, such as was common afterwards in Greece, and has been since in Christendom; and is remarkable both as giving its sanction to these, and as filled with a pathos of its own, which has been imitated, but never surpassed, in modern works of fiction. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul" — "Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (1 Sam. xviii. 1; 2 Sam. i. 25). Each found in each the affection that he found not in his own family: no jealousy of rivalry between the two, as claimants for the same throne, ever interposed: "Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next unto thee" (1 Sam. xiii. 17). The friendship was confirmed, after the manner of the time, by a solemn compact often repeated. The first was immediately on their first acquaintance. Jonathan gave David as a pledge his royal mantle, his sword, his girdle, and his famous bow (xviii. 4). His fidelity was soon called into action by the insane rage of his father against David. He interceded for him. He bore his father's message, and, after it had been acceded to (1 Sam. xix. 1-7), then the madness returned and David fled. It was in a secret interview during this flight, by the stone of Ezel, that the second covenant was made between the two friends, of a still more binding kind, extending to their mutual posterity — Jonathan laying such emphasis on this portion of the compact, as almost to suggest the belief of a slight misgiving on his part of David's future conduct in this respect. It is this interview which brings out the character of Jonathan in the liveliest colors — his little artifices — his love for both his father and his friend — his bitter disappointment at his father's unmanageable fury — his familiar sport of archery. With passionate embraces and tears the two friends parted, to meet only once more (1 Sam. xx.). That one more meeting was far away in the forest of Ziph, during his friend were as a yoke of oxen ploughing, and resolving the sharp ploughshares."

3. In xiv. 25, 31, the LXX. reads "Damnath" for "Beth-aven," and omits "Ajalon." [c] Josephus Ant. (vi. 6, § 5) puts into Jonathan's mouth a speech of patriotic self-devotion, after the manner of a Greek or Roman. Ewald (ii. 438) supposes that a substitute was killed in his place. There is no trace of either of these in the sacred narrative.
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Saul's pursuit of David. Jonathan's alarm for his 
friend's life is now changed into a confidence that 
he will escape: "He strengthened his hand in 
God." Finally, and for the third time, they re-
newed the covenant, and then parted forever (1 
Sam. xxiii. 16-18).

From this time forth we hear no more till the 
tale of Gileon. In that battle he fell, with his 
two brothers and his father, and his corpse shared 
his fate (1 Sam. xxxi. 2, 8). [SACL.] His ashes were 
buried first at Jabez-Gilead (chap. 13), but 
forthwith removed with those of his father to 
Zelah in Benjamin (2 Sam. xxi. 12). The news 
of his death occasioned the celebrated elegy of 
David, in which, he, as the friend, naturally oc-
cupies the chief place (2 Sam. i. 22, 23, 25, 26), 
and which seems to have been sung in the education 
of the archers of Judah, in commemoration of the one 
great archer, Jonathan: "He bade them teach the 
children of Judah the use of the bow" (2 Sam. i. 
17). 18.

He left one son, five years old at the time of 
his death (2 Sam. iv. 4), to whom he had prob-
ably given his original name of Merib-idad, after 
wards changed to Mephibosheth (comp. 1 Chr. viii. 
34, ix. 49). [Mephibosheth.] Through him the 
line of descendants was continued down to the 
time of Ezra (1 Chr. ix. 40), and even then their 
great ancestor's archery was practiced amongst 
them. [SACL.]

2. (Jonathan.) Son of Shimea, brother of Jon-
annah, and nephew of David (2 Sam. xxii. 21; 1 
Chr. xx. 7). He inherited the union of civil and military 
gifts, so conspicuous in his uncle. Like David, he 
engaged in a single combat and slew a gigantic 
Philistine of Gath, who was remarkable for an 
additional finger and toe on each hand and foot. 
(2 Sam. xxii. 21). If we may identify the Jonathan 
of 1 Chr. xxvii. 32 with the Jonathan of this pas-
sage, where the word translated "uncle" may be 
"nephew," he was (like his brother Jonathan) 
"wise"—and as such, was David's counsellor and 
secretary. Jerome (Quast. Heb. on 1 Sam. xiii. 12) 
conjectures that this was Nathan the prophet, thus 
making up the 8th son, not named in 1 Chr. ii. 
15-19. But this is not probable.

3. [Jonathan.] The son of Abiathar, the high-
priest. He is the last descendant of Eli, of whom 
we hear anything. He appears on two occasions.
1. On the day of David's flight from Absalom, 
when it first appeared his father Abiathar as far 
as Olivet (2 Sam. xv. 36), he returned with him 
to Jerusalem, and was there, with Abiathar the 
son of Zadok, employed as a messenger to carry 
the first news of Hushai's plans to David (xvii. 
15-21). 2. On the day of Solomon's inauguration, 
he suddenly broke in upon the banquet of Adonijah, 
to announce the success of the rival prince (1 K. 
42, 43). It may be inferred from Adonijah's ex-
pression ("Thou art a valiant man, and flnestest 
good tidings"), that he had followed the policy 
of his father Abiathar in Adonijah's support.

On both occasions, it may be remarked that he 
appears as the swift and trusty messenger.

4. The son of Shallai the Hararite (1 Chr. xi. 
31; 2 Sam. xxii. 32). He was one of David's 
heroes (gibborim). The LXX. makes his father's 
name Shallai (σαλαί), and applies the epithet "Arar-
ite" (ὁ Αραρίτης) to Jonathan himself. "Harar" 
is not mentioned elsewhere as a place; but it is a 
poetical word for "Har" (mountain), and, as such, 
may possibly signify in this passage "the moun-
tainer." Another officer (Abiam) is mentioned 
with Jonathan, as bearing the same designation 
(1 Chr. xi. 35).

A. L. S.

5. (Jonathan.) The son, or descendant, of 
Gershom, the son of Moses, whose name in the 
Masoretic is changed to Manasseh, as designed to 
screen the memory of the great lawgiver from 
the disgrace which attached to the apostasy of one 
so closely connected with him (Judg. xviii. 30). 
While wandering through the country in search of 
a home, the young Levite of Bethlehem-Judah 
came to the house of Micaiah, the rich Ephrâmite, 
and was by him appointed to be a kind of private 
champion, to minister in the house of gods, or 
sanctuary, which Micaiah had made in imitation of 
that at Shiloh. He was recognized by the five 
Danite spies appointed by their tribe to search the 
land for an inheritance, who lodged in the house 
of Micaiah on their way northwards. The favorable 
answer which he gave when consulted with regard 
to the issue of their expedition probably induced 
them, on their march to Laish with the warriors 
of their tribe, to turn aside again to the house of 
Micaiah, and carry off much gold and treasure, still 
continuing to hope till at last to make success certain. 
Jonathan, to whose ambition they appealed, accom-
panied them, in spite of the remonstrances of his 
patron; he was present at the massacre of the de-
fenseless inhabitants of Laish, and in the new city, 
which rose from its ashes, he was constituted priest 
of the graven image, an office which became heredi-
tary in his family till the Captivity. The Targum of 
1. Joseph, on 1 Chr. xxvii. 16, identifies him 
with Sheleah the son of Gershom, who is there 
said to have reigned (בֵּן מִן נָוִים דַּבָּר) in his old 
age, and to have been appointed by David as chief 
over his treasures. All this arises from a play 
upon the name Sheleah, from which this meaning is 
extracted in accordance with a favorite practice of 
The Targumist. 6. (Jonathan.) One of the sons of Adin (Ezr. 
viii. 6), whose representative Ebed returned with 
Ezra at the head of fifty men, a number which is 
increased (Ezr. viii. 32) to a hundred and fifty (Ezr. 
vi. 32, where Jonathan is written לאדבש). 
7. [In 1 Esdr. 1, 2, 32: Jonathan.] A priest, 
the son of Asahel, one of the four who assisted Ezra 
in investigating the marriages with foreign women, 
which had been contracted by the people who 
returned from Babylon (Ezra x. 15; 1 Esdr. ix. 
14). 8. [Vat. Alex. FA. omit.] A priest, and one of 
the chief of the fathers in the days of Jeshua, 
son of Jehohanan. He was the representative of 
the family of Melch (Neh. xii. 14).

9. One of the sons of Kareth, and brother of 
Jonathan (Jer. vii. 8). The LXX. in this passage 
omit his name altogether, and in this they are sup-
ported by two of Kennicott's MSS., and the parallel 
passage of 2 K. xxv. 28. In three others of Ken-
nicott's it was erased, and was originally omitted 
in three of Da Costa's. He was one of the captains 
of the army who had escaped from Jerusalem in 
the final assault by the Chaldeans, and, after the 
capture of Zedekiah at Jericho, had crossed the 
Jordan, and remained in the open country of the 
Ammonites till the victorious army had retired with 
their spoil and captives. He accompanied his 
brother Johanan and the other captains, who re-

JONATHAN

sorted to Gedaliah at Mizpah, and from that time we hear nothing more of him. Hitzig decides against the LXX. and the MSS. which omit the name (Der Proph. Jeremiaus), on the ground that the very similarity between Jonathan and Josiah favors the belief that they were brothers.

W. A. W.

10. (Jonathas; [FA. once (tl) arrow-v.)
Son of Saul, and his successor in the high-priesthood. The only fact connected with his pontificate recorded in Scripture, is that the genealogical records of the priests and Levites were kept in his day (Neh. xii. 11, 22), and that the chronicles of the state were continued to his time (2b. 23). Jonathan (or, as he is called in Neh. xii. 22, 23, John [Johann]) lived, of course, long after the death of Nehemiah, and in the reign of Artaxerxes Meneon.

Josephus, who also calls him John, as do Eusebius and Nicephorus likewise, relates that he murdered his own brother Jesus in the Temple, because Jesus was endeavoring to get the high-priesthood from him through the influence of Bagoes the Persian general. He adds that John by this means brought two great judgments upon the Jews: the one, that Bagoes entered into the Temple and polluted it; the other, that he imposed a heavy tax of 50 shekels upon every lamb offered in sacrifice, to punish them for this horrible crime (A. J. xi. 7, § 4). Jonathan, or John, was high-priest for 32 years, according to Eusebius and the Alexander. Chron. (Sch, de Success, in P. L. cap. vii.). Milman speaks of the murder of Jesus as "the only memorable transaction in the annals of Judea from the death of Nehemiah to the time of Alexander the Great." (Hist. of Jesus, ii. 29).

11. [Vat. FA. (!) arrow-.
Father of Zechariah, a priest who blew the trumpet at the dedication of the wall (Neh. xii. 35). He seems to have been of the course of Shemen. The words "son of" seem to be improperly inserted before the following name, Mattaniah, as appears by comparing xi. 17.

A. C. H.

12. (Jonatha). 1 Esdr. viii. 32. [See No. 6.]

13. [Sin.1 Macc. ii. 5, ! Jonatha; Sin.2 Alex. !! Jonathas; so Sin. in v. 17: Jonathos.] A son of Mattathias, and leader of the Jews in their war of independence after the death of his brother Judas Maccabaeus, b. c. 161 (1 Macc. ix. 19 ff.). [Mac-cabees.]

14. [Alex. in xi. 70 ! Jonatha, pen.] A son of Absalom (1 Macc. xiii. 11), sent by Simon with a force to occupy Joppa, which was already in the hands of the Jews (1 Macc. xii. 33), though probably held only by a weak garrison. Jonathan expelled the inhabitants ( τοις υπαρ η υππαιρα τοις υπαρ; cf. Jos. Ant. xiii. 6, § 3) and secured the city. Jonathan was probably a brother of Mattathias (2) (1 Macc. xi. 70).

15. [Jonatha; Alex. in viii. 22, !! Jonathas; Jonathas.] A priest who is said to have offered up a solemn prayer on the occasion of the sacrifice made by Nehemiah after the recovery of the sacred fire (2 Macc. i. 23 ff.; cf. Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Israel. iv. 184 f.). The narrative is interesting, as it presents a singular example of the combination of public prayer with sacrifice (Grimm, ad 2 Macc. i. c.).

B. F. W.

JONATHAS (Jonathas; [Vat. Alex. isor [Vulg. omit; Old Lat.] Jonathas; adi, Nathan) the Latin form of the common name Jonathan, which is preserved in A. V. in Tob. v. 13.

B. F. W.

JONATH-E-LIM-RECHOKIM (Jonath-e-lim-rechokim, a dumb dove of (in) distant places), a phrase found once only in the Bible, as a heading to the 56th psalm. Critics and commentators are very far from being agreed on its meaning. Rashi considers that David employed the phrase to describe his own unhappy condition when, exiled from the land of Israel, he was living with Achish, and was an object of suspicion and hatred to the people of Goliath: thus was he amongst the Philistines as a mute (mizpah) dove. Kirche supplies the following commentary: "The Philistines sought to seize and slay David (1 Sam. xxxii. 14-11), and he, in his terror, and pretending to have lost his reason, called himself Jonath, even as a dove driven from her cote." Knapp's explanation "on the oppression of foreign rulers"—assigning to Eleon the same meaning which it has in Ex. xiv. 15—is in harmony with the contents of the psalm, and is worthy of consideration. De Wette translates Jonath Elem Rechokim "dove of the distant terebintins," or "of the dove of dullness (Stummheit) among the strangers" or "in distant places.

According to the Septuagint, ἵππος τοῦ λιόν τοῦ ἄπω τῶν άγιων μεσαρχησιον, "on the people far removed from the holy places" (probably ἦλθον = ἦλθον, the Temple-hall; see Orient. Literatur-Blatt, p. 579, year 1841), a rendering which very nearly agrees with the Chaldee paraphrase: "On the congregation of Israel, compared with a mute dove while exiled from their cities, but who come back again and offer praise to the Lord of the Universe." Alon Ezra, who regards Jonath Elem Rechokim as merely indicating the modulation or the rhythm of the psalm (comp. the title ἔλεος ἵππος), appears to come the nearest to the meaning of the passage in his explanation, "after the melody of the air which begins Jonath-elem-rechokim." In the Biewer to Mendelssohn's version of the Psalms Jonath Elen Rechokim is mentioned as a musical instrument which produced dull, mournful sounds. "Some take it for a pipe called in Greek άλων, ἵππος, from ἵππος, Greek, which would make the inscription read "the long Grecian pipe," but this does not appear to us admissible." (Bouvier's Preface, p. 25).

D. W. M.

JOPPA (Jonath, i. e. Yaffo, beauty; the A. V. follows the Greek form, except once, ἔλεος: τοῦ νομίμου, LXX. N. T. and Vulg. [Joppa]: Ipan). Joseph,

—at least in the most recent editions—Strabo, and others: now Yaffo or Jaffa), a town on the S. W. coast of Palestine, the port of Jerusalem in the days of Solomon, as it has been ever since. Its etymology is variously explained; some deriving it from "Japheth," others from "Iopa," daughter of Eoheus and wife of Cepheus, Andromeda's father, its reputed founder; others interpreting it "the

* The Ordinance Survey (p. 21) makes Joppa a little over 39 miles from Jerusalem (Olive) by the way of Jimmon (Ginno).
watch-tower of joy," or "beauty," and so forth (Reldand, "Pulitien," p. 384). The fact is, that from its being a sea-port, it had a profane, as well as a sacred history. Pliny following Mela (De situ orb. i. 12), says that it was of ante-flood antiquity (Naut. Hist. v. 14); and even Sir John Manningville, in the 14th century, bears witness though perhaps with even less certainty than Mela, that Joppa was a constant port ("Every Travels in II.", p. 142). According to Josephus, it originally belonged to the Phoenicians (Ant. xiii. 15, § 4). Here, writes Strabo, some say Andromeda was exposed to the whale (Geograph. xvi. p. 759; comp. Muller's Hist. Geoc. Eryman. vol. iv. p. 325, and his Geograph. Geoc. Min. vol. i. p. 79), and he appeals to its elevated position in behalf of those who said the scene there; though in order to do so consistently, he had already shown that it would be necessary to transport Joppa into Ethiopia by the Phoenicians (Strab. i. p. 43). However, in Pliny's age—and Josephus had just before affirmed the same (Hist. Nat. iii. 9, § 3)—they still showed the chains by which Andromeda was bound; and not only so, but M. Scarrus the younger, the same that was so much employed in Judea by Pompey (Hist. Nat. iii. 6, § 218), had the bones of the monster transported to Rome from Joppa—where till then they had been exhibited (Mela, ibid.)—and displayed them there during his residence to the public amongst other prodigies. Nor would they have been uninteresting to the modern geologist, if his report be correct. For they measured 40 feet in length; the span of the ribs exceeding that of the Indian elephant; and the thickness of the spine or vertebrae being one foot and a half "semaepheidos," i.e. in circumference—when Solinus says "semaepheidos," he means in diameter, see Plin. Nat. Hist. ix. 5 and the note, Delphin ed.). Reldand would trace the adventures of Joppa in this legendary guise (see above); but it is far more probable that it symbolizes the first interchange of commerce between the Greeks, personified in their errant hero Persus, and the Phoenicians, whose lovely—but till then neglected—clane may be well shadowed forth in the fair virgin Andromeda. Persus, in the tale, is said to have plunged his dagger into the right shoulder of the monster. Possibly he may have discovered or improved the harbor, the rear from whose foaming reefs on the north, could scarcely have been surpassed by the barkings of Seyla or Charybdis. Even the chains shown there may have been those by which his ship was attached to the shore. Kings used by the Romans for mooring their vessels are still to be seen near Terracina in the S. angle of the ancient port (Murray’s Handb. for S. Italy, p. 10, 24 ed.).

Returning to the province of history, we find that Japho or Joppa was situated in the portion of Don (Josh. xix. 46) on the coast towards the south; and on a hill so high v. Mela was under the assurance (but incorrectly) that Jerusalem was visible from its summit. Having a harbor attached to it—though always, as still, a dangerous one—it became the port of Jerusalem, when Jerusalem became metropolis of the kingdom of house of David, and certainly never did port and metropolis more strikingly resemble each other in difficulty of approach both by sea and land. Hence, except in journeys to and from Jerusalem, it was not much used. In St. Paul's travels, for instance, the starting-points by water are, Antioch (Acts xv. 39, via the Lycus); it is presumed—xviii. 22, 23, was probably a landing-place on this voyage; xvii. 30, and xviii. 2, and once Seleucia (xii. 4, namely that at the mouth of the Orontes). Also once Antioch (xiv. 26) and once Tyre, as a landing place xxx. 3). And the same preference for the more northern ports is observable in the early pilgrims, beginning with him of Bordeaux.

But Joppa was the place fixed upon for the cedar and pine-wood, from Mount Lebanon, to be hauled by the servants of Hiram king of Tyre: thence to be conveyed to Jerusalem by the servants of Solomon—for the erection of the first “house of habitation” ever made with hands for the invisible Jehovah. It was by way of Joppa, similarly, that like materials were conveyed from the same locality, by permission of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the 2d Temple under Zerubbabel (1 K. v. 9; 2 Chr. xxiv. 16). Here, Josephus, whenever and wherever he may have lived (2 K. xiv. 25 certainly does not clear up the first of these points), “took ship to flee from the presence of his Maker,” and accomplished that singular history, which our Lord has appropriated as a type of one of the principal scenes in the great drama of His own (Jon. i. 3; Matt. xii. 40). Here, lastly, on the house-top of Simon the tanner, “by the sea-side”—with the view therefore circumscribed on the E. by the high ground on which the town stood: but commanding a boundless prospect over the western waters—St. Peter had his vision of tolerance,” as it has been hapily designated, and went forth like a 2d Person—but from the East—to emancipate, from still worse thraldom, the virgin daughter of the West.

The Christian poet Arator has not failed to discover a mystic connection between the raising to life of the aged Tabitha—the occasion of St. Peter’s visit to Joppa—and the baptism of the first gentile household (De Act. Apost. i. 840, ap. Migne, Patrol. Curs. Comp. Ivii. 161). These are the great Biblical events of which Joppa has been the scene. In the interval that elapsed between the Old and New Dispensations it experienced many vicissitudes. It had sided with Ahab and was attacked and captured by Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Mac. x. 76). It witnessed the meeting between the latter and Ptolemy (ibid. xi. 6). Simon had his suspicions of its inhabitants, and set a garrison there (ibid. xii. 34), which he afterwards strengthened considerably (ibid. xiii. 11). But when peace was restored, he reestablished it once more as a haven (ibid. xiv. 5). He likewise rebuilt the fortifications (ibid. xiv. 34). This occupation of Joppa was one of Josephus’ charges against Antiochus, son of Demetrius, against Simon; but the latter alleged in excuse the mischief which had been done by its inhabitants to his fellow citizens (ibid. xx. 30 and 35). It would appear that Judea Maccabaeus had burnt their places in the house of

Ptolomeus (ver. 7). Possibly also Paul disembarked at Seleucia, not Antioch (Acts xiv. 25), for in such cases it was very common to speak of the town and its harbor as one compass (Acts xx. 6). The Orontes, it is true, was navigable at that time (though it is no longer so) as far up as Antioch.
harrow some time back for a gross act of barbarity (2 Macc. xii. 6). Tribute was subsequently exacted for its possession from Hyrcanus by Antiochus Sidetes. By Pompey it was once more made independent, and comprehended under Syria (Joseph, Ant. xiv. 4, § 4); but by Cesar it was not only restored to the Jews, but its revenues — whether from land or from export-duties — were bestowed upon the 20,000 Jews and his helpers (xv. 10, § 6). When Herod the Great commenced operations, it was seized by him, lest he should leave a hostile stronghold in his rear, when he marched upon Jerusalem (xiv. 13, § 1), and Augustus confirmed him in its possession (xv. 7, § 4). It was afterward assigned to Archelaus, when constituted ethnarch (xvii. 11, § 4), and passed with Syria under Ovencus, when Archelaus had been deposed (xvii. 12, § 5). Under Cestius (i.e. Gesius Florus) it was destroyed amidst great slaughter of its inhabitants (Bell. Jud. ii. 18, § 10); and such a nest of pirates had it become, when Vespasian arrived in those parts, that it underwent a second and entire destruction — together with the adjacent villages — at his hands (iii. 9, § 3). Thus it appears that this part had already begun to be the den of robbers and outcasts which it was in Strabo's time (Geog. xvi. p. 759); while the district around it was so populous, that from Jamnia, a neighboring town, and its vicinity, 40,000 armed men could be collected (ibid.). There was a vast plain around it, as we learn from Josephus (Ant. xiii. 4, § 4); it lay between Jamnia and Cæsarea — the latter of which might be reached "on the margin" from it (Acts x. 9 and 24) — not far from Lydda (Acts i. 28), and distant from Antipatris 150 stadia (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 15, § 1).

When Joppa first became the seat of a Christian bishop is unknown: but the subscriptions of its presbyters are preserved in the acts of various synods of the 5th and 6th centuries (Le Quien, Orient Christian. iii. 629). In the 7th century Arculfus sailed from Joppa to Constantinople, the very route usually taken now by those who visit Jerusalem; but he Scenes here, and his performance (Early Travels in P. by Wright, p. 10). Seawolf, the next who set sail from Joppa, A. D. 1103, is not more explicit (ibid. p. 47). Meanwhile Joppa had been taken possession of by the forces of Godfrey de Bouillon previously to the capture of Jerusalem. The town had been deserted and was allowed to fall into ruin: the Crusaders contenting themselves with possession of the citadel (William of Tyre, Hist. viii. 91); and it was in part assigned subsuequenty for the support of the Church of the Resurrection (ibid. ix. 10); though there seem to have been bishops of Joppa (perhaps only titular at all) between A. D. 1253 and 1363 (Le Quien, 121; comp. p. 1241). Saladin, in A. D. 1188, destroyed its fortifications (Sanct. Secret. Pict. Crusis, lib. iii. part x. e. 5); but Richard of England, who won the contest for Joppa by sickly Queen Elina, and Richard of Devizes in Bohn's Ant. Lib. p. 61). Its last occupation by Christians was that of St. Louis, A. D. 1253, and when he came, it was still a city and governed by a count. "Of the immense sums," says Joinville, "it which cost the king to inclose Jaffa, it does not become me to speak; for they were countless. He inclosed the town from one side of the sea to the other; and there were 24 towers, including small and great. The ditches were well scoured, and kept clean, both within and without. There were 3 gates"... (Chron. of Crus. p. 495, Bohn). So restored it fell into the hands of the Sultan of Egypt, together with the rest of Palestine, by whom it was once more laid in ruins. So much so, that Bertrand de la Broquiere visiting it about the middle of the 15th century, states that it then only consisted of a few tents covered with reeds; having been a strong place under the Christians. Guides, accredited by the Sultan, here met the pilgrims and received the customary tribute from them; and here the papal indulgences offered to pilgrims commenced (Early Travels, p. 280). Finally, Jaffa fell under the Turks, in whose hands it still is, exhibiting the usual decrepitude of the cities possessed by them, and depending on Christian commerce for its feeble existence. During the period of their rule it has been three times sacked — by the Arabs in 1722; by the Manouches in 1775; and lastly, by Napoleon I. in 1799, upon the glories of whose early career "the massacre of Jaffa" leaves a stain that can never be washed out (v. Moroni, Diction. Eccl. s. v.; Porter, Howl. pp. 238, 239).

The existing town contains in round numbers about 4,000 inhabitants, and has three convents, Greek, Latin, and Armenian; and as many, or more monasteries. Its lozenges are worth a visit; yet few places could exhibit a harbor and landing more miserable. Its chief manufacture is soap. The house of Simon the Tanner of course purports to be shown still: nor is its locality locally chosen (Stanley, S. & P. 263, 274; and see Selden's Memoir, 60, 87, 155).

The oranges of Jaffa are the finest in all Palestine and Syria: its pomegranates and water-melons are likewise in high repute, and its gardens and orange and citron-groves deliciously fragrant and fertile. But among its population are fugitives and vagabonds from all countries; and Europeans have little security, whether of life or property, to induce a permanent abode there. E. S. F.

JOPPE (Ioppe; [Alex. 2 Macc. iv. 21, Iophé;] Joppa; [In 2 Macc. xii. 3, 7, I°pb1:spo] Joppa); I Joppa); 1 Esdr. v. 53, 1 Macc. x. 75, 76, xi. 6, xii. 33, xiii. 11, xiv. 5, 94, xv. 28, 35; 2 Macc. iv. 21, xii. 7. [Joppa.]}

JO'RAH (JORAH) [born in autumn, First: = JORAH (JORAH) (Jorah), the ancestor of a family of 112 who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr. ii. 18). In Neh. vii. 24 he appears under the name Hariph, or more correctly the same family are represented as the Beni-Hariph, the variation of name originating probably in a very slight confusion of the letters which compose it. In Ezr. two of De Rossi's MSS., and originally one of Kennicott's, had JORAH, i.e. Jorah, which is the reading of the Syr. and Arab. versions. One of Kennicott's MSS. had the original reading in Ezr. altered to JORAH, i.e. Jorah; and two in Neh. read JORAH, i.e. Hariph, which corresponds with Apela of the Alex. MS., and Haroph of the Syr. In any case the chance confusion of letters which might have caused the variation of the name is so slight, that it is difficult to pronounce which is the true form, the corruption of Jorah into Hariph being as easily conceivable as the reverse. Burrington (Gened. ii. 75) decides — Possibly Jorah and Hariph are interchanged as equivalent in sense (see note a. ii. 1068).
in favor of the latter, but from a comparison of both passages with Ezr. x. 31 we should be inclined to regard Harim (ךָּרַמ) as the true reading in all cases. But on any supposition it is difficult to account for the form Azepurith, or more properly Ἀσπορία, in 1 Esdr. v. 16, which Bunting considers as having originated in a corruption of the two readings in Ezra and Nehemiah, the second syllable arising from an error of the transcriber in mistaking the uncial E for Σ.

JORDAN

1. Of that which is called Jordan in the Holy Scripture, and in the printed copy used by Luther, read Ἰορδαν. i. e. Jorai.

2. The earliest allusion is not so much to the river itself as to the plain or plains which it traverses: Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere . . . even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt...

3. There is no regular description of the Jordan to be met with in Holy Scripture, and it is only by putting scattered notices of it together that we can give the general idea which runs through the Bible respecting it.

4. In the time of David (1 Chr. xxii. 23). A priest [יֵדְרֹמָה] in the reign of Jehoshaphat, one of those employed by him to teach the law of Moses through the cities of Judah (2 Chr. xvii. 8).

5. (בָּדְרָם: [Vat.] Alex. בָּדְרָמָפָר.] Son of Toi, king of Hamath, sent by his father to congratulate David on his victories over Hadadezer (2 Sam. xviii. 10). [вести.


JORDAN (יוֹרָד, i. e. Yarden, always with the definite article יֵדְרֹמָה, except Ps. xiii. 6 and Job xli. 23, from יֵדְרָם, Jorai, "to descend": [ירושים: Jordanes: now called by the Arabs edh-Sherif, or "the watering-place," with the addition of el-Kebir, "the great," to distinguish it from the Sheriat el-Mondhir, the Hieronaxa, a river that has never been known to have flowed into a sea that has never known a port — has never been a high road to more hospitable coasts — has never possessed a fishery — a river that has never boasted of a single town of eminence upon its banks. It winds through scenery remarkable rather for smoothness and tameness than for bold outline. Its course is not much above 200 miles from first to last, less than 1-15th of that of the Nile — from the roots of Anti-Lebanon, where it bursts forth from its various sources in all its purity, to the head of the Dead Sea, where it loses itself and its tributaries in the unfathomable chasm.

Such is the river of "great plain" of Palestine — the "Descender" — if not "the river of God" in the book of Psalms, at least that of His chosen people throughout their history. As Joppa could never be made easy of access or commodious for traffic as a commercial city, so neither could Jordan ever vie with the Thames or the Tiber as a river of the world, nor with the rivers of Sanaan's preference, the Phraer and Alama, for the natural beauty of its banks. These

the picturesque, over the Jordan, that Gerizim, and Samaria could over Zion and Jerusalem.

We propose to inquire, (i.) what is said about the Jordan in Holy Scripture; (ii.) the accounts given of it by Josephus and others of the same date; (iii.) the statements respecting it by later writers and travelers.

1. There is no regular description of the Jordan to be met with in Holy Scripture, and it is only by putting scattered notices of it together that we can give the general idea which runs through the Bible respecting it.

2. We must anticipate events slightly to be able to speak of the fords or passages of the Jordan. Jordan is inexhaustible in the book of Job (xli. 23), and deep enough to prove a formidable passage for belligerents (1 Mac. iv. 49); yet, as in all rivers of the same magnitude, there were shallows where it could be forded on foot. There were fords over against Jericho, to which point the men of Jericho pursued the spies (Jos. ii. 7), the same probably that are said to be "toward Moab" in the book of Judges, where the Moabites were slaughtered (iii. 28). Higher up, perhaps over against Sicech, some way above where the little river Jabbok (דַּבְּק) rises, were the Jordan, were the fords or passages of Bethabar (probably the Bethalmar, "house of passage," of the Gospel, though most moderns would read Bethany, see Stanley, S. P. p. 308, note 2d ed.), where Gideon lay in wait for the Midianites (Judg. vii. 24), and where the men of Gilead slew the Ephraimites (xii. 6). Not far off, in the clay ground between Sicech and Zarthan, were the Jordan, were the fords or passages of Bethel (probably the Bethalmar, "house of passage," of the Gospel, though most moderns would read Bethany, see Stanley, S. P. p. 308, note 2d ed.), where Gideon lay in wait for the Midianites (Judg. vii. 24), and where the men of Gilead slew the Ephraimites (xii. 6).

The fords undeniably witnessed the first recorded passage of the Jordan in the O. T.: we say recorded, because there can be little dispute but that Abraham must have crossed it likewise. But only the passage of Jacob is mentioned, and that in remarkable language: "With my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two banks" (Gen. xxxii. 10, and Jabbok in connection with it, ver. 22). And Jordan was next crossed — over against Jericho — by Joshua, the son of Nun, at the head of the descendants of the twelve sons of him who signalized the first passage. The magnitude of their operations may be inferred from the fact, that — of the children of Reuben and of Gad, and half the tribe of Manasseh.
only—"about 40,000 prepared for war passed over before the Lord unto battle." (Josh. iv. 13 and 14). The ceremonial of this second crossing is too well known to need recapitulation. It may be observed, however, that, unlike the passage of the Red Sea, where the intermediate agency of a strong east wind is freely admitted (Ex. xiv. 21), it is here said, in terms equally explicit, not only that the river was then unusually full of water, but that the waters which came down from above stood and rose upon an heap—"that the waters came down toward the sea of the plain . . . failed and were cut off," as soon as ever the feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped in the brim of the water" (Josh. iii. 15, 16). That it happened in harvest-time is seen also from ch. v. 10-12. Finally, with regard to the memorial of the twelve stones, such had been the altar erected by Moses "under the hill" (Ex. xxiv. 4); such, probably, the altar erected by Joshua upon Mount Ebal, though the number of stones is not defined (Josh. viii. 31); and such, long afterwards, the altar erected by Elijah (I K. xviii. 31). Whether these twelve stones were deposited in, or on the banks of, the Jordan, or whether there were two sets, one for each locality, has been disputed. Josephus only recognizes a single construction—that of an altar—in his narrative; and this was, according to him, in the present instance, 50 staedia from the river, and 10 staedia from Jericho, where the people encamped, with the stones which the heads of their tribes had brought from out of the bed of the Jordan. It may be added that Josephus seems both to admit a miracle, both in the passage of the Jordan and that of the Red Sea (Ant. v. 1, § 4, ii. 16, § 8). From their vicinity to Jerusalem these lower fords were much used; David, it is probable, passed over them in one instance to fight the Syrians (2 Sam. x. 17); and subsequently, when a fugitive himself, in his way to Mahanaim (xvii. 22), on the east bank. Hither Judah came to re-conduct the king home (2 Sam. xix. 15), and on this occasion a ferry-boat—If the Hebrew word has been rightly rendered—said to have been employed (ver. 18). Somewhere in these parts Elijah must have smitten the waters with his mantle, "so that they divided hither and thither" (2 K. ii. 8), for he had just left Jericho (ver. 4), and by the same route that he went did Elisha probably return (ver. 14). Naaman, on the other hand, may be supposed to have performed his ablutions in the upper fords, for Elisha was then in Samaria (v. 3), and it was by these fords doubtless that the Syrians fled when miraculously dispossessed through his instrumentality (vii. 15). Finally, it was probable in these upper fords that Judas and his followers went over into the great plain before Bethsan—not that they crossed over against Bethsan (Joseph. Ant. xii. 8, § 5), when they were retracing their steps from the land of Gilead to Jerusalem (1 Macc. v. 52).

Thus there were two customary places, at which the Jordan was fordable, though there may have been more, particularly during the summer, which are not mentioned. And it must have been at one of these, if not at both, that baptism was afterwards administered by St. John and by the disciples of our Lord. The plain inference from the Gospels would appear to be that these baptisms were administered in more places than one. There was one place where St. John baptized in the first instance (John x. 40), though it is not named. There was Bethabara—probably the upper fords—that the Baptist, having previously baptized our Lord—whether there or elsewhere—bears record to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Him who was in Capernaum (i. 29-34). There was Enon, near to Salim, to the north, where St. John was baptizing upon another occasion, "because there was much water there" (iii. 21). This was during the summer evidently (comp. ii. 23-29), that is, long after the feast of the Passover, and the river had become lower, so that it was necessary to resort to some place where the water was deeper than at the ordinary fords. There was some place "in the land of Judaea" where our Lord, or rather his disciples, baptized about the same time (iii. 22). And lastly, there was the place—most probably the lower ford near Jericho—where all "Jerusalem and Judæa" went out to be baptized of John in the Jordan (Matt. iii. 5; Mark i. 5).

Where our Lord was baptized is not stated expressly. What is stated is, (1) that as St. John was a native of some "city in the hill-country of Judæa" (Luke i. 28), so his preaching, commencing "in the wilderness of Judæa" (Matt. iii. 1), embraced "all the country about Jordan" (Luke iii. 3), and drew persons from Galilee, as far off as Nazareth (Mark i. 9) and Bethsaida (John i. 35, 40, 44), and (2) that this baptism from Jordan and the baptism of the multitude from Jerusalem and Judæa preceded that of our Lord (Matt. iii. 6, 13; Mark i. 5, 9); (3) that our Lord's baptism was also distinct from that of the said multitude (Luke iii. 21); and (4) that He came from Nazareth in Galilee, and not from Jerusalem or Judæa, to be baptized. The inference from all which would seem to be, (1) that the first (τὸ πῶλον) baptisms of St. John took place at the lower ford near Jericho, to which not only he himself, a native of Judæa, but all Jerusalem and Judæa likewise, would naturally resort as being the nearest; where similarly our Lord would naturally take refuge when driven out from Jerusalem, and from whence He would be within reach of tidings from Bethany, the scene of his next miracle (John x. 24, 40, xi. 1); (2) that his second were at the upper ford, or Bethabara, whither he had alleged to himself to the course of his preachings, and were designed for the inhabitants of the more northern parts of the Holy Land, among whom were Jesus and Andrew, both from Galilee; (3) that his third and last baptisms were in the neighborhood of Enon and Salim, still further to the north, where there was not generally so much of a ford, but, on the contrary, where the water was still sufficiently deep, notwithstanding the advanced season. Thus St. John would seem to have moved upwards gradually towards Galilee, the seat of Herod's jurisdiction, by whom he was destined to be apprehended and executed; while our Lord, coming from Galilee, probably by way of Samaria, as in the converse case (John iv. 3, 4), would seem to have met him half way, and to have been baptized in the ford nearest to that locality—a ford which had been St. John's of the first recorded crossing. The tradition which asserts Christ to have been baptized in the ford near Jericho, has been obliged to invent a Bethabara near that spot, of which no trace exists in history, to appear consistent with Scripture (Origen, quoted by Alford on John i. 28).

3. These fords—and more fight will be thrown upon their exact site presently—were rendered
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much the more precious in those days from two circumstances. First, it does not appear that there were: then any bridges thrown over, or boats regularly established on, the Jordan, for the purpose of transporting either pedestrians or merchandise from one bank to the other. One case, perhaps, of either bridge or boat is upon record; but it would seem to have been got up expressly for the occasion (2 Sam. xix. 18).4 Neither the LXX. nor Vulg. contain a word about a "boat," and Josephus says expressly that it was a "bridge" that was then extemporized (Ant. vii. 2 [11], § 2). And secondly, because, in the language of the third book of Joshua (xxi. 15), "Jordan overflowed all his banks all the time of harvest: "a "swelling" which, according to the 1st book of Chronicles (xii. 15), commenced "in the first month" (i.e. about the latter end of March), drove the lion from his lair in the days of Jeremiah (xii. 5, xiii. 10, l. 44), and had become a proverb for abundance in the days of Jesus the son of Sirach (Eccles. xxv. 29). The context of the first of these passages may suffice to determine the extent of this exuberance. The meaning is clearly that the channel or bed of the river became brimful, so that the level of the water and of the banks was then the same. Dr. Robinson seems therefore to have good reason for saying that the ancient rise of the river has been greatly exaggerated (i. 540, 2d ed.), so much so as to have been compared to that of the Nile (Ireland, Palestine, xli. 111). Evidently too there is nothing extraordinary whatever in this occurrence. On the contrary, it would be more extraordinary if it were otherwise. All rivers that are fed by melting snows are fuller between March and September than between September and March; but the exact time of their increase varies with the time when the snows melt. The Po and Adige are equally "all during their harvest-time with the Jordan; but the snows on Lebanon melt earlier than on the Alps, and harvest begins later in Italy than in the Holy Land. "The heavy rains of November and December," as Dr. Robinson justly remarks, "find the earth in a parched and thirsty state, and are consequently absorbed into the soil as they fall. The melting of the snows, on the other hand, on the mountainous slopes of Lebanon can only affect the rivers. Possibly the basins of Huleh and Tibersias may so far act as "regulators" upon the Jordan as to delay its swelling till they have been replenished. On the other hand, the snows on Lebanon are certainly melting fast in April.

4. The last feature which remains to be noticed in the Scriptural account of the Jordan is its frequent mention as a boundary: "over Jordan," "this," and "the other side," or "beyond Jordan," were expressions as familiar to the Israelites as "across the water," "this," and "the other side of the Channel," are to English ears. In one sense indeed, that is, in so far as it was the eastern boundary of the land of Canaan, it was the eastern boundary of the promised land (Num. xxxiv. 12). In reality, it was the long serpentine vine, trailing over the ground from N. to S., round which the whole family of the twelve tribes were clustered.

... four tribes of their number—nine tribes and a half—dwelt on the W. of it, and one fifth, or two tribes and a half, on the E. of it, with the Levites in their cities, originally assigned unto them, and it was theirs from its then reputed fountain-head to its exit into the Dead Sea. Those who lived on the E. of it had been allowed to do so on condition of assisting their brethren in their conquests on the W. (Num. xxxii. 20-33); and those who lived on the W. "went out with one consent" when their countrymen on the E. were threatened (Josh. xiii. 2). The great altar built by the children of Reuben, of Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, on the banks of the Jordan, was designed as a witness of this intercommunion and mutual interest (Josh. xiii. 10-29). In fact, unequal as the two sections were, they were nevertheless regarded as integral parts of the whole land; and thus there were three cities of refuge for the man-slayer appointed on the E. of the Jordan; and there were three cities and more on the W.—in both cases moreover equi-distant one from the other (Num. xxxv. 9-13; Josh. xx. 7-9; Lewis, Heb. Republ. ii. 13). When these territorial divisions had been broken up in the captivities of Israel and Judah, some of the "coasts beyond Jordan" seem to have been retained under Judaean (Jud. xxvii).

H. As the passage which is supposed to speak of "the fountain of Phaiah" (Num. xxxiv. 11, and Patrick ed. 1., see below) is by no means clear, we cannot appeal to Holy Scripture for any information respecting the sources of the Jordan. What Josephus and others say about the Jordan may be briefly told. Panium, says Josephus (i.e. the sanctuary of Pan), appears to be the source of the Jordan; whereas it has a secret passage hither under ground from Phaiah, as it is called, about 120 stadia distant from Cassara, on the road to Trachonitis, and on the right hand side of, and not far from, the road. Being a wheel-shaped pool, it is rightly called Phaiah from its rotundity (serpneumia); yet the water always remains there up to the brim, neither subduing nor overflowing. That this is the true source of the Jordan was first discovered by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis—for by that name it was more usually known at that time—and it was taken up at Panium. Panium was always a lovely spot; but the embellishments of Agrippa, which were sumptuous, added greatly to its natural charms (from Bell. Jud. i. 21, § 3; and Ant. x. 10, § 3, it appears that the temple there was due to Herald the Great). It is from this cave at all events that the Jordan commences its estuarian course above ground; traversing the marshes and fens of Seemenchitis (L. Menom or Hihkh), and then, after a course of 120 stadia, passing by the town Julias, and intersecting the Lake of Genesaret, winds its way through a considerable wilderness, till it finds its exit in the Lake Asphaltites (B. J. iii. 10, § 7). Elsewhere he somewhat modifies his assertion respecting the nature of the great plain [Luke 4]; while on the physical beauties of Genesaret, the palms and figs, olives and grapes, of Israel, p. 30, 2d ed.). Some explorers, as Costigan, Molyneux, and Lynch, have launched boats on the Jordan, and with difficulty have made their way to the Dead Sea; but for ordinary written heating and is still impracticable on account of the many violent rapids in the river, and to some extent unnecessary on so count of the fords.
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... that floured round it, and the fish for which its waters were far-famed, is still more eloquent (B. J. iii. 10, § 8). In the first chapter of the next book (iv. 1, § 1) he notices more fountains at a place called Daphne (still Dısfıch, see Rob. Bibl. Rev. vol. iii. p. 339, note), immediately under the temple of the golden calf, which he calls the sources of the little, and its communication with the great, Jordan (comp. Ant. i. 10, § 1, v. 3, § 3). Deut. vii. § 1, W. Robinson has explained it by a stream upon its sources, Phausius, who had visited the Jordan, dedicates upon its extraordinary disappearance. He cannot get over its losing itself in the Dead Sea, and compares it to the submarine course of the Alpheus from Greece to Sicily (lib. v. 7, 4, ed. Dindorf.). Pliny goes so far as to say that the Jordan instinctively shrinks from entering that dread lake by which it is swallowed up. On the other hand Pliny attributes its rise to the fountain of Panaces, from which, he adds, Cesarea was named (II. N. v. 15). Lastly, Strabo speaks of the aromatic reeds and rushes, and even balsam, that grew on the shores and marshes round Gennesaret; but he can be believed when he asserts that the Arabians and others were in the habit of wading up the Jordan with car·po/ (xvi. 2, 15.) It will be remembered that he wrote during the first days of the empire, when there were boats in abundance upon Gennesaret (John vii. 22-24).

III. Among the latest travellers who have explored and afterwards written upon the course of the Jordan, are Messrs. Irby and Mangles (Journal of Trav.). Dr. Robinson, Lient. Lynch and party (Narrat. and Off. Rep.), Capt. Newbold (Journal of R. Asiatic. S., vol. xvi. p. 8 ff.), Rev. W. Thomson (Bibl. Soc., vol. iii. p. 184 ff.), and Professor Stanley. While making our best acknowledgments to these writers for what is contained in the following summary, we shall take the liberty of offering one or two criticisms where personal inspection constrains us demurring to their conclusions. According to the older commentators " Dan " was a stream that rose in a fountain called Phila, in the district called Panium, and among the roots of Lebanon; then after a subterraneous course, reappeared near the town called Panana, Dan, or Cesarea, Philippia, where it was joined by a very small stream called " Jor;" and hence united both names in one—Jordan (Corn. a Lop. in Dent. xxiii. 22). It has been well observed that the Hebrew word " Jordan, has no relation whatever to the name Dan; and also that the river had borne that name from the days of Abraham, and from the days of Job, at least five centuries before the name of Dan was given to the city at its source (Robinson, iii. 412). It should be added that the number of streams meeting at or about Bánias very far exceeds two.

This is one of the points on which we are compelled to dissent from one and all of the foregoing travellers—not one of them dwells upon the phenomenon that from the village of Ḥasbāliyyeh on the N. W. to the village of Shiba'h on the N. E. of Bánias, the entire slope of Anti-Lebanon is alive with bursting fountains and gushing streams, every one of which, great or small, finds its way sooner or later into the swamp between Bánias and lake Ḥaleh, and eventually becomes part of the Jordan. Incidentally this of course comes out; but surely this, and not those three prime sources exclusively, to which Captain Newbold has most justly added a fourth, passed over without a word by the rest—should be made the prominent feature of that charmed locality. The fact is, that is the exception of Messrs. Irby and Mangles, he is the only traveller of them all who has in any degree explored the S. E. side of the slope; the route of the others being from Bánias to Ḥashbāliyyeh on the western side. Then again all have travelled in the months of April, May, or June—that is, before the melting of the snows had ceased to have influence—except Messrs. Irby and Mangles, whose scanty notices were made in February, or just after the heavy rains. Whereas in order to be able to decide to which of those sources Jordan is most indebted, the latter end of October, the end of the dry season, and just before the rains set in—when none but streams possessed of inherent vitality are in existence—should have been chosen. Far be it from us to depreciate those time-honoured parent springs—the noble fountain (of Daphne) under the Tell, or hill of Dan (Tell el-Kâdiyeh), which "gushes out all at once a beautiful river of delicious water " in the midst of verdure and welcome shade; still less, that magnificent " burst of water out of the low slope " in front of the picturesque cave of Bánias, inscriptions in the niches of which still testify to the deepv that was once worshipped there, and to the royal munificence that adorned the same. Travellers, nevertheless, who have seen Cætumus (and to read of it in Pliny, Ep. lib. viii. 8, is almost to see), Vaucou, or even Holywell in N. Wales, will have seen something of the kind. But what shall we say to " the bold perpendicular rock " near Ḥashbāliyyeh, " from beneath which," we are told, "the river gushes copious, transparent, and cool, from two regular streams, one to the N. E., one to the other to the N. W. " for if this source, being the most distant of all, may "claim in a strictly scientific sense to be the parent stream of the whole valley," then let us be prepared on the same principle to trace the Mississippi back to the Missouri. Besides, Captain Newbold—and we can here rouch for his statement—has detected a 4th source, which according to the Arabs, is never dry, in what is known as the mountain-torrent Ḥaθīb el-Kid, and Messrs. Irby and Mangles as a "rivulet;" but which the Captain appears to have followed to the springs called El-Shor, though we must add, that its sources, according to our impression, lie considerably more to the N. It runs past the ruined walls and forts of Bánias on the S. E. Nobody that has seen its dizzy entaracts in the month of April, or its deeprock-hewn bed at all other seasons, can speak lightly of it; though it is naturally lost upon all those who quit Bánias for the N. W.

Again, we make bold to say, that the Phila of Josephus has not yet been identified. Any lake would have been called Phila by the Greeks that bore that shape (Ercand, Palast. 41; comp. Hofmann's Lex. Univ. s. v.; if we mistake not, the Lake of Delos is a further instance). But Ṣirkit er-Rem, or the alleged Phila, lying to the S. E. of and at some distance from the cave of Bánias, we are not surprised that the story of Josephus should be voted absurd; for he is thus made to say seriously, what even to a tragic poet was the climax of impossibilities (Eur. Med. 410), that " the fountains of sacred streams flow backwards," or up-hill. The Arabs doubtless heard of the story of the chaff through some dragoon, who heard it from his masters; but the direction of Shiba'h—" six hours higher
ap the southern declivity of Mount Hermon, and therefore to the N. E. of Banâda is, by doubt the true one, as long since pointed out by Erland (ibid., and see his Map) for the site of the lake. According to Lynch, "a very large fountain issuing from the base of a high rock" exists there (Off. R. P., p. 112). Lastly, the actual description given by Captain Newbold of the lake Merj el-Man, "3 hrs. E. 10th N. from Banâda," proves, at all events, that there is a circular lake, besides Hirket er-Râm, in those regions, and in the very direction indicated by the historian. We cannot help, therefore, entertaining the suspicion that Merj el-Man will turn out to be the true Thâlah.

Once more, Mr. Thomson had stated that the Hotâbâégâ, when it reaches the L. Hûch, has been immensely enlarged by the waters from the great fountains of Banâda, Tell el-Kâdiy, el-Melihâbâ, Derrêlit or Derrît" (both on the western side of the plain), "and innumerable other springs." Captain Newbold, on the other hand, found it impossible to ascertain whether such a junction took place, nor, before they enter the lake (p. 15). His Arabs strongly maintained the negative. It was reserved for Dr. Robinson in 1832 to settle the question of their previous junction, which according to him may be witnessed one third of a mile N. of Tell Shesh Yaiqâf; so that they enter Hûchâb, as Kâb, as if in one united mass (vol. iii. p. 295). Its passage through and from Gennesaret is that of uninterrupted unity. But that the waters of the Jordan do not descend to mingle in any sense with those of the lake, is as true as that the Rhône and the Lake of Genève never embrace. Any comparison between the waters of the Jordan, as a fertilizer, or as a beverage, with those of the Nile, would be no less unreal; while from the immense amount of vegetable matter which they contain, the former decomposes with a rapidity perfectly marvelous when kept. Travellers, therefore, who arc desirous of preserving them, will do well to go to the fountain-heads for their supply. There alone they sparkle and look inviting.

"The Jordan enters Gennesaret about two miles below the ruins of the ancient city Julias, or the Bethsaida of Ptolemais, which lay upon its eastern bank. At a distance of about 80 yards, it is about 70 feet wide, a lazy, turbid stream, flowing between low alluvial banks. There are several bars not far from its mouth, where it can be forded. . . . From the site of Bethsaida to Jisr Renât Yâkîb is about six miles. The Jordan here rushes along, a foaming torrent (much of course depending on the season when it is visited), through a narrow winding ravine, shut in by high precipitous banks. Above the bridge the current is less rapid and the banks are lower. The whole distance from the Lake el-Hûch to the Sea of Tiberias is nearly nine miles, and the full of the river is about 600 feet." (Porter's Handbook, part ii, pp. 426-27; comp. Stanley's S. of P., p. 364, note 1, 2d ed.).

The two principal features in the course of the Jordan are its descent and its sinuosity. From its fountain-heads to the point where it is lost to nature, it rushes down one continuous inclined plane, only broken by a series of rapids or precipices falls. Between the Lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, Lieutenant Lynch passed down 27 rapids which he calls threatening; besides a great many more of lesser magnitude. According to the calculations which were then made, the descent if the Jordan in each mile was about 118 English feet; the depression of the Lake of Tiberias below the level of the Mediterranean 553.3; and that of the Dead Sea 331.7 (Robinson, i. 612, note xxx.). Thus "the Descender" may be said to have fairly earned his name. Its sinuosity is not so remarkable in the upper part of its course. Lieutenant Lynch would regard the two phenomena in the light of cause and effect. "The great secret," he says, "of the depression between Lake Tiberias and the Dead Sea is solved by the torrentious course of the Jordan. In a space of 60 miles of latitude and course, or 5 miles of length, the Jordan transverses at least 200 miles" (Off. Letter, p. 265 of Narrat.). During the whole passage of 81 days, the time which it took his boat to reach the Dead Sea from Gennesaret, only one straight reach of any length, about midway between them, i.e. on the 4th day, is noticed. The rate of stream seems to have varied with its relative width and depth. The greatest width mentioned was 190 yards, the point where it enters the Dead Sea. Here it was only 3 feet deep. On the 6th day the width in one place was 80 yards, and the depth only 2 feet; while the current on the whole varied from 2 to 8 knots. On the 5th day the width was 70 yards, with a current of 2 knots, or 30 yards with a current of 6 knots.

The only living tributaries to the Jordan noticed particularly below Gennesaret were the Yarmûk (180 yards wide), and the Geniss (175 yards wide). The mouth of the former of these was passed on the 3d day, 40 yards wide, with moderate current; while the latter, whose course became visible on the 7th day, was, on the 8th day, discovered to have two distinct outlets into the main stream, one of which was then dry. Older writers had distinguished two beds and banks of the Jordan; the first, that occupied by the river in its normal state; the second, comprising the space which it occupied during its swelling or overflow (Martinier, Dict. Geogr., s. v.). Similarly Lieutenant Lynch has remarked, "There are evidently two terraces to the Jordan, and through the lowest one the river runs its serpentine course. From the stream, above the immediate banks, there is, on each side, a singular terrace of low hills, like truncated cones, which is the bluff terminus of an extended table-land, reaching into a distance of two or three miles, and bounded at the foot by hills on the western side" (Narrat., April 13, and comp. what Capt. Newbold says, p. 22). There are no bridges over Jordan which to an earlier date has been assigned than that of the Roman occupation; and there are vestiges of Roman roads in different parts of the country — between Nablûs and Bâisûn for instance — that may well have crossed by these bridges. The Saracens afterwards added to their mules, or restored these which they found in ruins. Thus the bridge called el-Chayûn over the Hotâbâégâ, has two pointed arches and one round (Newbold, p. 13), while the entire architecture of the Jisr Renât Yâkîb (of the daughters of Jacob), 2 miles to the S. of L. Hûch, as well as of the Khan adjacent to it on the eastern side, is pronounced to be Saracenic (ibid., p. 20). A Roman bridge of two arches that traverses the Jordan near the village bearing that name, and was doubtless on the route from Tiberias and Tari- chea to Gadara and Decapolis (ibid., p. 21, Irby, p. 90). Lastly, the bridge of Mâpinîâch, which crosses the Jordan about six miles from the Lake of Gennesaret, was Saracenic; while that near the ford Rimâq was more Roman (Newbold, p. 29 and Lynch, Narr., April 16).
Turning from these artificial constructions to the old bridges of nature — the fords — we find a remarkable yet perfectly independent concurrence between the narrative of Lieutenant Lynch and what has been asserted previously respecting the fords or passages of the Bible. We do not indeed affirm that the localities fit into each other like the pieces of a puzzle. Yet still it is no slight coincidence that no more than three, or at most four regular fords should have been set down by the chroniclers of the American expedition. The two first occur on the same day within a few hours of each other, and are called respectively Wacobs and Sakwat (Off. Rep. pp. 25 and 26). Eighteen miles E. by N. of the last of these were the ruins of Jerash (which our authority confounds with Pella), exactly in a line with which is placed the site of Succoth, or Sükat, in the map of Dr. Robinson; though he admits that arguments are not wanting for placing it some way to the S. (vol. iii. p. 310). The next ford is passed the following, or the 7th day, the ford of Danisch, as it is called, opposite to the commencement of the Wady Zerka, some miles above the junction of that river with the Jordan, and where the road from Nebulus to es-Salt crossed. Could we ascertain the true site of Succoth, we might be better able to decide which of these two fords answered best to the Beth-barah of the Old Test., or Bethabara of the New; and then Elou might be the ford, or one of the two fords, to the N. of it. It is perhaps worthy of note that the neighborhood of the ford Sükat is represented as the dreariest wild imaginable — fearful solitude and monotony (Narr., April 15). That Messrs. Irby and Mangles forded the Jordan near Tarichea was probably due to the ruins of the old Roman bridge; on the contrary, where they forded it on horseback, 13 hour from Beisan, Lynch found the water between 5 and 6 feet deep.

The ford el-Masbi'en a over against Jericho was the last ford put upon record, and it is too well known to need any lengthened notice. Here tra-
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expressing our warmest thanks to our Transatlantic brethren. It was not enough that Dr. Robinson should have eclipsed all other writers who had pre-

cealed him in his noble work upon Palestine, but that a nation from the extreme W.—from a contin-

tent utterly unknown to the Old or New Testa-

ment—should have been the first to accomplish

the navigation of that sacred river, which has been

before the world so prominently for nearly 4000

years; this is a fact which surely ought not to be

passed over by any writer on the Jordan in silence,

or unacknowledged. "

E. S. F.

JORHAS (Ἰωάβος: Jorius) = Joram (1 Esdr. viii. 44; comp. Ezr. viii. 16).

JORIBUS (Ἰωάβος: Joribus) = Joram (1 Esdr. ix. 19; comp. Ezr. x. 18).

JORYM (Ἰωάβις: Jorion), son of Matithah, in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii. 23), in the 13th generation from David inclusive; about con-
temporary, therefore, with Ahaz. The form of the name is anomalous, and should probably be either Joram or Joarim.

A. C. H.

JORKAM (יוּרֵקָם: [diffusion of the peo-

ple, Fürst: ] יְרֵךְ: [Vat. 10/1/0/1/0: Alex. 10/

נָהָוְא: Jeronim], either a descendant of Caleb the son of Hezron, through Hebron, or, as Archi says, the name of a place in the tribe of Judah, of which Raham was prince (1 Chr. ii. 44). It was proba-

bly in the neighborhood of Hebron. "Jerome gives it in the form Jeremah (Jos. ii. 6, 15)."

JOS'ABAD. 1. (יוּשָבָד: [Jehovah is giver: ] יְשַׁבָּד: [Vat. -8/8/0: Alex. 10/0/

אֶפֶד: Jepheb, a proper Jozabad, the Gedalicthe, one of the hardy warriors of Benjamin who led Saul to follow the fortunes of David after his residence among the Philistines at Ziklag (1 Chr. xii. 4).

2. (יוּשָבָד: [Vat. יְשַׁבָּד: Alex. יְשַׁבָּד: Jozabad, son of Jeshua the Levite (1 Esdr. viii. 63; comp. Ezr. viii. 33).

3. (יוּשָבָד: [Vat. יְשַׁבָּד: Alex. יְשַׁבָּד: Jozabad), one of the sons of Belai (1 Esdr. ix. 23).) (יוּשָבָד:)

JOS'APHTH (יוּשָבָד: Josaphat) = Je-

sonaphtah, king of Judah (Matt. i. 8).

JOSAPHIAS (יוּשָבָד: Josaphiach) = Jo-

sephiah (1 Esdr. viii. 36; comp. Ezr. viii. 10).

* JOS'É, A. V., Luke iii. 29 incorrectly for Joseph, which see.

A.

JOSE'ED (יוּשָבָד: Josedec, Jedecch), 1 Esdr. v. 3, 48, 56, vi. 2, 19; Esclus. xlii. 12, = Joseph, le law, or Jozadak or Jozabad, the father of Jeshua, whose name also appears as Josudith (Hag. i. 1).

JOSEPH (יוּשָבָד: [see infra: ] יְשַׁבָּד: [Jos-

eph].)

1. The elder of the two sons of Jacob by Rachel. Like his brethren, he received his name on account of the circumstances of his birth. We read that Rachel was long barren, but that at length she "laced a son; and said, God hath taken away (יוּשָבָד) my reproach and she called his name Joseph (יוּשָבָד:); saying, the Lord will add (יוּשָבָד) to me another son" (Gen. xxx. 27, 28); a hope fulfilled in the birth of Benjamin (comp. xxxv. 17). Thus

arches, iv. 256, 277; Tristram, Natural History of the Bible, pp. 5, 10, 22; and, especially, Osis's translation of Ritter's Groce of Palestine, ii. 11, 29-55, 61, &c H.
JOSEPH

passage seems to indicate a double etymology (from בֵּית and בָּיִם). There is nothing improbable in this explanation, because of the relation of the taking away the reproach to the expectation of another son. Such double etymologies are probably more common in Hebrew names than is generally supposed.

The date of Joseph's birth relatively to that of the coming of Jacob into Egypt is fixed by the mention that he was thirty years old when he became governor of Egypt (xlii. 46), which agrees with the statement that he was "seventeen years old." (xxxvi. 2) about the time that his brethren sold him. He was therefore born about 39 years before Jacob came into Egypt, and, according to the chronology which we hold to be the most probable, B. C. cir. 1906.

After Joseph's birth he is first mentioned as a youth, seventeen years old. As the child of Rachel, and "son of his old age" (xxvii. 3), and doubtless also for his excellence of character, he was beloved by his father above all his brethren. Probably at this time Rachel was already dead and Benjamin but an infant, Benjamin, that other "child of his old age" (xlv. 20), whom Jacob afterwards loved as all that remained of Rachel when he supposed Joseph dead — "his brother is dead, and he alone is left of his mother, and his father loved him" (l.c.). A. Jacob at this time had two small pieces of land in Canaan, Abraham's burying-place at Hebron in the south, and the "parcel of a field, where he [Jacob] had spread his tent." (Gen. xxxiii. 19), at Shechem in the north, the latter being probably, from its price, the lesser of the two. He seems then to have stayed at Hebron with the aged Isaac while his sons kept his flocks. Joseph, we real, brought the evil report of his brethren to his father, and they hated him because his father loved him more than them, and bad shown his preference by making him a dress of blue and vermilion, which appears to have been a long tunic with sleeves, worn by youths and maidens of the richer class. The hatred of Joseph's brethren was increased by his telling of a dream foreboding that they would bow down to him, which was followed by another of the same import. It is remarkable that thus early prophetic dreams appear in Joseph's life. This part of the history (xlviii. 3-11) may perhaps be regarded as a retrospective introduction to the narrative of the great crime of the envious brethren. They had gone to Shechem to feed the flock, and Joseph was sent thither from the vale of Hebron by his father to bring him word of their welfare and that of the flock. They were not at Shechem, but were gone to Dothan, which appears to have been not very far distant, pasturing their flock like the Arabs of the present day, wherever the wild country (ver. 24) was unowned. On Joseph's approach, his brethren, except Reuben, resolved to kill him; but Reuben saved him, persuading them to cast him into a dry pit with the intent that he might restore him to his father. Accordingly when Joseph was come, they stripped him of his tunic and cast him into the pit, "and they sat down to eat bread: and they lifted up their eyes and looked, and beheld, a company of Ishmaelites came from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery (?) and balm and gum ladanum (?); going to carry [it] down to Egypt." (ver. 25). — In passing we must call attention to the interest of this early notice of the trade between Palestine and Egypt. — The Ishmaelites are also called Midianites in the narrative: that the two names are used interchangeably is evident from ver. 28; it must therefore be supposed that one of them is generic; the caravan "came from Gilead" and brought balm; so that it is reasonable to infer the merchants to have been Midianites, and that they are also called Ishmaelites by a kind of generic use of that name. Judith suggested to his brethren to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelites, appealing at once to their covetousness and, in proposing a less cruel course than that on which they were

d According to the order of the nar- rative, Rachel's death preceded the selling of Joseph; it is unlikely that 17 years should have elapsed between the birth of Joseph and that of Benjamin; and as Benjamin had ten sons at the coming into Egypt (xlii. 21), it is scarcely probable that he was born no more than 22 years before. There is moreover no mention of Rachel besides the allusion in the speech of Judah to Joseph, quoted above (xlii. 26), in the whole subsequent narrative, until dying Jacob, when he blesses Ephraim and Manasseh, returns to the thought of his beloved wife, and says, "And as for me, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when we were few; and the Lord had dealt kindly with me in the way of Ephrath; and I buried her there in the way of Ephrath; the same [is] Beth-lehem." (xlii. 7). Joseph's anxiety in Egypt to see Benjamin seems to favor the idea that he had known him as a child. When Joseph was sold, Benjamin can, however, have only been very young.

The name of this dress seems to signify "a tunic reaching to the extremities." It was worn by David's daughter Tamar, being the dress of "the king's daughter."(2 Sam. iii. 38). There seems no reason for the LXX. rendering σαρκικόν, or the Vulg. polypntia, except that it is very likely that such a tunic would be ornamented with colored stripes, or embroidered. The richer classes among the ancient Egyptians wore long dresses of white linen. The people of Palestine and Syria, represented on the Egyptian monuments as enemies or tributaries, wore similar dresses, partly colored, generally with a stripe round the skirts and the borders of the sleeves.

e From Joseph's second dream, and his father's rebuke, it might be inferred that Rachel was living at the time that he dreamt it. It is indeed possible that it may have occurred some time before the selling of Joseph, and been interpreted by Jacob of Joseph, who certainly was not alive at its fulfillment, so that it could not apply to her. Yet, if Leah only survived, Jacob might have spoken of her as Joseph's mother. The dream, moreover, indicates eleven brethren besides the father and mother of Joseph; if therefore Benjamin were already born, Rachel must have been dead: the reference is therefore more probably to Leah, who may have been living when Jacob went into Egypt.

The three articles of commerce carried by the caravan we have rendered spicery, balm, and gum ladanum. The meaning of מָלָאכָם is extremely doubtful: there is nothing to guide us but the renderings of the LXX. rendering σπειράματα, and the Vulg. aromata, and the conjecture of their meaning with that of the name of the second article. As to the מָלָאכָם, there can be no doubt that it was a kind of balm, although its exact kind is difficult to determine. The meaning of מָלָאכָם is not certain: perhaps gum ladanum is a not improbable conjecture.
probably still resolved, to what remnant of brotherly feeling they may still have had. Accordingly they took Joseph out of the pit and sold him "for twenty [shekels] of silver" (ver. 28), which we find to have been, under the Law, the value of a male from five to twenty years old (Lev. xxvii. 34). Probably they took him, in the same manner, in white slaves, and the price, according to the unchangeableness of eastern customs, long remained the same. It is worthy of remark that we here already find the descendants of Abraham's concubines oppressing the Circumcised. Reuben was absent, and on his return to the pit was greatly distressed at not finding Joseph. His brethren pretended to Jacob that Joseph had been killed by some wild beast, taking to him the tunic stained with a kid's blood, while even Reuben forsook to tell him the truth, all speaking constantly of the lost brother as though they knew not what had become of him, and even as dead.

"And Jacob rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days. And all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him: but he refused to be comforted; and he said, For I will go down unto my son mourning into the grave. Thus his father wept for him" (Gen. xxxvii. 34, 35).

Joseph's lamentation shows that he knew of a future state, for what comfort would he have in going into his own grave when he thought that his lost son had been torn by wild beasts? This is one of the cases in which we should certainly understand "Hades" by "the grave," and may translate, "For I will go down unto my son mourning unto Hades." c The Midrash tells Joseph in Egypt to Potiphar, "an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the executioners, an Egyptian" (xxxix. 1; comp. xxxvi. 31)."d We have probably no right to infer, as Gesenius has done (Thes. s. v. I7Ψ), that by the executioner we are to understand the same as the king's guard or body-guard. e This may be the case when the Chaldeans are spoken of, for the immediate infliction of punishment under the very eye of the sovereign was usual both with Solomon and Tartars, as a part of their system of investing the regal power with terror; but the more refined Egyptians and their responsible kings do not seem to have practiced a custom which nothing but necessity could render tolerable. That in this case the crime was less heinous literally, it is found in the control exercised by Potiphar over the king's prison (xxxix. 20), and from the fact that this prison is afterwards shown to have been in the house of the captain of the executioners, that officer then being undoubtedly a successor of Potiphar (xl. 3, 4). The name Potiphar is written in hieroglyphics PEP-PT-PAH or PEP-PT-KA, and signifies "belonging to Ra." (The sun). It occurs again, with a slightly different orthography, Poti-phereh, as the name of Joseph's father-in-law, priest or prince of On. It may be remarked that as Ra was the chief divinity of On, or Heliopolis, it is an interesting undesignated coincidence that the latter should bear a name identical with the divine name.

It is important to observe that a careful comparison of evidence has led us to the conclusion that, at the time that Joseph was sold into Egypt, the country was not united under the rule of a single native line, but governed by several dynasties, of which the Fiftteenth Dynasty, of Shepherd Kings, was the predominant line, the rest being tributary to it. The absolute dominions of this dynasty lay in Lower Egypt, and it would therefore always be most connected with Palestine. The manners described are Egyptian, although there is apparently an occasional slight tinge of Semitism. The date of Joseph's arrival we should consider B. C. cir. 1830. [EGYPT: CHRONOLOGY.]

In Egypt, the second period of Joseph's life begins. As a child he had been a true son, and withstood the evil example of his brethren. He is now to serve a strange master in the hard state of slavery, and his virtue will be put to a severer proof than it had yet sustained. Joseph prospered in the house of the Egyptian, who, seeing that God blessed him, and pleased with his good service, "set him over his house, and all (that) he had he gave into his hand" (xxxix. 4, comp. 5). He was placed over all his master's property with perfect trust, and "the Lord blessed the Egyptian house for Joseph's sake" (ver. 5). The sculptures and paintings of the ancient Egyptian tombs bring vividly before us the daily life and duties of Joseph. The property of great men is shown to have been managed by scribes, who exercised a most methodical and minute supervision over all the operations of agriculture, gardening, the keeping of live stock, and fishing. Every product was carefully registered to check the dishonesty of the laborers, who in Egypt have always been famous in this respect. Probably in no country was farming ever more systematic. Joseph's previous knowledge of tending flocks, and perhaps of husbandry, and his truthful character, exactly fitted him for the post of overseer. How long he filled it we are not told, "Joseph was fair of form and fair in appearance" (xxxix. 6). His master's wife, with the well-known profligacy of the Egyptian women, tempted him, and failing, charged him with the crime she would have made him commit. Potiphar, incensed against Joseph, cast him into prison. It must not be supposed, from the bêttness of the morals of the Egyptians in practice, that the sin of unfaithfulness in among the Israelites during and after the sojourn in Egypt, see art. EGYPT. f The word נֶרֶשׁ, which we have rendered "officer," with the A. V., properly means "smear," as explained in the margin, although it is also used in the Bible in the former sense (Gen. Thes. s. v.). Potiphar's office would scarcely have been given to a commoner, and there is, we believe, no evidence that there were such in the Egyptian courts in ancient times. This very word first occurs in hieroglyphics, written šrs, as a title of Persian functionaries, in inscriptions of the time of the Persian dominion.

g The name הָשָׁרָה must mean "captain of the executioners," from Potiphar's connection with the prison, although the LXX renders it ἐκαστασία.
Joseph

wife was not ranked among the highest vices. The punishment of adulterers was severe, and a moral tale recently interpreted, "The Two Brothers," is founded upon a case nearly resembling that of Joseph. It has, indeed, been suggested that the story was based upon the trial of Joseph, and as it was written for the heir to the throne of Egypt at a later period, there is some reason in the idea that the virtue of one who had held so high a position as Joseph might have been in the mind of the writer, were this part of his history well known to the priests, which, however, is not likely. This incident, moreover, is not so remarkable as to justify great stress being laid upon the similarity to it of the main event of a moral tale. The story of Belerophon might as reasonably be traced to it, were it Egyptian and not Greek. The Muslims have founded upon the history of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, whom they call Yosuff and Zeleckha, a famous religious allegory. This is much to be wondered at, as the Kor-an relates the tempting of Joseph with no material variation in the main particulars from the authentic narrative. The commentators say, that after the death of Potiphar (Kitteer) Joseph married Zeleckha (Sale, ch. xii.). This mistake was probably caused by the circumstance that Joseph's father-in-law bore the same name as his master.

Potiphar, although convinced of Joseph's guilt, does not appear to have brought him before a tribunal, where the enormity of his alleged crime, especially after the trust placed in him, and the fact of his being a foreigner, which was made much of by his master's wife (xxxix. 14, 17), would probably have insured a punishment of the severest kind. He seems to have only cast him into the prison, which appears to have been in his house, or, at least, under his control, since afterwards prisoners are related to have been put in ward [in] the house of the captain of the executioners, into the prison "(xl. 3), and simply, "in ward [in] the captain of the executioners' house" (xli. 10, comp. xl. 7). The prison is described as "a place where the king's prisoners [were] bound" (xxix. 20). Here the hardest time of Joseph's period of probation began. He was cast into prison on a false accusation, to remain there for at least two years, and perhaps for a much longer time. At first he was treated with severity; this we learn from Ps. cx. 2, "He sent a man before them, Joseph [who] was sold for a slave; whose feet they afflicted with the fetter; the iron entered into his soul." (ver. 17, 18). There is probably here a connection between "fetter" and "iron" (comp cxlix. 8), in which case the signification of the last clause would be a various stage of the growth of the tree and fruit as though immediately following one another, would allow the omission of the process of preparing the wine. The evidence of the manuscripts makes it very improbable that unfermented wine was drunk by the ancient inhabitants, so that it seems impossible that it should ever have taken the place of fermented or true wine, which was the national beverage of the higher classes at least.

"And here also have I done nothing that they should put me into the dungeon" (Judg. xvi. 15), does not throw light upon this matter; for although the word used seems properly to mean the worst kind of prison, or the worst part of a prison, here it must be merely equivalent, as in xli. 14, to "גַּלִּית בָּעָשׁוֹ (xxxix. 8), & c., which seems properly a milder term.

It has been imagined, from the account of the reminiscence of the chief of the cup-bearers, that the wine drunk by the king of Egypt may have been the fresh unfermented juice of the grape; but the nature of the dream, which embraces a long period, and merely indicates the various stages of the growth of the tree and fruit as though immediately following one another, would allow the omission of the process of preparing the wine. The evidence of the manuscripts makes it very improbable that unfermented wine was drunk by the ancient inhabitants, so that it seems impossible that it should ever have taken the place of fermented or true wine, which was the national beverage of the higher classes at least.

"Lit. "at the end of two years of days," but we may read "after," or "at the end;" and the word "days" appears merely to indicate that the year was a period of time, or possibly is used to distinguish the ordinary year from a greater period, the year of days from the year of years.

This word is probably of Egyptian origin. [Egypt; Niat.]

There can be no doubt that this is an Egyptian word. The LXX. does not translate it (Gen. xii. 18; Is. xix. 7); and Jesus the son of Strach, as
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There can be no doubt that this is an Egyptian word. The LXX. does not translate it (Gen. xii. 18; Is. xix. 7); and Jesus the son of Strach, as
of the river, evil in appearance, and lean-flushed (xli.—3). These, afterwords described still more strongly, ate up the first seven, and yet, as is said in the second account, when they had eaten them remained as lean as before (xli.—4, 17—21). Then Pharaoh had a second dream — Behold, seven ears of corn coming up on one stalk, fat or full, ver. 22] and good. And, behold, seven ears, thin and blasted with the east wind, sproting forth after them (ver. 5, 6). These, also described more strongly in the second account, devoured the first seven ears (ver. 5—7, 22—24). In the morning Pharaoh sent for the scribes, (xlii.), and the wise men, and they were unable to give him an interpretation. Then the chief of the cupbearers remembered Joseph, and told Pharaoh how a young Hebrew, servant to the captain of the executioners, had interpreted his and his fellow-prisoner’s dreams. Then Pharaoh sent and called Joseph, and they made him hasten out of the prison: and he shaved [himself], and changed his raiment, and came unto Pharaoh’s (ver. 14). The king then related his dreams, and Joseph, when he had disclaimed any human wisdom, declared to him that they were sent of God to forewarn Pharaoh. There was essentially but one dream. Both kine and ears symbolized years. There were to be seven years of great plenty in Egypt, and after them seven years of consuming and “very heavy famine.” The doubling of the dream denoted that the events it foreshadowed were certain and imminent. On the interpretation of it may be remarked, that it seems evident that the kine represented the animal products, and the ears of corn the vegetable products, the most important object in each class representing the whole class. Any reference to Egyptian superstitions, such as some commentators have imagined, is both derogatory to revelation and, on purely critical grounds, unreasonable. The perfectly Egyptian color of the whole narrative is very noticeable, and nowhere more so than in the particulars of the first dream. The cattle coming up from the river and feeding on the bank may be seen even now, though among them the lean kine predominate: and the use of one Egyptian word, if not of two, in the narrative, probably shows that the writer knew the Egyptian language. The corn with many ears on one stalk must be wheat, one kind of which now

grown in Egypt has this peculiarity. Another point to be remarked is, that Joseph shaved before he went into Pharaoh’s presence, and we find from the monuments that the Egyptians, except when engaged in war, shaved both the head and face, the small beard that was worn on the chin being probably artificial. Having interpreted the dream, Joseph counselled Pharaoh to choose a wise man and put him over the land of Egypt in order that he should take the fifth part of the produce of the seven years of plenty against the years of famine. To this high post the king appointed Joseph. Thus, when he was thirty years of age, was he at last released from his state of suffering, and placed in a position of the greatest honor. About thirteen years’ probation had prepared him for this trust: some part passed as Potiphar’s slave, some part, probably the greater, in the prison. If we view of Hebrew and Egyptian chronology be correct, the Pharaoh here mentioned was Asshur, Manetho’s Assis or Asses, whose reign we suppose to have occupied the first half of the nineteenth century B. C.

Pharaoh, seeing the wisdom of giving Joseph, whom he perceived to be under God’s guidance, greater powers than he had advised should be given to the officer set over the country, made him not only over Egypt, but second only to the sovereign. We read: “And Pharaoh took off his signet from his hand, and put it upon Joseph’s hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen (xlii.—22, 23), and put a collar of gold about his neck: and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Abrech (xlii.—24, 25), even to set him over all the land of Egypt” (xlii. 42, 43). The monuments show that on the investiture of a high official in Egypt, one of the chief ceremonies was the putting on him a collar of gold (see Ancient Egyptians, pl. 80); the other particulars, the vestures of fine linen and the riding in the second chariot, are equally in accordance with the manners of the country. The meaning of what was cried before him has not been satisfactorily determined. We are told that Pharaoh named Joseph Zaphnaith-paaneah (xlii. 45), the signification of which

Kamassian. 3. The spring hot winds are southerly. 4. They do not last fifty days. 4. They are not called Chamshin (Khamseen) or Kamassen. 5. They prevail, usually for three days at a time, during the seven weeks (49 days) following Easter, vulgarly called in Egypt Khamseen, which is a plural of Kamassen, a term applied in the singular to neither winds nor period, though they are not strictly confined to this fluctuating period. 6. They have no relation to the Kamassen, which occurs in any hot weather, and seldom lasts more than a quarter of an hour. 7. The Kamassen is not peculiar to Arabia. 8. We learn that Joseph was two years in prison after the liberation of the chief of the cupbearers. The preponderance of evidence, however, seems in favor of supposing that he was longer in prison than in Potiphar’s house.

b. The signet was of so much importance with the ancient Egyptian kings that their names (except perhaps in the earliest period) were always inscribed in an oval which represented an elongated signet. 3. We do not here except Burns’ etymology, Ephedrae, i. c., for we doubt that the root bears the signification he gives it, and think the construction un questionable.
Joseph. [See ZAPINAXI-DAAPNIAI.] He also gave him to wife Asenath daughter of Potipherah, priest [or 'prince,' ḫnwyn] of On' (ver. 45). Whether Joseph's father-in-law were priest or prince cannot, we think, be determined, although the former seems more likely, since On was a very pious city, and there is no good reason to think that a priest would have been more exclusive than any other Egyptian functionary. His name, implying devotion to Ra, the principal object of worship at On, though, as already noticed, appropriate to any citizen of that place, would be especially so to a priest. [POTIPHERAH.] It is worthy of remark that On appears to have been the capital, and seems to have been certainly the religious capital, as containing the great temple, of Apepop, a shepherd-king, probably of the same line as Joseph's Pharaoh. (Select Papyrus; Brugsch, Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenland. Gesellsch.) The name of Joseph's wife we are disposed to consider to be Hebrew. [ASENATH.] Joseph's history, as governor of Egypt, shows him in two relations, which may be here separately considered. We shall first speak of his administration of the country, and then of his conduct to his brethren. In one respect, as bearing upon Joseph's moral character, the two subjects are closely connected, but their details may be best treated apart, if we keep this important aspect constantly in view.

Joseph's first act was to go throughout all the land of Egypt.' (ver. 46). During the seven plenteous years there was a very abundant produce, and he gathered the fifth part, as he had advised Pharaoh, and laid it up. The narrative, according to Semitic usage, speaks as though he had taken the whole produce of the country, or the whole surplus produce (ver. 48); but a comparison with a parallel passage shows that our explanation must be correct (ver. 31, 36). The abundance of this store is evident from the statement that "Joseph gathered corn as the sand of the sea, very much, until he could number it' (ver. 49). The representations of the monuments, which show that the contents of the granaries were accurately noted by the scribes when they were filled, well illustrate this passage.

Before the years of famine Asenath bare Joseph two sons, of whom we read that he named the 1...2...[a forgotten?]; For God [said] and named, forget all my toil, and all my father's house. And the name of the second called he Ephraim [fruitful?]. 3...For God hath caused me to be fruitful in the land of my affliction' (50-52). Though, as was natural, the birth of a son made Joseph feel that he had at last found a home, that his father's house was no longer his home, yet it was not in utter forgetfulness of his country that he gave this and the other, both born of his Egyptian wife, Hebrew names, still less, can we signifying his devotion to the God of his fathers.

When the seven good years had passed, the famine began. We read that ' the dearth was in all lands; but in all the land of Egypt there was bread. And when all the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread: and Pharaoh said unto all the Egyptians, Go unto Joseph, what he saith unto you, do. And the famine was over all the face of the earth. And Joseph opened all the storehouses [lit. 'all wherein ['nets], and sold unto the Egyptians; and the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt. And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy [corn]; because that the famine was [so] sore in all lands' (ver. 34-37). The expressions here used do not require us to suppose that the famine extended beyond the countries round Egypt, such as Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, as well as some part of Africa, although of course it may have been more widely experienced. It may be observed, that although famines in Egypt depend immediately upon the failure of the inundation, and in other countries upon the failure of rain, yet that, as the rise of the Nile is caused by heavy rains in Ethiopia, an extremely dry season there and in Palestine would produce the result described in the sacred narrative. It must also be recollected that Egypt was anciently the granary of neighboring countries, and that a famine there would cause first scarcity, and then famine, around. Famines are not very frequent in the history of Egypt; but the famous seven years' famine in the reign of the Pharaoh Khufu of the V dynasty, which is the only known parallel to that of Joseph, of this an account is given under Famine. Early in the time of famine, Joseph's brethren came to buy corn, a part of the history which we mention here only as indicating the liberal policy of the governor of Egypt, by which the storehouses were opened to all buyers of whatever nation they were.

After the famine had lasted for a time, apparently two years, there was 'no bread in all the land; for the famine [was] very sore, so that the land of Egypt and the land of Canaan failed by reason of the famine. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house' (xvii. 13, 14). When all the money of Egypt and Canaan was exhausted, barley became necessary. Joseph then obtained all the cattle of Egypt, and in the next year, all the land, except that of the priests, and apparently, as a consequence, the Egyptians themselves. He demanded, however, only a fifth part of the produce as Pharaoh's right. It has been attempted to trace this enactment of Joseph in the fragments of Egyptian history preserved by profane writers, but the result has not been satisfactory. Even were the latter sources trustworthy as to the early period of Egypt, it. This difficulty we may perhaps partly attribute to the pointing.

a The very old opinion that ḫnwyn means prince as well as priest has been contradicted by Gesenius, but not disproved.

b It may be remarked, as indicating that Joseph's family did not maintain an Egyptian mode of life, that Manasseh took an Aramean as a concubine (1 Chr. vii. 14). This happened in his father's lifetime: for Joseph lived to see the children of Muchir the son of his concubine born (Gen. xliii. 14).

c The derivation of Ephraim can scarcely be doubted, although there is difficulty in determining
tian history, it would be difficult to determine the
areas referred to, as the actions of at least two kings are
asscribed by the Greeks to Sesostriis, the king
particularly. Herodotus says that, according to the
Egyptians, Sesostriis made a division of the
soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning
square plots of ground of equal size to all, and
obtaining his chief revenue from the rent which the
holders were required to pay him every year" (ii.
109). Elsewhere he speaks of the priests as hav-
JESUS to see his brother, first refusing that they should return without sending for and bringing Benjamin, then putting them in prison three days, but at last releasing them that they might take him back to the brethren and be left as a hostage. They were then stricken with remorse, and saw that the punishment of their great crime was come upon them. "And they said one to another, We [are] verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben answered them, saying, Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye shall not hear? therefore, behold, also his blood is required. And they knew not that Joseph understood [them]; for an interpreter [was] between them. And he turned himself about from them, and wept; and returned to them again, and communed with them, and took from them Simeon, and bound him before their eyes" (21-24). Thus he separated one of them from the rest, as the heir of the patriachry from his father, and reserved their money in their sacks, and gave them provision for the way, besides the corn they had purchased. The discovery of the money terrified them and their father, who refused to let them take Benjamin. Yet when the famine continued, and they had eaten the supply, Jacob desired his sons to go again to Egypt. But they could not go without Benjamin. At the persuasion of Judah, who here appears as the spokesman of his brethren, Jacob was at last prevailed on to let them take him, Judah offering to be surety. It may be remarked that Reuben had made the same offer, apparently, at once after the return, when Jacob had withheld his consent, telling his father that he might shew his sons if he did not bring back Benjamin (37, 38). Judah seems to have been put forward by his brethren as the most able, and certainly his after-conduct in Egypt would have justified their choice, and his father's trusting him rather than the rest. Jacob, anxious for Benjamin, and not unmindful of Simeon, touchingly sent to the governor out of his scanty stock a little present of the best products of Palestine, as well as double money that his sons might repay what had been returned to them.

When they had come into Egypt, Joseph's brethren, as before, found him presiding at the sale of corn. Now that Benjamin was with them he told his steward to shew and make ready, for they should dine with him at noon. So the man brought them into Joseph's house. They feared, not knowing, as it seems, why they were taken to the house (xiii. 25), and perhaps thinking they might be imprisoned there. Joseph no doubt gave his command in Egyptian, and apparently did not cause it to be interpreted to them. They were, however, encouraged by the steward, and Simeon was brought out to them. When Joseph came they brought him the present, again fulfilling his treas, as twice they bowed before him. At the sight of Benjamin he was greatly affected. "And he lifted up his eyes and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, [Is] this your younger brother, of whom ye spake unto me? And he said, our brother is, yea, your brother whom ye sold into Egypt. And he made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought [where] to weep; and he entered into [his] chamber, and wept there. And as he washed his face, and went out, and refrained himself" (29-31). The description of Joseph's dinner is in accordance with the representations of the monuments. The governor and each of his guests was seated separately, and the brethren were placed according to their age. That the youngest thus had the lowest place, yet when Joseph sent messes from before him to his brethren, he showed his favor to Benjamin by a mess five times as large as that of any of them. "And they drank, and were merry with him" (32-34). It is mentioned that the Egyptians and Hebrews sat apart from each other, as to eat bread with the Hebrews was an abomination to the Egyptians" (32). The scenes of the Egyptian table show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great. That guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainer. These points of agreement in matters of detail are well worthy of attention. There is no evidence as to the entertaining foreigner. But the general exclusiveness of the Egyptians is in harmony with the statement that they did not eat with the Hebrews.

The next morning, when it was light, they left the city (for here we learn that Joseph's house was in a city), having had their money replaced in their sacks, and Joseph's silver cup put in Benjamin's sack. His steward was ordered to follow them, and say (claiming the cup), "Therefore have ye rewarded evil for good? [Is] not this [it] in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth? Ye have done evil in so doing." (xlv. 4, 5). When they were thus accused, they declared that the guilty person should die, and that the rest should be bondmen. So the steward searched the sacks, and the cup was found in Benjamin's sack; whereupon they rent their clothes, and returned to the city, and went to Joseph's house, and fell before him on the ground. And Joseph said unto them, What deed [is] this that ye have done? wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?" Judah then, instead of protesting innocence, admitted the alleged crime, and declared that he and his brethren were the governor's servants. But Joseph replied that he would alone keep him in whose hand the cup was found. Judah, not unmindful of the trust he held, then hid the whole matter before Joseph, showing him that he could not leave Benjamin without causing the old man's death, and as surety nobly offered himself as a bondman in his brother's stead. Then, at the touching relation of his father's love and anxiety, and, perhaps, moved by Judah's generosity, the strong will of Joseph gave way to the tenderness he had so long felt, but restrained, and he made himself known to his brethren. If Iditheroe had dealt severely, now he showed his generosity. He sent forth every one but his brethren. "And he wept aloud. . . . And Joseph said unto his brethren, I [am] Joseph; doth my father yet live? And his brethren could not answer him; for they were troubled at his presence. And Joseph said unto his brethren, Come near to me, I pray you. And they came near. And he said, [Is] my father yet alive? And Joseph told his brethren that he was not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither: for God did send me before you to preserve life. For these two years [this] dear famine [been] in the land: and yet [there are] five
Joseph, at this time can, we think, he only explained by the supposition that he felt it was his duty to treat his brethren severely: otherwise his delay and his causing distress to his father are inconsistent with his deep affection. The sending for Benjamin seems hard to understand, except we suppose that Joseph felt he was the surest link with his father, and Jacob may more readily receive his testimony as to the lost son.

There is no need here to speak largely of the rest of Joseph's history: full as it is of interest, it throws no new light upon his character. Jacob's spirit revived when he saw the wagons Joseph had sent. Encouraged on the way by a Divine vision, he journeyed into Egypt with his whole house.

And Joseph made ready his chariot, and went up to meet Israel his father, to Goshen, and presented himself unto him; and he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while. And Israel said unto Joseph, Now let me die, since I have seen thy face, because thou [art} yet alive " (xvi. 29, 30).

Then Jacob and his house abode in the land of Goshen, Joseph still ruling the country. Here Jacob, when near his end, gave Joseph a portion above his brethren, doubtless including the 'parch of ground before the house of Pharaoh,' future burying-ground of Shechem's family (comp. John iv. 5). Then he blessed his sons, Joseph most earnestly of all, and died in Egypt. "And Joseph fell upon his father's face, and wept upon him, and kissed him " (I. 1).

When he had caused him to be embalmed by "his servants the physicians" he carried him to Canaan, and laid him in the cave of Machpehlah, the burying-place of his fathers. Then it was that his brethren feared that, their father being dead, Joseph would punish them, and that he strove to remove their fears. From his being able to make the journey into Canaan with "a very great company" (9), as well as from his living apart from his brethren and their fear of him, Joseph seems to have been still governor of Egypt. We know no more than that he lived "a hundred and ten years" (22, 20), having been more than ninety in Egypt; that he "saw Ephraim's children of the third" [generation], and that the children also of Machir the son of Manasseh were borne upon Joseph's knees (23); and that dying he took an oath of his brethren that they should carry up his bones to the land of promise: thus showing in his latest action the faith (Heb. xi. 22) which had guided his whole life. Like his father he was embalmed, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt " (I. 20). His trust was kept, and the bones of Joseph in his inheritance in Shechem, in the territory of Ephraim his offspring.

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

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

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. The facts of the Bible are spoken of under the name of Joseph, which is given even to the whole Israelite nation. Ephraim is, however, the common name of his descendants, for the division of Manasseh gave almost the whole political weight to the brother-tribe. That great people seems to have inherited all Joseph's ability with none of his goodness, and the very knowledge of his power in Egypt, instead of stimulating his offspring to follow in his steps, appears only to have constantly drawn them into a balking after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

* "Joseph's conduct towards his brethren, and his father," prior to the disclosure in Egypt, is susceptible of a somewhat different interpretation from that which is offered in a preceding paragraph. The mental distress which the brothers endured, was both a deserved punishment and a needful discipline, and it was a fitting retribution of Divine Providence that the injured brother should be the agent in inflicting it. Its evident justice. If not the motive for its infliction, may have well reconciled it to, and his conviction of its necessity must have been such as to overcome his great reluctance to cause his honored father an illiterion pang, even though his sorrow would soon be turned into joy. The assumed part which he acted, and the harsh tone which he adopted, were foreign to every sentiment of his heart, and it cost a violent struggle with his noble nature, to bear this alien attitude to a point essential to the end which he had in view. And what was this end? Was it, as suggested above, to punish his brethren?—not indeed to gratify an unfatral vinvictiveness, but as a calm instrument of God's justice, and for their good.

This effect was, doubtless, secured, but it seems to us that he had an object, apart from this, which dictated his policy, while he neither sought, nor desired, their punishment—willingly leaving it to the being who had been his Protector.

Before revealing himself to them, it was necessary for him to know whether they still cherished the feelings which had prompted their wicked treatment of him. Had he sought their punishment, or a mere personal triumph, he could have had it at an earlier period. This he did not seek, but waited for the day, which he must have anticipated from the time of his elevation, when he could put them to the test, and ascertain if the way were open for the resumption of the lost relation—which he did desire with the longings of a child and the fervor of a brother-tribe. He has been exiled from home. The hour has come, and he must now know whether they have repented of their wickedness towards him—whether the old rancor has been changed to contrition and tenderness. Their relation to his own brother Benjamin, will furnish a decisive test. The partiality which the doing father had felt for himself, and which had cost him so dearly, would have inevitably passed over to the surviving son of the lamented Rachel, the son of his old age. Joseph cannot be certain that Benjamin is alive, or if living, that he is not persecuted—that, having the same pretext for it, their treatment of him has not been as treacherous and cruel as it was of himself. He must see them together and judge for himself, and learn whether their dispositions are changed. Their brief imprisonment and the detention of Simeon (the eldest son to Reuben, and, it may be, the guiltless) were severe, but necessary, expedients to induce them to bring Benjamin, or rather, to deter them from coming without him, on their second visit, which would be equally a necessity with the first.

The plan succeeds, and Benjamin arrives with his brothers. Joseph bestows special attentions upon him, and has the opportunity of observing whether their former envy survives. Finally causes him to be arrested as a thief, and proposing to retain him as a prisoner, bids the others return in peace to their father. Will they do it? They not merely abandoned Joseph—they sold him as a slave, and only not murdered him. Will they now simply desert Benjamin, and leave him to his fate? They did not scruple to shock their father with the tidings of Joseph's death. Are they still so callous as to consent to return and tell him that Benjamin is gone also? They committed an enormous crime to rid themselves of the other favorite. Are they willing to be freed from this, without any culpable agency of their own? The result shows that their hearts are softened. The recollection of their injustice to Joseph, has made them even tender of Benjamin. The sight of the suffering which they have brought upon their father, has made them
careful of his feelings and sympathetically devoted to his happiness. The arrest of the youngest brings them all, with rent garments, into Joseph's presence, when Judah, the orator of the company, draws near and addresses his unknown brother in a strain which stands unrequited, perhaps, among recorded speeches, as an exhibition of pathetic eloquence. With entire artlessness he tells the whole story, and with the generous devotion of a true son and brother, asks leave to abide as a bondman "instead of the lad," "lest, peradventure, I see the evil that shall come on my father."

Joseph, under Divine guidance, has refrained from a premature disclosure, and the fit time has fully come. He has no disposition to injure or reproach his brothers, or punish them in any way. He has put them to the test, as it was his duty to do, and satisfied that their feelings are now right, the struggling emotions of his nature, long pent up, find an irresistible vent. Troubled by the disclosure and unable to speak, he calms their agitation and seeks to soothe their self-upbraiding, thrice reminding them of the wisdom of God's plan, which had been broader than theirs. This is followed by affectionate embraces, and the charge to hasten homeward with a message to their aged father — sitting in his loneliness, day after day, in the door of his tent at Hebron, and anxiously waiting for tidings from Egypt. And years after, when on the decease of their father they humbly asked the forgiveness of their brother, he still comforted them with the reflection that God had overruled their conduct for good. From first to last, the narrative appears to us to demonstrate the view, which also seems to us most consonant with the eminent meekness of this noble Hebrew, that the leading design of his harsh policy was to subject them to a needful test, which the Lord used as a means of deepening their penitence, and that he gladly desisted, and with a brother's sympathy sought to assuage their bitter regrets, as soon as he was convinced that they were no longer false brothers, but true.

We would further suggest that the charge to them to "fall not out by the way" on their return, does not necessarily indicate that he thought them "not less wicked or not wiser than of old." Now that their associated guilt had been brought home to them, nothing was more natural than that they should seek to throw off individual responsibility. Kenben had already put in his exculpating plea, and the design of the charge was to turn them from unprofitable mutual criminations, and lead them to a devout recognition of the divine sovereignty and goodness.

It is intimately above, that Joseph was not wholly acting under Divine direction. The divining cup may not be fully explicable; it plainly reveals an Egyptian superstition, but does not necessarily imply Joseph's participation in it, and the allusion must be construed by what is known of the life. If consummate wisdom in plan and skill in execution, if a spirit beautiful in every relation, if the fruits of a manly and boldly pious, if a character as nearly faultless as has been delineated in human biography, be marks of Divine guidance, we must accord it to him, whose bow abode in strength and whose arms were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob.

It is obvious to add, that the wisdom of the presidential dealings, as related to the family in Hebron, was not less marked as related to Joseph in Egypt. The course of discipline through which he passed was an indispensable qualification for the high service in reserve for him — enabling him to learn the most difficult lesson, and be prepared to bear without injury one extreme of fortune, by having properly endured the other. S. W.

* Ewald, in his Geschichte des Volkes Israel comments upon the statesmanship of Joseph in taking advantage of the pressure of famine to reduce the entire population to a tenantry, and thus accomplishing without violence a great social revolution; — a statesmanship "careful at once of the weal of populous nations, and for the consolidation and increase of the royal authority, and winning its best victories through the combination of these seemingly opposite aims. By providently storing up in his garner supplies of corn sufficient for many years of possible scarcity, Joseph was enabled not only to secure to the people the present means of existence and the possibility of better times in future, but to establish a more solid organization of government, such as a nation is very loath to accede to except in a time of overmastering necessity." (Martinmein's translation, p. 413.)

The present state of Egyptian chronology will hardly warrant the positive conclusions of Mr. Poole concerning the epoch of the Hyksos; yet, while his views are retained in the text, the data are here appended for a more comprehensive view of the subject. The problem concerning the Israelites in Egypt is mixed with the question of the Hyksos whose date is still unsettled. Bunsen makes Joseph the Grand-vizir of Sesostris, second king of the 12th Dynasty, about 2180 n. c., and 209 years before the incursion of the Hyksos; as the Hyksos were Semitic tribes, the Hebrews were undisturbed during their supremacy; but after their expulsion, the Israelites were reduced to forced labor as a means of consolidating the Pharaonic power. But this theory, which makes the sojourn in Egypt last the coming and going of the Hyksos, prolongs the stay of the Israelites beyond the utmost stretch of our Biblical chronology. (Egypt's Pasts, vol. v. p. 68.) Brugsch regards the Hyksos as Ismaelitish Arabs, who invaded Egypt about 2115 n. c. and ruled over the Delta for 511 years. Taking the second Menepthah of the 19th Dynasty, 1341-1221 n. c. for the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and computing backward 430 years, he places Joseph in office under one of the Shepherd kings. (Histoire d'Egypte, 1. 78.) Mr. Poole also makes the Pharaoh of Joseph one of the Shepherd kings in the first half of the nineteenth century, n. c. But if the Hebrews were in Egypt under the Hyksos — though this may account for the favorable reception of Jacob, and the undisputable growth of his posterity in Goshen — it is not easy to imagine how so large a foreign population, of a kindred race with the Hyksos, was suffered to remain in the Delta when the Shepherds were expelled by the revised native government; and the notion that the Exodus of the Israelites and the expulsion of the Hyksos were the same event, has no foundation either in Egyptian or in Hebrew history. To meet this difficulty, Leipsius places the migration of Jacob into Egypt after the expulsion of the Hyksos, with an interval sufficient for the fear of another Arab invasion to have died out, though the prejudice of the Egyptian: and, that the number of "shepherds" remained. His dates are, for the expiration of the Hyksos about 1501 n. c., the arrival of Jacob 1414, the Exodus 1314. (Köninglsbc.) But this brings the Exodus down to
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very late period, and reduces the sojourn in Egypt to one hundred years. Ewald, with his usual boldness in inventing an hypothesis to solve a difficulty, conceives that at the first, only a small portion of the Israelitish family followed Joseph into Egypt, — then under the rule of the Hyksos: that, at the expulsion of the latter, the Israelites took sides with the Egyptians, and that Joseph then summoned Israel in a body out of Canaan, and established them in Goshen as a frontier-guard of the kingdom against any new attacks of the Hyksos. In the date of the Hyksos invasion and the duration of the Shepherd dynasties in Egypt, all these writers are substantially agreed. They agree also in the main facts concerning Joseph as an historical person, and the residence of the Israelites in Egypt until the exodus under Moses. Even Ewald concedes that the "Blessing of Jacob" (Gen. xlix. 22-25), from the complication of the language and poetry, must be referred to pre-Mosaic times. The order of the historical events is not strictly dependent upon chronology.

2. Father of Igael who represented the tribe of Issachar among the spies (Num. xi. 7).

3. A lay Israelite of the family of Bani, who was compelled by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 45). In 1 Esdr. vii. 30, he is given as the representative of the priestly family of Shechaniah, in the next generation after the return from Captivity (Neh. xii. 14).


5. [Alex. Iαυτμος; Josephus.] In 2 Mac. viii. 22, v. 19, Joseph is named among the brethren of Judas Maccabaeus apparently in place of John (Ewald, Gesch. iv. 334, note; Grinnell ad 2 Mac. vii. 22). The confusion of Iαυτμος, Ἰωακης, Ἰωακης is well seen in the various readings in Matt. xii. 53.

7. [Ἰωακης; Joseph.] An ancestor of Judith (Jud. 13). B. F. W.

8. One of the ancestors of Christ (Luke iii. 30), son of Joanan, and the eighth generation from David inclusive, about contemporary therefore with king Azahiah.

9. [Ἰωακης but Tisch. Treg. and Lehmann. margin. Ἰωακης; Joseph.] Another ancestor of Christ, son of Judah or Abiaud, and grandson of Joanna or Hananiah the son of Zerubbabel, Luke iii. 26. Afford adopts the reading Josech, a mistake which seems to originate with the common confusion in Heb. MSS. between ? and ?.


11. Son of Heli [Luke iii. 23], and reputed father of Jesus Christ. The recurrence of this name in the three above instances, once before, and twice after Zerubbabel, whereas it does not occur once in St. Matthew's genealogy, is a strong evidence of the paternal descent of Joseph the son of Heli, as traced by St. Luke to Nathan the son of David.

All that is told us of Joseph in the N. T. may be summed up in a few words. He was a just man, and of the house and lineage of David, and was known as such by his contemporaries, who called Jesus the son of David, and were disposed to own Him as Messiah, as being Joseph's son. The public registers also contained his name under the reckoning of the house of David (John i. 45; Luke iii. 23; Matt. i. 20; Luke ii. 4). He lived at Nazareth in Galilee, and it is probable that his family had been settled there for at least two preceding generations, possibly from the time of Matthias, the common grandfather of Joseph and Mary, since Mary lived there too (Luke i. 26, 27). He espoused Mary, the daughter and heir of his uncle Jacob, and before he took her home as his wife received the angelic communication recorded in Matt. i. 20. It must have been within a very short time of his taking her to his home, that the decree went forth from Augustus Cesar which obliged him to leave Nazareth with his wife and go to Bethlehem. He was there with Mary and his first-born, when the shepherds came to see the babe in the manger, and he went with them to the Temple to present the infant according to the law, and there heard the prophetic words of Sim eon, as he held him in his arms. When the wise men from the East came to Bethlehem to worship Christ, they found the city was taken, and he went to Egypt with them by night, when warned by an angel of the danger which threatened them; and on a second message he returned with them to the land of Israel, intending to reside at Bethlehem the city of David; but being afraid of Archelaus he took up his abode, as before his marriage, at Nazareth, where he carried on his trade as a carpenter. When Jesus was 12 years old, Joseph and Mary took him with them to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, and when they returned to Nazareth he continued to act as a father to the child Jesus, and was reputed to be so indeed. But here our knowledge of Joseph ends. That he died before our Lord's crucifixion is indeed tolerably certain by what is related John xix. 27, and perhaps Mark vi. 3 may imply that he was then dead. But where, when, or how he died, we know not. What was his age when he married, what children he had, and, who was their mother, are questions on which tradition has been very busy, and very contradictory, and on which it affords no available information whatever. In fact the different accounts give are not traditions, but the attempts of different ages of the early Church to reconcile the narrative of the Gospels with their own opinions, and to give support, as they thought, to the miraculous conception. It is not necessary to detail or examine these accounts here, as they throw light rather upon the history of those opinions during four or five centuries, than upon the history of Joseph. But it may be well to add that the origin of all the earliest stories and assertions of the fathers concerning Joseph, as e. g., his extreme old age, his having sons by a former wife, his having the custody of Mary given to him by lot, and so on, is to be found in the apocryphal Gospels, of which the earliest is the Protevangelium of St. James, apparently the work of a Christian Jew of the second century, quoted by Origen, and referred to by Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (Tischendorf, P. T. c. viii.). The same stories are repeated in the other apocryphal Gospels. The monophysite Coptic Christians are said to have first assigned a festival to Joseph in the Calendar, namely, on the 20th July, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic almanc: "Reques sancti sensa justi Josephu fabri lignarii, Deipara Virginis Mariae sponsi, qui pater Christi..."
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recri promenit." The apocryphal Hisborio Josephi fabri iurgorii, which now exists in Arabic, is thought by Tierschendorf to have been originally written in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to have been transferred to the Western Churches from the East as late as the year 1380.

The above-named history is acknowledged to be quite fabulous, though it belongs probably to the 4th century. It professes to be an account given, by our Lord himself to the Apostles on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and makes him old and the father of 4 sons and 2 daughters before he espoused Mary. It is headed with this sentence: "Benedictiones ejus et precum servent nos omnes, O fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to know the opinion of the ancient on the obscure subject of Joseph's marriage, may consult Jerome's sermonic tract Cantar Heliodrion. He will see that Jerome highly disapproves the common opinion (derived from the apocryphal Gospels) of Joseph being twice married, and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men," in favor of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were his cousins only, or at all events against the opinion of Heliodorus, which had been held by Eusebius, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentin, that they were the children of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opinion were called Antiochenes, as enemies of the Virgin.

(Epiphanius, Adv. Heres. i. iii. ii. ii. Her. xxviii. also Her. li. See also Pearson on the Creed, Art. Virgin Mary: Mill, on the Brethren of the Lord; Calmet, de St. Joseph, S. Mor. Verg. copies, and Lord Laetare's note on Matt. xiii. 55; Winer, Realb. v. v. Jesus and Josephs.)

* 12. Joseph is the reading of the oldest MSS. (adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, instead of Josaph of the received text) in Matt. xiii. 55, as the name of one of the brethren of our Lord. [Joseph, 2.]

* 17. Joseph (instead of Josaph) is the proper name of Barnabas (Acts iv. 36) according to the oldest MSS. and the best critical editions. [Joseph, 3.]

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA [A. V. Arimathaea] (I.αυτητος αριμαθειας), a rich and pious Israelite who had the privilege of performing the last offices of duty and affection to the body of our Lord. He is distinguished from other persons of the same name by the addition of his birthplace Arimathaea, a city supposed by Robinson to be situated somewhere between Lydia and Nore, now Beirut Nubat, a mile northeast of Tyre (Hill, Res. ii. 239-41, ii. 142).

Joseph is denominated by St. Mark (xv. 43) an honourable councillor, by which we are probably to understand that he was a member of the Great Council, or Sanhedrin. He is further characterized as "a good man and just" (Luke xxiii. 51), one of those who, hearing in their hearts the words of their old prophets, was waiting for the kingdom of God (Acts iv. 41; Luke ii. 25, 39, xxiii. 53). We are expressly told that he did not "consent to the counsel and deed" of his colleagues in conspiring to bring about the death of Jesus; but he seems to have lacked the courage to protest against their judgment. At all events we know that he shrank, through fear of his countrymen, from professing himself openly a disciple of our Lord.

The awful event, however, which crushed the hopes while it excited the tears of the chosen disciples, had the effect of inspiring him with new boldness and confidence to which he had been before a stranger. The crucifixion seems to have wrought in him the same clear conviction that it wrought in the centurion who stood by the cross: for on the very evening of that dreadful day, when the triumph of the chief priests and rulers seemed complete, Joseph "went boldly unto Pilate and crave the body of Jesus." The fact is mentioned by all four Evangelists. Pilate, having ascertained himself that the Divine Sufferer was dead, consented to the request of Joseph, who was thus rewarded for his faith and courage by the blessed privilege of consigning to his own new tomb the body of his crucified Lord. In this sacred office he was assisted by Nicodemus, who, like himself, had hitherto been afraid to make open profession of his faith, but now dismissing his fears bought an abundant store of myrrh and aloes for the embalming of the body of his Lord according to the Jewish custom.

These two masters in Israel then having enfolded the sacred body in the linen shroud which Joseph had bought, consigned it to a tomb hewn in a rock—a tomb where no human corpse had ever been laid.

It is specially recorded that the tomb was in a garden belonging to Joseph, and close to the place of crucifixion.

The minuteness of the narrative seems purposely designed to take away all ground or pretext for any rumor that might be spread, after the Resurrection, that it was some other, not Jesus himself, that had risen from the grave. But the burial of Jesus in the new private sepulchre of the rich man of Arimathea must also be regarded as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 9): according to the literal rendering of Bishop Lowth, "with the rich man was his tomb." Nothing, but the merest legendary character, is recorded of Joseph, beyond what we read in Scripture. There is a tradition, surely a very improbable one, that he was of the number of the Seventy. Another, with neither authentic or not, deserves to be mentioned as generally current, namely—that Joseph, being sent to treat Britain by the Apostle St. Philip, about the year 61, settled with his brother disciples at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire; and there erected of wicker twigs the first Christian oratory in England, the parent of the majestic abbey which was afterwards founded on the same site. These and other guides to this day show the miraculous things said to bad and bless (every Christmas-day) that sprung from the staff which Joseph stuck in the ground as he stepped to rest himself on the hill-top. (See Du Fauge's Monumentum, i. 1; and Harnack, Hist. and Art. of Glastonbury: Assmann, Hist. Brtit. iii. 319.) Winer refers to a manuscript in Joseph Scaliger, Pius de Josepho Arimathia, Vivae, 1601, 4 vol.

E. H. . . .

JOSEPH, called BARSABAS [or BAR-SABAS, Locam, Tisch. Treg.], and surnamed Justus; one of the two persons chosen by the assembled church (Acts i. 26) as worthy to fill the place in the Apostolic company from which Judas

a Calmet, however, places the admission of Joseph into the calendar of the Western Church as early as the year 900. See Tischendorf, at sup.
JOSEPHUS

had fallen. He, therefore, had been a companion of the disciples all the time that they followed Jesus, from his baptism to his ascension.

Papias (ap. Euseb. H. E. i. 38) calls him Justus Barsabas, and relates that having drunk some deadly poison he, through the grace of the Lord, sustained no harm. Eusebius (H. E. i. 12) states that he was one of the seventy disciples. He is to be distinguished from Jesus Barsabas (Acts iv. 36) and from Judas Barsabas (Acts xxv. 22). The significance of Barsabas is quite uncertain. Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. Acts i. 23) gives five possible interpretations of it, namely, the son of conversion, of quiet, of an oath, of wisdom, of the old man. He prefers the last two; and suggests that Joseph Barsabas may be the same as Joses the son of Alpheus, and that Judas Barsabas may be his brother, the Apostle.

W. T. R.

JOSEPHUS (Ἰωάννης; [Vat. Φωτις; Josephus]), 1 Esdr. ix. 94. [Josephus, 3.]

JOSES (Ἰωάννης [ἢ Ἰωάννης; Lachm. Tisch. Treg.], Alford Ἰουσαφ; Ἰωάννης [ἢ Ἰωάννης] is the genitive case; [Josephus]). 1. Son of Eleazar, in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii. 27); 15th generation from Abraham, i. e. about the reign of Manasseh. a The A. V. gives the name as Joses, which is merely the form of the genitive case. A.

2. In Matt. xiii. 55, Lachm. Tisch. Treg. Ἰωάννης; and so Sin. in Mark vi. 3; Tisch. reads Ἰωάννης also in Matt. xxvii. 50: Joseph.] One of the Lord's brethren (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). His name connects him with the preceding. For the inquiry who these brethren of the Lord were, see James. All that appears with certainty from Scripture is that his mother's name was Mary, and his brother's James (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xiv. 47).


JO'ASHAH (לוֹזָשָׁה) [perh. Jehovah lets dwell, Gen.; Ἰωάννης; [Vat. Ιωάννης: Alexander Ἰωάννας; Joseph], a prince of the house of Simeon, son of Amaziah, and consequently with the more proper designation branch of the tribe, who, in the days of Hoseah, headed a marauding expedition against the peaceable Hamite shepherds dwelling in Gedor, exterminated them, and occupied their pastureage (1 Chr. iv. 34. 38-41).

JO'SHAPATH (יוֹשָחָד) [Jehovah judges]: Ἰωάννης; F.A. Ἰωάννης; Josephath, the Mithnite, one of David's guard, apparently selected from among the warriors from the east of Jordan (1 Chr. xi. 43). Buxtorf (Lex. Todt. col. 1284) gives Mathath as the Chaldee equivalent of Bar'khim. by which latter is always represented in the Targ. Onk.; and if this were the place which gave Joshaphath his surname, he was probably a Gadite. In the Syriac, Joshaphat and Uzziah (ver. 44) are interchanged, and the latter appears as "Azri of Anathoth."

a * Barsabas, says Meyer, is a patronymic (son of, and Justus a Roman surname such as Jesus often adopted at that time (Apostelgesch. ii. 23). If it has been questioned whether the Captain of the Lord's Host was a created being or not. Dr. W. E. Miller discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favor of the former al-

Joshua

under the direction of God again renewed (Josh i. 1), Joshua, now in his 85th year (Joseph. Ant. v. 1 § 29), assumed the command of the people at Shittim, sent spies into Jericho, crossed the Jordan, fortified a camp at Gilgal, circumcised the people, kept the passover, and was visited by the Captain of the Lord's Host. A miracle made the fall of Jericho more terrible to the Canaanites. A miraculous repulse in the first assault on Ai impressed upon the invaders the warning that they were the instruments of a holy and jealous God. At fell-
and the law was inscribed on Mount Ebal, and read by their leader in the presence of all Israel.

The treaty which the fear-stricken Gibeonites obtained deceitfully was generously respected by Joshua. It stimulated and brought to a point the hostile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hailstorm, and a miraculous prolongation of the day, obtained a decisive victory over them at Makkedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country, as far as Kadesh-barnea and Gaza. He returned to the camp at Gilgal, master of half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confed- eracy of the Canaanitish chiefs in the north, under Java'm king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the Valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations with thirty-one kings swell the roll of his conquests; and amongst others the Anakim — the old terror of Israel — are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve and did not achieve the complete extirpa- tion of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land.

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

After an interval of rest, Joshua convened an as- sembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvelous fulfill- ment of God's promises to their fathers, and warn- ing them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended: and lastly, he caused them to renew their compact at Shechem, a place already famous in connection with Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 4), and Joseph (Josh. xxiv. 32).

He died at the age of 110 years, and was buried in his own city, Timnath-serah.

Joshua's life has been noted as one of the very few which are recorded in history with some fulness of detail, yet without any stain upon them. In his character have been traced, under an oriental garb, such features as chieflykindled the imagina- tion of western chroniclers and poets in the Mid- dle Ages: the character of a devout warrior, blame- less and fearless, who has been taught by serving as a youth how to command as a man: who earns by manly vigor a quiet honored old age; who combines strength with gentleness, ever looking up- for and obeying the Divine impulse with the sim- ple faith which held, with all his inner power and directs it calmly, and without swerving, to the accomplishment of a high mission.

All that part of the book of Joshua which re- lates his personal history seems to be written with the unconscious, vivid power of an eye-witness. We are not merely taught to look with a distant reverence upon the first man who bears the name which is above every name. We stand by the side of one who is admitted to hear the words of God, and see the vision of the Almighty. The image of the armed warrior is before us as when in the sight of two armies he lifted up his spear over un- guarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (iv. 14) with awe; the mild father who demonstrated with Achaz; the calm, dignified judge who pronounced his sentence; the devout worshipper prostrating himself before the Captain of the Lord's host. We see the lonely man in the height of his power, separate from those about him, the last survivor of a famous generation; the honored old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshipped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

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

Holy Scripture itself suggests (Heb. iv. 8) the consideration of Joshua as a type of Christ. Many of the Christian Fathers have enlarged upon this view; and Bishop Pearson, who has collected their opinions (On the Circumc., Art. ii. pp. 87-90, and 94-96, ed. 1843), points out the following and many other typical resemblances: (1) the name common to both; (2) Joshua brings the people of God into the land of promise, and divides the land amongst the tribes; Jesus brings his people into the presence of God, and assigns them to their man- sions; (3) as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so the Gospel of Christ succeeding the Law, announced One by whom all that believe are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses (Acts xiii. 39); (4) as Joshua the minister of Moses renewed the rite of circumcision, so Jesus the minister of the circumcision brought in the circumcision of the heart (Rom. xvi. 8, ii. 29).

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

Among the supernatural occurrences in the life of Joshua there is one, which is so much discussed as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (x. 12-14). No great difficulty is found, in
and of Hezekiah (2 K. xx. 11); and in connecting both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by He- rodotus, ii. 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Darle, and others, as no miracle but an optical illusion; by Rosenmüller, following Igen, as a mistake of the time of day; by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (Intro. to O. T. p. 644) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Joshua. So Ewald (Gesch. Isr. ii. 290) traces in the latter part of verse 18 an interpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet: and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Peru. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text as intended to describe a miracle is sufficiently vindicated by Delitzsch, Ost- reicher (in p. 190) and J. G. A. Richter, of Switzerland. Sedis ap. Non. Thes., Theol.-Philol. p. 516; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the 4th letter in his Apology for the Bible. — For the view of Hengstenberg on the “Standing still of the Sun and Moon,” see Evang. Kirchenzeitung, 1832, No. 55; and the same translated in the Biblical Repository, iii. 721-730. [H.]

Procopius, who flourished in the 6th century, relates (Vand. iii. 10) that an inscription existed at Tyris in Mauritania, set up by Phoenician refugees from Canaan, and declaring in the Phoenician language, “We are they who fled from the face of Joshua the robber the son of Nun.” Ewald (Gesch. Isr. ii. 297, 298) gives sound reasons for forbearing to use this story as authentic history. It is, however, accepted by Rawlinson (Bampton Lectures, for 1859, iii. 91).

Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. in Matt. i. 5, and Chorog. Luci praev. iv. § 3) quotes Jewish traditions to the effect that Rahab became a proselyte, and the wife of Joshua, and the ancestress of nine prophets and priests; also that the sepulchre of Joshua was adorned with an image of the Sun in memory of the miracle of Aijalon. The LXX. and the Arab. Ver. add to Josh. xxiv. 30 the statement that in his sepulchre were depicted the illustrious which were used for the circumcisions at Gilgal (Josh. v. 2). The principal occurrences in the life of Joshua are reviewed by Bishop Hall in his Contemplations on the O. T. ixxx. 7, 8, and 9.

W. T. B.

*Joshua, the son of Nun, is meant, Heb. iv. 8, where the A. V. employs Jesus for Ἰσραήλ, though the translators add in the margin “that is, Joshua. The object may have been to represent the Greek name in a uniform manner in the N. T. Most of the preceding English versions avoid this confusion. See Tranch’s Authorized Version, p. 75f. (2d ed. 1839). [Jesus, 8.]]

1. [Σαρχή: Alex. Ἰσραήλ; Josue.] An inhabitant of Beth-shemesh, in whose land was the stone at which the milch-kine stopped, when they drew the ark of God with the offerings of the Philistines from Ekron to Beth-shemesh (1 Sam. vi. 14, 18).

2. [Ἰσραήλ: Alex. Ἰσραήλ; Jesus.] A governor of the city, who gave his name to a gate of Jerusalem (2 K. iii. viii. 8).

4. [Ἰσραήλ: Jesus.] Called Joshua in Ezra and Nehemiah; a high priest, who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel. [See Hag. i. 1, 2, 14, ii. 2, 4; Zech. vii. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11.] For details, see Joshua, No. 4.

W. T. B.
JOSHUA, BOOK OF

theory that it is a compilation from two distinct documents. The boundaries of the different tribes, it is said, are stated sometimes with greater, sometimes with less exactness. Now, this may be a fault of the surveyors employed by Joshua: but it is scarcely an inconsistency to be charged on the writer of the book who transcribed their descriptions. Again, the Divine promise that the coast of Israel shall extend to the Euphrates (i. 4) is not inconsistent with the fact that the country which Joshua was commanded to divide (xiii. 16) does not extend so far. Again, the statement (xvii. 3) that Ekrón, etc., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (xv. 4) that it was assigned to Judah. Dr. Davidson gives no proof either of his assertion that the former text is in fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekrón was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment. Again, it would seem that Dr. Davidson pushes a theory too far when he assumes (Letter to O. T. 657, 658) that one and the same writer would hardly denote a "tribe" by one Hebrew word in some passages, and by a synonymous Hebrew word in others; or that he would not in some passages designate Moses as the servant of the Lord, and in others mention Moses without so designating him; or that he would not describe the same class of persons in one place as "servants of the Lord," and in another, as "servants of Aaron." Such alleged discrepancies are not sufficient either to impair the authority of the book, or to prove that it was not substantially the composition of one author.

2. Scope and contents. — The book of Joshua is a distinct whole in itself. Although to later generations it became a standing witness of the faithfulness of God in fulfilling his promises to Israel, yet the immediate aim of the inspired writer was probably of a more simple character. He records, for the information of the nation to which he belonged, the acts of Joshua so far as they possessed a national interest. The book was not intended to be a mere ascription of praise to God, nor a mere biography, nor a mere collection of documents. While it serves as a link between that which precedes, and that which follows it, it has a distinct and independent existence. There is not sufficient ground for treating it as a part of the Pentateuch, or a compilation from the same documents as formed the groundwork of the Pentateuch. The fact that its first sentence begins with a conjunction does not show any closer connection between it and the Pentateuch than exists between Judges and it. The references in i. 8, viii. 31, xxvii. 26, to the "book of the law," rather show that that book was distinct from Joshua. Other references to events recorded in the Pentateuch tend in the same direction. No quotation (in the strict modern sense of the word) from the Pentateuch can be found in Joshua. The author quotes from memory, like the writers of the N. T., if he quotes at all comp. xiii. 7 with Num. xxxv. 14; xiii. 7 with Num. xxx. 27; xii. 21 with Num. xx. 18; xii. 20-24 with Num. xviii. 1, 2; and Num. xviii. 20, xxi. with Num. xxxv. xxvii.

Perhaps no part of Holy Scripture is more immersed than the first half of this book by being printed in chapters and verses. The first twelve chapters form a continuous narrative, which seems never to halt or flag. And the description is frequently so minute as to show the hand not merely of a contemporary, but of an eye-witness. An awful sense of the Divine Presence reigns throughout. We are called out from the din and tumult of each battle-field to listen to the still, small Voice. The progress of events is clearly foreshadowed in the first chapter (vv. 5, 6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen Power, the Jewish leader rises high and calmly amid all.

The second part of the book (ch. xiii.-xxii.) has been aptly named by Dr. Davidson the book of the Norman conquerors of England. The lists of which it consists were doubtless the abstract of such reports as were supplied by the men whom Joshua sent out (xviii. 8) to describe the land. In the course of time it is probable that changes were introduced into their reports — whether kept separately among the national archives, or embodied in the contents of a book — by transcribers adapting them to the actual state of the country in later times when political divisions were modified, new towns sprung up, and old ones disappeared (comp. the two lists of Levitical towns, Josh. xxi. and I Chron. 54, d. c.).

The book may be regarded as consisting of three parts: a) the conquest of Canaan, (b) the partition of Canaan, (c) Joshua's farewell.

a. The preparations for the war, and the passage of the Jordan, ch. 1-5; b) the capture of Jericho, 6; the conquest of the south, 7-10; the conquest of the north, 11; c) the second address, 23; his second address at Shechem, and his death, 24.

The events related in this book extend over a period of about 25 years, from n. c. 1451 to 1426. The declaration of Caleb, xiv. 10, is useful in determining the chronology of the book.

3. Author. — Nothing is really known as to the authorship of the book. Joshua himself is generally named as the author by the Jewish writers and the Christian Fathers; and a great number of critics ascribe one or more or less entirely in that belief. But no contemporary assertion or sufficient historical proof of the fact exists, and it cannot be maintained without qualification. Other authors have been conjectured, as Philonax by Lightfoot; Eleazar by Calvin; Samuel and Vain Tii; Jeremias by Henry; one of the elders who survived Joshua, by Keil. Von Lengerke thinks it was written by one in the time of Joshua; by some one in the time of Samuel, or somewhat later: Masius, Le Clerc, Manner, and others by some one who lived after the period of Joshua, but before 426 B. C. It is now advocated for the most part in connection with a theory, which may perhaps help to explain the composition of the Pentateuch; but which, when applied to a book so uniform in its style as Joshua, seems to introduce more difficulties than it removes. It has been supposed that the book as it now stands is a compilation from two earlier documents: one, the original, called Holistic, the other supplementary, called Joabistic; they are distinguished by
the names given in them to God, and by some other characteristic differences on which the supporters of the hypothesis are not perfectly agreed. Ewald's theory is that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua form one complete work: that it is mainly compiled from contemporary and ancient documents, and that it has grown into its present form under the hands of five successive writers or editors; the first of whom composed his book in the time of the judges, and the last (to whom the book of Deuteronomy is assigned) in the time of Manasseh. His account of these authors or compilers may be seen in Gesch. Isr. i. 81-174, and his method of apportioning various parts of the book of Joshua to the several writers in Gesch. Isr. i. 84 and ii. 292-305. The theory of this able critic, so conjectural, complicated, and arbitrary, has met with many opponents, and few, if any, supporters even in his own country.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (xxv. 22-33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some of the events after the death of Joshua, such as the capture of Hazor, the capture of Bethel, of Debir (Josh. xv. 14-19, and Judg. i. 10-15), and of Leshem (Josh. xix. 47, and Judg. xviii. 7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (Josh. xv. 63, and Judg. i. 21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages xiii. 2-6, xvi. 10, xvi. 11, which also are subsequently repeated in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

The arguments which, though insufficient to prove that Joshua was the author, yet seem to give a preponderance in favor of him when compared with any other person who has been named, may be thus briefly stated: (a) It is evident (xvii. 26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book; (b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with the kings of Canaan (Josh. i. 1, iii. 7, iv. 2, v. 2, 9, vi. 10, viii. 1, 8, 11, xvi. 1, xxiv. 2), and with the Captain of the Lord's Host (v. 13), must have emanated from himself; (c) no one is more likely than the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (xxiii. and xxiv.); (d) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and to collect the documents contained in the book; (e) the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts: (f) one verse (vi. 25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, v. 1 and 6 — assuming the common reading of the former to be correct — are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene. Havernick's assertion that some grammatical forms used in Joshua are less ancient than the corresponding forms in Judges, may be set against Keil's list of expressions and forms which are peculiar to this book and the Pentateuch; and Havernick is not supported by facts when he supposes that no expedition of any separate tribe against the Canaanites could have occurred in the lifetime of Joshua, and that the book was therefore written some time afterwards. It has been said that the expression "to this day," which is found fourteen times in the book, presupposes so considerable an interval of time between the occurrence of the event and the composition of the history, that Joshua could not have lived long enough to write in such language. But a careful examination of the passages will scarcely bear out that observation. For instance, in three places (xxii. 5, xxiii. 8, 9) the phrase denotes a period unquestionably included within the twenty-five years which Joshua lived in Canaan; in xxii. 17 it goes but a little farther back; in iv. 9, vii. 26, viii. 29, and x. 27 it describes certain piles of stones which he raised as still remaining — a remark which does not necessarily imply that more than twenty years had elapsed since they were raised; and in vi. 25 it defines a period within the lifetime of a contemporary of Joshua, and therefore probably within his own. In the remaining passages (viii. 28, xiii. 13, xiv. 14, xvii. 63, xvi. 10) there is nothing which would make it impossible that Joshua should have used this expression.

4. There is extant a Samaritan book of Joshua in the Arabic language. It was printed for the first time at Leyden in 1818, with the title "Liber Josua; Chronicon Samaritanum, edidit, Latine commentariis illustravit, J. J. Junius, Edinb. — Liber extraordinarius; ad libro Septem metas apportioning various parts of the book of Joshua to the several writers in Gesch. Isr. i. 84 and ii. 292-305. The theory of this able critic, so conjectural, complicated, and arbitrary, has met with many opponents, and few, if any, supporters even in his own country.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (xxv. 22-33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some of the events after the death of Joshua, such as the capture of Hazor, the capture of Bethel, of Debir (Josh. xv. 14-19, and Judg. i. 10-15), and of Leshem (Josh. xix. 47, and Judg. xviii. 7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (Josh. xv. 63, and Judg. i. 21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages xiii. 2-6, xvi. 10, xvi. 11, which also are subsequently repeated in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

The arguments which, though insufficient to prove that Joshua was the author, yet seem to give a preponderance in favor of him when compared with any other person who has been named, may be thus briefly stated: (a) It is evident (xvii. 26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book; (b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with the kings of Canaan (Josh. i. 1, iii. 7, iv. 2, v. 2, 9, vi. 10, viii. 1, 8, 11, xvi. 1, xxiv. 2), and with the Captain of the Lord's Host (v. 13), must have emanated from himself; (c) no one is more like the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (xxiii. and xxiv.); (d) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and to collect the documents contained in the book; (e) the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts: (f) one verse (vi. 25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, v. 1 and 6 — assuming the common reading of the former to be correct — are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene. Havernick's assertion that some grammatical forms used in Joshua are less ancient than the corresponding forms in Judges, may be set against Keil's list of expressions and forms which are peculiar to this book and the Pentateuch; and Havernick is not supported by facts when he supposes that no expedition of any separate tribe against the Canaanites could have occurred in the lifetime of Joshua, and that the book was therefore written some time afterwards. It has been said that the expression "to this day," which is found fourteen
We have some words from Ritter respecting the geographical and historical accuracy of the book of Joshua, which deserve attention. The subject of the book being the subjugation and conquest of the land of Canaan, its predominant character, as he remarks, must from the nature of the case be geographical. But beyond this it is true also that the entire political and religious life of the Hebrews was interwoven in the closest manner, like a piece of network, with the geography of the country; far more so than is true of modern European nations; so that, especially at this time when we know so much of the topography of Palestine, we are able to subdivide the history of the people of God almost everywhere.

The test has been applied, and the result has been to establish the accuracy of the book even in minute details, and comparatively unimportant and trivial local relations. Its notices, not only of distinct regions, but of valleys, fountains, mountains, villages, have been confirmed, often with surprising certainty and particularity. The great geographer refers as an example of this to the account of Joshua's second campaign in the south of Palestine (Josh. xxii. 40, 41; xxiii. 1-13). He shows that the division of the country there into five parts, the scene of that expedition, rests upon a basis in nature, upon a diversity of geographical position which none but an eye-witness could have remarked, and which modern travellers find to be entirely characteristic of the region still. He shows, in addition to this general accuracy in the outlines, that the specialties are equally true; that many of the cities and towns which are mentioned have remained under their ancient names to the present day, and also occur together in groups, precisely in the manner that the sacred writers represent them as having been arranged of old. This agreement between the Old Testament records in general and the geography of the land as now more and more fully illustrated, furnishes an important evidence of the authenticity. (Ein Blick auf Palastina und seine Christliche Besiedelung, Berlin, 1852.)

On no side perhaps has this book been so violently assailed as that of its morality involved in the mission of Joshua to subdue and expel the aboriginal Canaanites. The reader will find some very pertinent remarks on this subject, in Dean Stanley's History of the Jewish Church, i. 254 ff. (Amor. ed.). We quote, after his example, a few sentences from one of Dr. Arnold's sermons on the Wars of the Israelites (vi. 35 ff.):—

"It is better that the wicked should be destroyed a hundred times over than that they should tempt those who are yet innocent to join their company. Let us but think what might have been our fate, and the fate of every other nation under heaven at this hour, had the sword of the Israelites done its work more sparingly. Even as it was, the numbers of those who were left, and the nations around them, so tempted the Israelites by their idolatrous practices, that we read continually of the whole people of God turning away from his service. But had the heathen lived in the land in equal numbers, and, still more, and they intermarried largely with the Israelites, how was it possible, humanly speaking, that any sparks of the light of God should have survived to the coming of Christ?"

They seem of very small importance to us now, these perpetual contests with the Canaanites and the Midianites and the Ammonites and the Philistines, with which the books of Joshua and Judges and Samuel are almost filled. We may half wonder that God should have interfered in such quarrels, or have changed the course of nature, in order to give one of the nations of Palestine the victory over another. But in these contests, on the fate of one of these nations of Palestine, the happiness of the human family depended. The Israelites fought not for themselves only, but for its... They did God's work; they preserved unhurt the seed of eternal life, and were the ministers of blessing to all other nations, even though they themselves failed to enjoy it."

H. JOSIAH (יהודה) [Jehovah heals or succors] Josian. [Val. almost everywhere Jersias; Sin. in Zeph. i. 1, Josias.] 1. The son of Amon and Jehudah, succeeded his father K. c. 641, in the eighth year of his age, and reigned 31 years. His history is contained in 2 K. xxii.-xxiii. 30: 2 Ch. xxxiv., xxxv.; and the first twelve chapters of Jeremiah throw much light upon the general character of the Jews in his days. He began in the eighth year of his reign to seek the Lord, and to put away his side, six years afterwards, in a personal progress throughout all the land of Judah and Israel, he destroyed everywhere high places, groves, images, and all outward signs and relics of idolatry. Those which Solomon and Ahaz had built, and even Hezekiah had spared, and those which Manasseh had set up were recently, now ceased to pollute the land of Judah; and in Israel the purification began with Jerobeam's temple at Bethel, in accordance with the remarkable prediction of the disobedient prophet, by whom Josiah was called by name three centuries before his birth (1 K. xii. 2). The Temple was restored under a special commission; and in the course of the repairs Hilkiah the priest (Hilkiah) found that book of the Law of the Lord which quickened so remarkably the ancient zeal of the king. The question as to the contents of that book has been discussed elsewhere; in forming an opinion on it we should bear in mind that it is very difficult for us in this age and country to estimate the sanctity of the opportunities which were then open to the study of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. xvii. 7) is a proof that even under such kings as Asa and his son, the Levites were insufficient for the religious instruction of the people. What then must have been the amount of information accessible to a generation which had grown up in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon? We do not know that the Law was read as a stated part of any public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction, Deut. xxvii. 11, was obeyed once in seven years), though God was worshiped by the voluntary sacrifices, public, and prayer. The son of Amon began only when he was sixteen years old to seek the God of David, and for ten years he devoted all his active energies to destroying the gross external memorials of idolatry throughout his dominions, and to strengthening and multiplying the visible signs of true religion. It is not surprising that in the 29th year of his age he should find the most awful denunciations and some home to his heart on a particular occasion with a new and strange power, and that he should send to a prophetess to inquire in what degree of closeness those words were to be
Josiah applied to himself and his generation. That he had never read the words is probable. But his conduct is no sufficient proof that he had never heard them before, or that he was not aware of the existence of a "Book of the law of the Lord."

The great day of Josiah's life was that on which he and his people, in the eighteenth year of his reign, entered into a special covenant to keep the law of the Lord, and celebrated the feast of the Passover at Jerusalem with more magnificent offerings, better arranged services, and a larger concourse of worshippers than had been seen on any previous occasion.

After this, he endeavors to abolish every trace of idolatry and superstition were still carried on. But the time drew near which had been indicated by Huldah (2 K. xxii. 20). When Pharaoh-Necho went from Egypt to Carchemish to carry on his war against Assyria (comp. Herodotus, ii. 159), Josiah, possibly in a spirit of loyalty to the Assyrian king, to whom he may have been bound, opposed his march along the sea-coast. Necho reluctantly paused and gave him battle in the Valley of Esdraelon; and the last good king of Judah was carried wounded from Hadadrimmon, to die before he could escape to Jerusalem.

He was buried with extraordinary honors; and a funeral dirge, in part composed by Jeremiah, which the affection of his subjects sought to perpetuate as an annual solemnity, was chanted probably at Hadadrimmon. Compare the narrative in 2 Chr. xxxv. 25 with the allusions in Jer. xxvi. 10, 18, and Zech. xii. 11, and with Jackson, On the Creed, bk. viii. ch. 23, p. 375. The prophecy of Huldah, that he should "be gathered into the grave in peace," must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in Jer. xxxiv. 5. Some excellent remarks on it may be found in Jackson, On the Creed, bk. xi. ch. 36, p. 664. Josiah's reformation and his death are commented on by Bishop Hall, Contemplations on the O. T. bk. xx.

It was in the reign of Josiah that a nomadic band of Sidonians overran Asia (Herodotus, vii. 104-106). A detachment of them went towards Egypt by the way of Phœnicia: somewhere southward of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetihus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah's reign. But Ewald (Die Parthenon, 165) conjectures that the 96th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Sidonians. The town Beth-shan is said to derive its Greek name, Scythopolis (Reland, Pol. 992), Lightfoot, Chor. Morc. vii. § 2), from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his authority in the land of Israel is added as an indication that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach.

The same people are described at a later period by Ezekiel (xxviii.). See Ewald, Gesch. Jthii. iii. 689.

Josiah Jotapata 1481

(Arabia; [Vat.] Alex.
Josibiah, the father of John, a Simeonite, descended from that branch of the tribe of which Shime was the founder, and which afterwards became most numerous (1 Chr. iv. 35).

Josiphia (Joseph), the father or ancestor of Shedonith, who returned with Ezra (Ezra viii. 10). A word is evidently omitted in the first part of the verse, and is supplied both by the LXX. and the Syr., as well as by the compiler of 1 Esdr. viii. 36. The LXX. supply Bazezi, i. e. בזזיא', which, from its resemblance to the preceding word בזזיא', might easily have been omitted by a transcriber. The verse would then read, "of the sons of Bani, Shedonith the son of Josiphiah." In the Syriac Shedonith is repeated, but this is not likely to have been correct. Josiphiah is called in Esdras Josiphians.

* Jotapata (Jotorparsa), a famous fortress in Galilee, which figured largely in the early post-Biblical Jewish history. Josephus, who commanded the forces in it, and was captured there, has given a full description of the place, which he had fortified, and of the siege by Vespasian, in which 40,000 persons perished before it was reduced. (J. iii. 7 E.) The site, which had been searched for by modern travelers, was discovered by Schultz in 1847, and identified with the modern Jift; an

(Gesch. LXX. iii. 507) conjectures that it may have been the common name of Josiah to restore not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is somewhat derogatory to the character of Josiah.
JOZACHAR

3. (lōsābāh: [FA. lōsābāh]) Alex. lōsābāh. A hero of Manasseh, like the preceding (1 Chr. xii. 29).

4. (lōsābāh: [Vat. E. lōsābāh]) Alex. lōsābāh, in 2 Chr. xxxi. 13.) A Levite in the reign of Hezekiah, who was one of the overseers of offerings and dedicated things in the Temple, under Cennahim and Shimai, after the restoration of the true worship.

JOTBAH

minihated T.T.L. about fifteen miles southeast from Akka. The spot was visited and described by Dr. Robinson in 1833 (Later Biblical Res. p. 105 ff.), who also identifies it with the Jiphthah-el of Joshua. [Jiphthah-el.]

JOTBAH (747n [goodness]; lēr'ēbah: [Vat. lērēbah]) Alex. lērēbah: Jos. lērēdyē; Jēthēh. the native place of Mesullemeth, the queen of Manasseh, and mother of Amon king of Judah (2 K. xxi. 19). The place is not elsewhere named as a town of Palestine, and is generally identified with Jdtbath, or Jotbathah, mentioned below. This there is nothing either to prove or disprove. [G.]

JOTBATH or JOTBATHAH (747n [goodness], pleasurable); lērēbah: [Vat. in Deut. Tašēbah; in Num. Vat. 1 Šēbēlah] Alex. lērēbah, [or šēba; Jēthētah]. Dext. ʃ. 7 Num. xxxii. 35), a desert station of the Israelites; it is described as "a land of torrents of water." There are several confusions of wadies on the W. of the Arabah, any one of which might in the rainy season answer the description, and would agree with the general locality. II. II.

JOTHAM (747n [Jehovah is uprightness]; lāhōthām: Vat. lāhōthān; Alex. in ver. 5 lāhō'ē; ver. 21, lēhō'ach; Joshua.) The youngest son of Gideon (Judg. ix. 5, 7, 21, 57), who escaped when his brethren, to the number of 49 persons, were slain at Ophrah by their half-brother Abimelech. When this likely act of Abimelech had secured his election as king, Jotham, ascending Mount Gerizim, boldly uttered, in the hearing of the men of Shechem, his well known warning parable of the reign of the bramble. Nothing is known of him afterwards, except that he dwelt at Beer.

2. (lēhō'ē, lēhō'ach; Vat. Alex. in 2 K. xv. 5, 7, 32. lēhō'ē; and so Alex. 2 K. xvi. 12, 1 Chr. xxvi. 23: Alex. 1 Chr. v. 17. lēhō'ach: Joshua, Joshua). The son of king Uzziah or Azariah and Jerusalem. After administering the kingdom for some years during his father's minority, he succeeded to the throne w. c. 758, when he was 25 years old, and reigned 16 years in Jerusalem. He was contemporary with Pekah and with the prophet Isaiah. His history is contained in 2 K. xxv. and 2 Chr. xxvii. He did right in the sight of the Lord, and his reign was prosperous, although the highways were not removed. He built the great hight of the Temple, made some additions to the wall of Jerusalem, and raised fortifications in various parts of Judah. After a war with the Ammonites he compelled them to pay him the tribute they had been accustomed to pay his father. Towards the end of his reign Rezin king of Damascus, and Pekah, began to assume a threatening attitude towards Judah. W. T. B.

3. A descendant of Judah, son of Jahdi (1 Chr. ii. 47).

JOURNEY, DAY'S. [JAYV'S JOURNEY, Amer. ed.]

JOURNEY, SABBATH-DAY'S. [SABBABTH-

JOZACHAR (747n [Jehovah re- rememberers]; lōsābāh: [Vat. lōsābāh] Alex. lōsēbērō:] Jōzāchar), the son of Shimeon the Ammonites, and one of the murderers of Josiah king of Judah (2 K. xii. 21). The writer of the Chronicles (2 Chr. xxiv. 26) calls him Zahah, which is nothing more than a clerical error for Jozachar: the first syllable being omitted in consequence of the final letters of the preceding word יָנָה.

In 15 MSS. of Kennicott's edition the name in the Kings is יָנָה, i. e. Jozabah, and in the same is the reading of 32 MSS. collated by De Rossi. Another MS. in De Rossi's possession had יָנָה, i. e. Jozachah, and one collated by Kennicott יָנָה, or Jozabah, which is the reading of the Peshito-Syriac. Barrington concludes that the original form of the word was יָנָה, or Jozaphat; but for this there does not seem sufficient reason, as the name would then be all but identical with that of the Mehitite Jeozabad, who was the accomplice of Jozachar in the murder. It is uncertain whether their conspiracy was prompted by a personal feeling of revenge for the death of Zedekiah, as Josephus intimates (Ant. ix. 8, § 4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehudah. The care of the chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm a suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the chronicler as an instance of Divine retribution. On the accession of Amoniah the conspirators were executed. W. A. W.
JOZADAK

JOZADAK [זִזַּדָּק [Jehoah righteously]: 
Iowa: [Vat. in Neh., Iowa: Joesdoc], 
Ex. iii. 2, 8, v. 2, x. 18; Neh. xii. 26. The name is a contraction of JOZADAK.

JUBAL (גֵּבָל) [sound, blast of trumpets]: 
"Jubal": A son of Lamech by Adah, and the inventor of the "harp and organ" (Gen. iv. 21; ki-nor evy'g, probably general terms for strung and wind instruments). His name appears to be connected with this subject, springing from the same root as yebel, "Jubilee." That the inventor of musical instruments should be the brother of him who introduced the nomad life, is strictly in accordance with the experience of the world. The connection between music and the pastoral life is indicated in the traditions of the Greeks, which ascribed the invention of the pipe to Pan and of the lyre to Apollo, each of them being also devoted to pastoral pursuits.

W. L. B.

JUBILEE, THE YEAR OF (גְּבָלֵי, שְׁכִינַת הָלֻכָּת, and simply גְּבָלָה: estos τος αφετέρους, αφετέρως σημαίνουσιν Japheth, and Japhethi, the fifth year after the succession of seven sabbatical years, in which all the land which had been alienated returned to the families of those to whom it had been allotted in the original distribution, and all bondmen of Hebrew blood were liberated. The relation in which it stood to the sabbatical year and the general directions for its observance are given Lev. xxv. 8-16 and 23-55. Its bearing on lands dedicated to Jehovah is stated Lev. xxvii. 16-23. There is no mention of the Jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manasseh, on account of the daughters of Zelophheud (Num. xxxvi. 4; see below, § 3. note d).

II. The year was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement with the blowing of trumpets through-out the land, and by a proclamation of universal liberty.

1. The soil was kept under the same condition of rest as had existed during the preceding sabbatical year. There was to be neither ploughing, sowing, nor reaping; but the chance produce was to be left for the use of all comers. [SABBATHIAL YEAR.]

2. Every Israelite returned to "his possession and to his family": "that is, he recovered his right in the land originally allotted to the family of which he was a member, if he, or his ancestor, had parted with it.

(a.) A strict rule to prevent fraud and injustice in such transactions is laid down in a Hebrew, [Note: the latter seems by far more probable. Connected with the mistake as to the origin of the word גְּבָלָה (which will be noticed below), was the notion that they were rams' horns. R. Jehush, in the Mishnah, says that the horns of rams (גְּבָלָה) were used at the Feast of Trumpets, and those of wild goats (גְּבָלָה) at the Jubilee. But Maimonides and Bartenora say that rams' horns were used on both occasions (Rashi Hinnom, p. 282, edit. Sarug). Rashi and others have justly objected that the horns of rams, or those of wild goats, would form but sorry trumpets. [CONTR.] It is probable that on this, as on other occasions of public proclamation, the trumpets were blown by the priests, in accordance with Num. xxxv. 29, 30, in which verse mendium lateis suspice, forte in die numerou, יְבָלָה בָּלִים, primiitus positum (pro גְּבָלָה) cui deinde (in the rest of the whole) "die expiationem"? (Comment. de vera fest. nat. iii. p. 20). In the same vein of criticism, considering that the rest of the soil is alien to the idea of the Jubilee, he would expunge ver. 11 as an interpolation. He is disposed to deal still more freely with that part of the chapter which relates to the sabbatical year.

c. The trumpets used in the proclamation of the Jubilee appear to have been curved horns, not the long, straight trumpets represented on the arch of Titus, and which, according to Hengstenberg (Egypt and the Books of Mose, p. 131, Eng. trans.), are the only ones represented in Egyptian sculptures and paintings. The straight trumpet was called גְּבָלָה, and גְּבָלִים the other, גְּבָלָה. The Jubilee horns used in the siege of Necho are called גְּבָלָה (Josh. vi. 4); and, collectively, in the following verse, גְּבָלִים. (See Keil on Josh. vi. 4.) It is not quite certain whether they were the horns of oxen or of metal (Kronwald, p. 50), but the latter seems by far more probable. Connected with the mistake as to the origin of the word גְּבָלָה (which will be noticed below), was the notion that they were rams' horns. R. Jehush, in the Mishnah, says that the horns of rams (גְּבָלָה) were used at the Feast of Trumpets, and those of wild goats (גְּבָלָה) at the Jubilee. But Maimonides and Bartenora say that rams' horns were used on both occasions (Rashi Hinnom, p. 282, edit. Sarug). Rashi and others have justly objected that the horns of rams, or those of wild goats, would form but sorry trumpets. [CONTR.]

It is probable that on this, as on other occasions of public proclamation, the trumpets were blown by the priests, in accordance with Num. xxxv. 29, 30, in which verse mendium lateis suspice, forte in die numerou, יְבָלָה בָּלִים, primiitus positum (pro גְּבָלָה) cui deinde (in the rest of the whole) "die expiationem"? (Comment. de vera fest. nat. iii. p. 20). In the same vein of criticism, considering that the rest of the soil is alien to the idea of the Jubilee, he would expunge ver. 11 as an inter-
Houses calculated rites of Jubilee. The same formula is used — "When ye be come into the land which I give unto you" — both in Lev. xxv. 2, and Lev. xxiii. 10.

III. Josephus (Ant. iii. 12, § 3) states that all debts were remitted in the year of Jubilee, while the Scripture speaks of the remission of debts only in connection with the sabbatical year (Deut. xxv. 13, 22). He also describes the terms on which the holder of a piece of land resigned it in the Jubilee to the original proprietor. The former (he says) produced a statement of the value of the crops, and of the money which he had laid out in tillage. If the expenses proved to be more than the worth of the produce, the balance was paid by the proprietor before the field was restored. But if the balance was on the other side, the proprietor simply took back the field, and allowed him who had held it to retain the profit.

Philos (De Septemviris, cc. 13, 14, vol. v. p. 37, edit. Tacht.) gives an account of the Jubilee agreeing with that in Leviticus, and says nothing of the remission of debts.

IV. There are several very difficult questions connected with the Jubilee, of which we now proceed to give a brief view:

1. Origin of the word Jubilee. — The doubt on this point appears to be a very old one. The Hebrew word is treated by the LXX. in different modes. They have retained it untranslated in Josh. vi. 8, 13 (where we find καταραίαν τοῦ Ἰαβδᾶ, and σάλπιγγα τοῦ Ἰαβδᾶ). In Lev. xxv. they generally render it by ἄφέσις, or ἄφεσας σήματια: but where the context suits it, by φάνον σάλπιγγα. In Ex. xix. 13 they have τις φωναὶ καὶ σάλπιγγαι. The Vulgate retains the original word in Lev. xxv., as well as in Josh. vi. ("cumque quarnus usus est in Jubilo"); and renders it by vocem in Ex. xix. 13. It seems, therefore, beyond doubt that uncertainty respecting the word must have been felt when the most ancient versions of the O. T. were made.

Nearly all of the many conjectures which have been hazarded on the subject are directed to explain the word exclusively in its bearing on the year of Jubilee. This course has been taken by Josephus — εὐχοδόρδιον δὲ σημαίνει τοίχωμα: and by St. Jerome — Jebul est dumitibus or mittitis. Many modern writers have exercised their ingenuity in the same track. Now in all such attempts at explanation there must be an anachronism, as the word is used in Ex. xix. 13, before the institution of the Law, where it can have nothing to do with the year of Jubilee, or its observances. The expression there used is εὐχοδόρδιον τοίχωμα; similar to that in Josh. vi. 5, where the meaning is here mean others, states that no cities were thus reckoned, as regards the Jubilee, but such as were walled in the time of Joshua. According to this, Jerusalem was excluded.

Maimonides says that the interval between the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement, in the year of Jubilee, was a time of rest only, without resuming the work of the servitude; and that observation regarding the jubilean year is confirmed by a passage in Lev. xxvii. 32. The Mishnah contains nothing on the jubilean year, and there is no evidence of a reformation in its observances.
JUBILEE, THE YEAR OF

the peculiar sound, or the instrument for producing the sound? Ewald favors the latter notion, and so does Gesenius (Thee. sub 71, 72), following the old versions (with which our own agrees), though under 71, 72 he explains 72 as clangor. De Wette inclines the same way, rendering the words in Ex. xix. 13 — "beim Blazen des Jobelhorns." Luther translates the same words — "wenn es wird abre lange tonen" (though he is not consistent with himself in rendering Josch. vi. 3) — Diller renders them, "cum trahatur sonus," and most recent critics agree with him. It would follow from this view that what is meant in Joshua, when the trumpet is expressly mentioned, is, "When the sound called Jubilee (whatever that may be) is prolonged on the horn." a

As regards the derivation of the word, it is now very generally ascribed to the root 71, 72, "undavit, copiose et cum quantum impetu fluxit." Hence Kraeland explains 71, 72, "id quod magno strepitu fluat"; and he adds, "duplex igitur in ea radice vis distinguitur, thuendi et sonandi altera in 71, 72 (dillium), Gen. vi. 17, altera in 71, 72 (artic. musicae inventor), Gen. iv. 21, conspicua." The meaning of Jubileum would thus seem to be, a resounding, penetrating sound? But in the uncertainty, which, it must be allowed, exists, our translators have taken a safer course by retaining the original word in Lev. xxv. and xxvi., than that which was taken by Luther, who has rendered it by Hallelujah.

2. Was the Jubilee every 40th or 50th year? — If the plain word of this text, xxv. 10, were to be followed, this question need not be asked. The statement that the Jubilee was the 50th year, after the succession of seven weeks of years, and that it was distinguished from, not identical with, the seventh sabbatical year, is as evident as language can make it. But the difficulty of justifying the wisdom of allowing the land to have two years of rest in succession has been felt by some, and deemed sufficient to prove that the Jubilee could only have been the 49th year, that is, one with the seventh Sabbatical year. But in such a case, a mere a priori argument cannot justly be deemed sufficient to overthrow a clear unequivocal statement, involving no inconsistency, or physical impossibility.

Heng has suggested that the sabbatical year might have begun in Nisan and the Jubilee Year in Tisri (Wimer, sub cocce). In this way the knobs of the harvestmen would only have been intermitted for a year and a half. It is thus a very harsh supposition to imagine that Moses would have spoken of the institution of the two years, and of the relation in which they stand to each other, without noticing such a distinction, had it existed. It is most probable that the sabbatical year and the Jubilee both began in Tisri, as is stated in the Mishna (Rosh Hodesh, p. 300, edit. Suren). [SABBATICAL YEAR.]

The simplest view, and the only one which accords with the sacred text, is, that the year which followed the seventh sabbatical year was the Jubilee, which was intercalated between two series of sabbatical years, so that the next year was the first of a new half century, and the seventh year after that was the first sabbatical year of the other series.

Thus the Jubilee was strictly a Pentecost year, holding the same relation to the preceding seven sabbatical years, as the day of Pentecost did to the seven Sabbath days. Substantially the same formula, in reference to this point, is used in each case d (cf. Lev. xxiii. 15, 16, xxv. 8–10).

3. Were Debits remitted in the Jubilee? — Not a word is said of this in the O. T., or in Philo. The affirmative rests entirely on the authority of Josephus. Maimonides says expressly that the remission of debts is a point of distinction between the sabbatical year and the Jubilee. The Mishna is to the same effect (Shebith, cap. x. p. 194, edit. Suren). f It seems that Josephus must either have

The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (Misc. Sac. p. 1025 f.; Critici Sacri, vol. ix.), in Carpov (p. 448 f), and, most completely given, in Kraeland (p. 11 f.).

The success of any distinguished Jewish teacher who advocated the claims of the 49th year was R. Johai. He was followed by the Gamm, certain doctors who took up the exposition of the Talmud after the work was completed, from the seventh to the eleventh century (Wimer, sub cocce). The principal Christian writers on the same side are, Scaliger, Petavius, Ussher, Canerius, and Schroeder.

a The grounds on which the opposite view rests are stated elsewhere. [See Cornet.]

b Carpov (App. p. 449) appears to have been the first to put forth this view of the origin and meaning of the word. The figure of the "rich stream of music" is familiar enough in most languages to recommend it as probable. But Gesenius prefers to make a second root, 72, juvabere, which he ascribes to onomatopoeia, like the Latin jiuvare, and the Greek ἠλέκτρον.

c The fanciful notion that 72 signifies a ram has some interest, from its being held by the Jews so generally and by the Chaldee Paraphrast; and from its having influenced our translators in Josch. vi. to call the horns on which the Jubileum was sounded trumpeta de ramis horne. It appears to come from the strange nonsense which some of the Rabbis in early times began to talk respecting the ram which was sacrificed in the place of Isaac. They said (R. Bechaj in Ex. xix. ap. Kraeland) that after the ram was burnt, God miraculously restored the body. His muscles were deposited in the golden altar; from his visera were made the strings of David's harp; his skin became the mantle of Elijah; his left horn was the trumpet of Sata.; and his right horn was to sound when Messiah comes (Is. xxvii. 15). R. Akiba, recent to connect this with the Jubilee, affirms that 72 is the Arable for a ram, though the best Arabic scholars say there is no such word in the language.

d Ewald (Afterthemer, p. 449) and others, have referred the words of Is. xxxvii. 9 to the Jubilee year expressly. But Gesenius adopts another view of the passage, which accords better with the context. He regards it as merely referring to the continuance of the decolation occasioned by the war for two years.

e The Message of Josephus and of Philo, and of every eminent Jewish and Christian writer, except those that have been mentioned, are in favor of the fifteenth. Iieder has taken up the matter very satisfactorily (Hein. der Cirix t. 995).

f Whether this was an absolute remission of debts, or merely a justification for the year, will be considered under Sabbatical Year.
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wholly made a mistake, or that he has drawn too
side an inference from the general character of the
year. Of course to those who were in bondage for
their debts, the freedom conferred by the Jubilee
must have amounted to a remission; as did, not
less, their freedom at the end of their seven years
of servitude.

The first Jubilee year must have fallen in due
course after the first seven sabbatical years. For
the commencement of the series on which the
succession of sabbatical years was reckoned, see
CHRONOLOGY, vol. i. p. 437, and SABBATICAL
YEAR.

V. Maimonides, and the Jewish writers in gen-
eral, consider that the Jubilee was observed till
the destruction of the first Temple. But there is no
direct historical notice of its observance on any one
occasion, either in the books of the O. T., or in any
other records. The only passages in the Prophets
which can be regarded with much confidence, as
referring to the Jubilee in any way, are Is. v. 7, 8,
9, 10; Is. ix. 1, 2; Ez. vii. 12, 13; Ez. xvi. 16,
17, 18. Regarding Is. xxxvii. 30, see note d, p. 1485.
Some have doubted whether the law of Jubilee ever
came into actual operation (Michaelis, Laws of
Jubilee, art. xxi., and Winer, sub r., a number)
others have confidently denied it (Krauss, p. 89; Hup-
feld, p. iii. p. 20). But Ewald contends that the
institution is eminently practical in the character
of its details, and that the accidental circumstance
of no particular instance of its observance having
been recorded in the Jewish history proves nothing.
Besides the passages to which reference has been
made, he applies several others to the Jubilee. He
conceives that the year of visitation mentioned in
Jer. xi. 19, xiii. 12, xlviii. 44, denotes the pub-
lishment of those who, in the Jubilee, withheld by
thyanny or fraud the possessions or the liberty of
the poor. From Jer. xxxii. 6-12 he infers that the
Law was restored to operation in the reign of
Josiah (ibid. p. 424, note 1).

VI. The Jubilee is to be regarded as the outer
circle of that great sabbatical system which
comprises within it the sabbatical year, the sabbatical
month, and the Sabbath-day. The rest and resto-
ration of an individual member of the state, in his
spiritual relation, belongs to the weekly Sabbath
and the sabbatical month, while the land had its
rest and relief in the sabbatical year. But the
Jubilee is more immediately connected with the
body politic; and it was only as a member of the
state that each person concerned could participate
in its provisions. It has less of a formally religious
aspect than either of the other sabbatical institu-
tions, and its details were of a more immediately
practical character. It was not distinguished by
any prescribed religious observance peculiar to itself,
like the rites of the Sabbath day and of the sab-
batical month; nor even by anything like the read-
ing of the Law in the sabbatical year. But to the
Hebrew state, policy and religion were never sep-
ated, nor was their essential connection ever
dropped out of sight. Hence the year was hal-
lowed, in the strict sense of the word, by the solemn
blast of the Jubilee trumpets, on the same day on
which the sins of the people had been acknowledged
in the generalfast, and in which they had been
symbolically expiated by the entrance of the high-
priest into the holy of holies with the blood of the
appointed victims. Hence also the deeper ground
of the provisions of the institution is stated with
marked emphasis in the Law itself. — The land was
to be restored to the families to which it had been
at first allotted by divine direction (Josh. xiv. 2),
because it was the Lord's. The land shall not be
purchased for ever: for the land is Mine; ye are
strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev. xxv. 23). "I
am the Lord your God which brought you forth
out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of
Canaan, and to be your God" (ver. 38). — The
Hebrew bondman was to have the privilege of
claiming his liberty as a right, because he could never
become the property of any one but Jehovah.
"For they are my servants which I brought forth
out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold
bondmen." (ver. 42). "For unto me the children of
Israel are servants, whom I brought forth out of the
land of Egypt." (ver. 55).

If regarded from an ordinary point of view, the
Jubilee was calculated to meet and remedy those
incidents which are inevitable in the course of
human society: to prevent the accumulation of
inordinate wealth in the hands of a few, and to
relieve those whom misfortune or fault had reduced
to poverty. As far as legislation could go, its
provisions tended to restore that equality in outward
circumstances which was instituted in the first
settlement of the land by Joshua. But if we look
on the subject (Bib. Law, art. 73). The very well-
proved instance of anything like it in other nations
appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by
Strabo, lib. viii. p. 365, ed. Cassub. He says that
they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald
following the statement of Plutarch, refers to the
institute in a similar manner, but Mr. Grote is of
another view of the matter (Hist. of Greece, vol. ii.
p. 594).

D. A collateral result of the working of the Jubilee
must have been the preservation of the genealogical
tables, and the maintenance of the distinction of the
tribes. Ewald and Michaelis suppose that the tables
were systematically corrected and filled up at each
Jubilee. This seems reasonable enough, in order that
the fresh names might be filled in, that irregularities
arising from the dying out of families might be recti-
fied, and that disputed claims might be, as far as pos-
sible, authoritatively met.

Its effect in maintaining the distinction of the tribe
is illustrated in the appeal made by the tribe of Man-
nosh in regard to the daughters of Zelophehad (Num.
xxxviii. 6). The sense of the passage is, however, ob

"a The words of Isaiah (v. 7-10) may, it would seem with
more distinctness, be understood to the same
 efect, as denouncing woe against those who had un-
righteously hindered the Jubilee from effecting its
object.

b If there were a difficulty in considering this pas-
sage to have any bearing on the Jubilee, from its
relation, apparently, to a priest's field (see § 11.
2 (c)). At all events, the transaction was merely the
transfer of land from one member of a family to
another, with a recognition of a preference allowed
to a near relation to purchase. The case mentioned
Ruth iv. 3 f. appears to go further in illustrating the
Jubilee principle. — Naomi is about to sell a field of
Elimelech's property. Boaz proceeds to the next of
kin to purchase it of her, in order to prevent it from
going out of the family, and, on his refusal, takes it
himself, as having the next right.

c The foundation of the law of Jubilee appears to
be so essentially connected with the children of Israel,
that it seems strange that Michaelis should have
doubly affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he
acknowledges that he can produce no specific evidence

JUDAEA

1. [Jubal.] Son of Joseph in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii. 30), in the ninth generation from David, about the time of King Joash.

2. [Jubal.] Son of Joanna [Joannah] or Hannaiah [Hannaiah, 8] (Luke iii. 28). He seems to be certainly the same person as Abin in Matt. i. 13. His name, Ἰẛα, is identical with that of ὸνα, only that ὸνα is prefixed; and when Jesus is discarded from Luke’s line, and allowance is made for St. Matthew’s omission of generations in his genealogy, their tiers will agree perfectly. Both may be the same as Hadiah of 1 Chr. iii. 24.


3. [Judas.] One of the Lord’s brethren, enumerated in Mark vi. 3. [Joses; Joseph.] On the question of his identity with Judæ the brother of James, one of the twelve Apostles (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13), and with the author of the general Epistle, see art. JUDE. In Matt. xiii. 55 his name is given in the A. V. as JUDAS [and so be given, Mark vi. 3].

4. [Judas.] The patriarch Judah (Suns. 66; Luke iii. 33; Heb. vii. 14; Rev. v. 5, vii. 5) [or in the last three passages, the name of the tribe.]

A. C. H.

* JUDA, a city of (A. V.), for τον Ιουδα in Luke i. 39, where Zacharias and Elizabeth lived, and where probably John the Baptist was born. But whether a town so named is meant, or the territory of JUDEA (=Ioubaia) is disputed. In the latter case the city is spoken of merely as one of the hill country (Αμοίβα, Luke) of Judæa, the name of which may have been unknown to Luke. Some suppose that the nameless city may have been Hebron, as that was both among the hills and belonged to the priests (Jos. xxvi. 11).

So Lightfoot (Hor, Hebr. ii. 493, Rotterdam, 1686), Sepp (Leben Christi, ii. 8), and Andrews (Life of our Lord, p. 65). The Franciscans have a Convent of St. John at ‘Ain Kòrin, a little west of Jerusalem, where they place the house of Zacharias and the nativity of the Forerunner (Thomson’s Land and Books, i. 530 ff.). Others regard this Juda as the name of the town itself, and identical with the modern Jatta, found in the neighborhood of Hebron. Dr. Robinson, after Reland (Palestina, p. 387), adopts this view (Bibl. Res. ii. 296, and Greek Horn, Notes, § 4). That this Jatta and Jutah in Josh. xxii. 16, are the same, no one can doubt; but it does not follow from this that Jatta and Jutah are the same. Meyer (on Luke i. 39) calls it an arbitrary supposition. Bleek also objects (Synopt. Erklärungen, i. 53) that if Luke had been acquainted with the name, he would naturally have introduced it in ver. 23. If Judah answers to Jutah (=Iat’ar) it can be only as a very mutilated form; for otherwise Juda and Jutah (Ἰουδα) have no etymological relation to each other.

II. JUDEA or JUDEA (Ioubaia), a territorial division which succeeded to the overthrow of the ancient landmarks of the tribes of Israel and the Jews, whose wealth did not consist in lands, it was reasonable that they should retain them in absolute possession. It has been conjectured that many of these tribesmen were foreign proselytes, who could not hold property in the land which was subject to the law of Jubilee.

a. This view is powerfully set forth by Bähr.
JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF

Judah in their respective capacities. The word first occurs Dan. v. 13 (A. V. "Jewry"), and the first mention of the "province of Judaea" is in the book of Ezra (v. 8); it is alluded to in Neh. xi. 3 (Heb., and A. V. "Judah"), and was the result of the division of the Persian empire mentioned by Herodotus (iii. 89-97), under Darius (comp. Esth. viii. 11). In the works of Josephus the word "province" is dropped, and throughout the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees, the expressions are the "land ofJudaea," "Judaea" (A. V. frequently "Jewry"), and throughout the N. T. In the words of Josephus, "The Jews made preparations for the work of rebuilding the walls under Nehemiah" — a name which they received forthwith on their return from Babylon, from the tribe of Judah, which being the first to arrive in those parts, gave name both to the inhabitants and the territory" (Ant. xi. 5, § 7). But other tribes also returned from Babylon, such as the tribes of Benjamin and Levi (Ezra i. 5, and x. 5-9; Neh. xi. 4-36); scattered remnants of the "children of Ephraim and Manasseh" (1 Chr. ix. 3), or "Israel," as they are elsewhere called (Ezr. ii. 70, iii. 1, and iv. 11); Nehemiah, vii. 7, the borders of those peoples was not ascertainable (Ezr. ii. 59). In fact so many returned that in the case of the sin-offering the number of he-goats offered was twelve, according to the original number of the tribes (ibid. vii. 17, see also viii. 35). There had indeed been more or less of an amalgamation from the days of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxx.-xxxiii.), which continued ever afterwards, down to the very days of our Lord. Anna, wife of Phanuel, for instance, was of the tribe of Asher (St. Luke ii. 36). St. Paul of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1), St. Barnabas, a Levite, and so forth (Acts iv. 3; comp. Acts xxvi. 7; and Pirie, Lexicon, vol. i. p. 128-130, ed. McCaul). On the other hand the schismatical temple upon Mount Gerizim drew many of the dissatisfied Jews from their own proper country (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8). Nazareth, a city of Galilee, was the residence of our Lord's own parents; Bethsaida, that of three of his Apostles; the borders of the sea of Galilee generally, that of most of them. The scene of his preaching — intended as it was, during his earthly ministry, for the lost sheep of the house of Israel — was, with the exception of the last part of it, confined to Galilee. His disciples are addressed by the two angels subsequently to his Ascension, as "men of Galilee" (Acts i. 11), and it was asked by the multitude that came together in wonder on the day of Pentecost, "Are not all these who speak, Galileans?" (Acts ii. 7). Thus, neither did all who were Jews inhabit that limited territory called Judaea; nor again was Judaea inhabited solely by that tribe which gave name to it, or even in sole conjunction with Benjamin and Levi.

Once more as regards the territory. In a wide and more improper sense, the term Judaea sometimes extended to the whole country of the Canaanites, its ancient inhabitants (Joseph. Ant. i. 6, § 2); and even in the Gospels we seem to read of the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan (St. Matt. xix. 1; St. Mark x. 1), a phrase perhaps countenanced by Josephus no less (Ant. xii. 14, § 11; comp. Jer. viii. 4), if the usual rendering of these passages is to be followed (see Reiss, Politien, i. 5). He stirred up the people, teaching through- out all Jewry (κατὰ διὸν τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας) beginning from Galilee, unto this place," said the chief priests of our Lord (St. Luke xxiii. 5). With Pontius, moreover (see Reiss, ibid.), and with Dion Cassius (xxviii. 16), Judaea is synonymous with Palestine-Syria; the latter adding that the term Palestine had given place to it. With Strabo (xiv. p. 756 f.) it is the common denomination for the whole inhabited country between Elymais and Lebanon, and even Libanus, thus including Galilee and Samaria. Similarly, the Jews, according to Tacitus (Hist. v. 6), occupied the country between Arabia on the E., Egypt on the S., Phoenicia and the sea on the W., and Syria on the N.; and by the same writer both Pompey and Titus are said to have conquered Judaea, the other and less important divisions of course included.

Still, notwithstanding all these large significations which have been alluded to, Judaea was, in strict language, the name of the third district, west of the Jordan, and south of Samaria. Its northern boundary, according to Josephus (B. J. iii. 3, § 5) was a village called Amath, its southern another village named Jirdas. Its general breadth was from the Jordan to Joppa, though its coast did not exceed three miles in breadth, and it was latterly subdivided into eleven lots or portions, with Jerusalem for their centre (Joseph. ibid.). In a word it entitled "the original territories of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, together with Dan and Simeon: being almost the same with the old kingdom of Judah, and about 100 miles in length and 60 in breadth" (Lewis, ibid. i. 2).

It was made a portion of the Roman province of Syria, upon the deposition of Archelaus, the ethnarch of Judaea in A. D. 6, and was governed by a procurator, who was subject to the governor of Syria. The procurator resided at Caesarea on the coast, and not at Jerusalem (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 13, § 3; xviii. 1, § 1; § 1; § 1). Its history as a Roman province is related under JERUSALEM (p. 1391 ff.), and the physical features of the country are described in the article PALESTINE. E. S. H.

JUDAEA, THE LAND OF (γεφων τῆς Ἰουδαίας: desert Judaea), designates the region in which John the Baptist made his first appearance as the herald of the Messiah (Matt. iii. 1). It is the same, no doubt, as the "wilderness of Judah" (ἐρήμων Ἰουδαίας) in Judg. i. 16. It lay along the eastern border of Judaea towards the Dead Sea, in which were the "six cities with their villages" mentioned in Josh. xv. 61 f. It was the scene of many of David's perils and escapes during the days of his persecution by Saul (Ant. xix. 4, 17; xix. 10-12; xx. 1; xx. 1; xx. 1; xx. 1). It was a desert, of course, not in our own, but the oriental sense; i.e., fit for cultivation at intervals, thinly inhabited, and resorted to mainly as pasture-ground. As such terms must be more or less fluctuating, it may have included also the western shore of the Jordan north of the Dead Sea, which Josephus also designates as ῾Ιούδαιας (B. J. iii. 19, § 7, and iv. 8, §§ 2, § 2). (See Bleek's Synopsis. ErkUii.-hnu. der dcri ersten Jerusalems, i. 141.)

Mark i. 4 and Luke (iii. 2) refer to the same desert simply as ῾Ιούδαιας. Luke's ἔρημους τοῦ ῾Ιούδαου (iii. 3) includes the wider circuit of John's labors at a later period, as in the course
of his ministry he preached now on this side of the Jordan and now on that. It is unnecessary, as well as incorrect, to suppose that any part of this Judean desert lay on the east of the river. It certainly is not just to regard גֶּפֶן גַּדְתִּי 'Leou- baias (Matt. iii. 1), as equivalent to גֶּפֶן גַּדְתִּי 'Leontov (Matt. iii. 5); for the latter (the other, or Jordan Valley) denotes the general region from which, and not that to which, the people came for baptism. (See also Bibli. Secura, xxiii. 529.) Hence, if the desert of the Saviour’s temptation (Matt. iv. 1 ff.) was in Perea (Stanley, Ellicott), it was a different one from that in Judaea. To urge no other reason, the proximity of Matt. iii. 1 to iv. 1 is adverse to that opinion. Probably the Saviour went to be tempted to a remotest part of the desert previously mentioned; but on returning to John after the lapse of forty days, he found him at Bethabara, or Bethany, beyond the Jordan (John i. 28). The actual place of the temptation may have been קָרָתָכּ (a corruption of קְרֵדְכִרְטֵא, 40 days), a part of the desert back of Jericho to- wards Jerusalem. It is a high mountain cut off from the plain by a wall of rock 1,290 or 1,500 feet high, is frightfully wild, and roams with wild beasts and reptiles, and thus answers fully to Mark’s significant intimation (i. 13) respecting the wildness of the scene (ἔθη τῶν θηρίων). H.

**JU'DAH** (יֵהוּדָה), i. e. Yehudâ [præs. honor.]: יְהוּדָא in Gen. xxix. 35; Alex. Jôdua, elsewhere Yôdâ in both MSS. and in N. T.; and so also Josephus: יְהוּדָא, the fourth son of Jacob and the fourth of Leah, the last before the tempo- rary cessation in the births of her children. His whole brothers were Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, elder than himself—issachar and Zebulun younger (see xxxv. 23). The name is explained as having originated in Leah’s exclamation of praise;” at this fresh gift of Jehovah—"She said, ‘now will I praise יְהוּדָא, Heb. Yehovah,’ and she called his name Yehudath (Gen. xxix. 35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob—"Ju- dah, thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (xlix. 8). The name is not of frequent occurrence in the O. T. To the Apocrypha, however, it appears in the great hero Judas Maccabæus in 1 Macc. iv. 47, in N. T. in Jude, Judas Iscariot, and others [Juda; JU-DAS].

Of the individual Judah more traits are pre- served than of any other of the patriarchs with the exception of Joseph. In the matter of the sale of Joseph, he and Reuben stand out in favorable contrast to the rest of the brothers. But for their interference he, who was “their brother and their flesh,” would have been certainly put to death. Though not the firstborn, he “prevailed above his brethren” (I Chr. v. 2), and we find him subse- quently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the detention of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (xliii. 3-10). And when, through Joseph’s artifice, the brothers were brought back to the palace, he is again the leader and spokesman of the land. In that thoroughly Oriental scene it is Judah who unhesitatingly acknowledges the guilt which had never been committed, throws himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, of- fers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of their disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (xiv. 14, 16-34). So too it is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (xvii. 28). This ascendency over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed by him to his father and sons, whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father’s sons shall bow down before thee until he shall be the gathering of the people.” (Gen. xlix. 17-40). In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier than the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to beat to Jacob the fragrant role of Joseph (Well’s Biblical Legends, pp. 88-90).

His sons were five. Of these three were by his Caananite wife Bath-shua; they are all insignificant, two died early, and the third, Shelah, does not come prominently forward, either in his person, or his family. The other two, Pharez and Zerah—twins—were illegitimate sons by the widow of the Egyptian, Zilpah, the elder, is named first; it is not infrequent in the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the elder, were descended the royal, and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which, centuries after, was reppossessed by his de- scendants—amongst villages which retain their names unaltered in the catalogues of the time of the conquest. The three sons went with their father into Egypt at the time of the final removal thither (Gen. xlii. 12; Ex. i. 3).

When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. The numbers of the tribe at the cen- sus at Sinai were 74,600 (Num. i. 26, 27), considerably in advance of any of the others, the largest of which—Dan—numbered 62,700. On the borders of the Promised Land they were 76,900 (xxvi. 22). Dan being still more nearly the chief of the tribe at the former census was Nahor, the son of Amminadab (Num. i. 7, ii. 3, vii. 12, x. 14), an ancestor of David (Ruth iv. 20). Its rep- resentative amongst the spies, and also among those appointed to partition the land, was the great Ca- leb the son of Jephunneh (Num. xiii. 6; xxiviv.). During the march through the desert Judah’s place was in the van of the host, on the east side of the Tabernacle, with his kinsmen Issachar and Zebu- lun (iii. 3-9; x. 14). The traditional standard of the tribe was a lion’s whelp, with the words, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered! (Targ. Pseudojon. on Num. ii. 3).

During the conquest of the country the only in- cidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are—(1) the misbehavior of Achan, who was of the great house of Zerah (Josh. vii. 1, 16-18); and (2) the conquest of the mountain-district of Hebron by Caleb, and of the strong city Debir, in the same locality, by his father and son—Anan the Oth- niel (Josh. xiv. 6-15; xv. 13-19). It is the only instance given of a portion of the country being expressly reserved for the person or persons who

---

a The obscure and much disputed passage in verse 10 will be best examined under the head Simeon.
conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors of each locality. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land wherein his feet had trodden" (Josh. xiv. 9; comp. Num. xiv. 21), may have led to the exception.

The boundaries and contents of the territory allotted to Judah are narrated at great length, and with greater minuteness than the others, in Josh. xv. 1-66. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchy intervened with Judah, and when more care would naturally be bestowed on them than on those of any other tribe; or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in 1 Chr. ii. iii., iv. no doubt arises from the former reason. However this may be, we have in the record a very full and systematic description of the allotment to this tribe. The north boundary — for the most part coincident with the south boundary of Benjamin — began at the bend of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at or about the present road from Jericho, ran westward to En-shemesh — probably the present Ain-Haum, below Bethany — thence over the Mount of Olives to En rogel, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, made the precipice of the city, climbed the hill in a N. W. direction to the Water of Nephthah (probably Lifer), and thence by Kirjath-jearim (probably Karit el-Lather, Beth-shemesh (Ain-Sheha), Timnah, and Ekron, to Japhoel on the sea-coast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the Wady el-Arish; but between these two points it passed through Machir Accabrim, the Wilderness of Zinc, Hebron, Adar, Karkaa, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin the extreme south of all (Josh. xv. 1-12). This territory — in average length about 45 miles, and in average breadth about 50 — was from a very early date divided into four main sections. (1.) The South — the undulating pasture country, which intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (Josh. xv. 21; Stanley, S. of P.). It is this which is designated as the wilderness (midebar) of Judah (Judg. i. 16). It contained thirty-seven cities, with their dependent villages of ophel and siphar. Twelve of those farthest south were called to Simcon (xix. 1-39). Amongst these southern cities the most familiar name is Beer-sheba.

(2.) The Lowland (xxv. 33; A. V. valley) — or, to give it its own proper and constant appellation, the Shefelah — the broad belt or strip lying between the central highlands — the mountain — and the Mediterranean, the lower portion of that maritime plain, which extends through the whole of the seashore of Palestine, from Sodom in the north, to Elimelechah at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the

**Country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (Neh. xxiii. 23, 24). There, planted at equal intervals along the level coast, were their five chief cities, each with its circle of smaller dependents, overlooking, from the natural modulations of the ground, the "standing waves" — "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excited the ingenuity of Samson, and are still remarked by modern travellers. "They are all remarkable for the beauty and profusion of the gardens which surround them — the scarlet blossoms of the pomegranates, the enormous oranges which gild the green foliage of their famous groves" (Stanley, S. of P. 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immense shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of corn-fields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the constant contests between Israel and the Philistines (S. of P. 258). From them gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat, which were transmitted to Phœnica by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of the Herods still nourished the moneyed class of Sidon and Tyre (Lk. iv. 20). There were olive-trees, the sycamore-trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (1 Chr. xxvii. 28). The nature of this locality would seem to be reflected in the names of many of its towns if interpreted as Hebrew words: DILEAN = cemeteries; GEDERAH, GEDOTH, GEDEROOTH, sheepfolds; ZOReAH, wassps; ES-SANNIN, spring of gardens, etc., etc. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew: and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of earlier Orphic names, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations. The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to the Philistines can only have been allotted to the tribe, and if taken possession of by Judah were only held for a time.

What were the exact boundaries of the Shefelah we do not know. We are at present ignorant of the principles on which the ancient Jews drew their boundaries between one territory and another. One thing only is almost certain, that they were not determined by the natural features of the ground, or else by boundaries to which the spies transmitted the same. The lowland plain, whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains, [Alemeth: Japhan, etc.] (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tophet's The Wandering, 1859.)

(3) The third region of the tribe — the Mount, the hill country of Judah — though not the richest, was at once the largest and the most important of the four. Beginning a few miles below Hebron, where it attains its highest level, it stretches eastward to the Dead Sea and westward to the Shefelah, and forms an elevated district or plateau, which, though thrown into considerable modulations, yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hill country of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Edom alone, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonously smooth,—round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat broader proportions than those immediately north of Jerusa-
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ren, which, though in early times probably covered with forests [HARETT], have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf-oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even in the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flowers. The number of towns enumerated (Josh. xxv. 38-60) as belonging to this district is 38; but, if we may judge from the ruins which meet the eye on every side, this must have been very far below the real number. Hardly a hill which is not crowned by some fragments of stone buildings, more or less considerable,—those which are still inhabited surrounded by groves of olive-trees, and inclosures of stone walls protecting the vineyards, now desolate; but where these are not, few, and woods and springs are frequent—in the neighborhood of "Solomon's Pools" at Ureth the most abundant.

(4.) The fourth district is the Wilderness (Mlheb), which here and here only appears to be synonymous with Aridcli, and to signify the sunk-en district immediately adjoining the Dead Sea. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Lebedi, on the slopes of the cliffs overhanging the Sea, or else on the lower level of the shore. The "city of Salt" may have been on the salt plains, between the sea and the cliffs which form the southern termination to the Ghor.

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (Josh. xxi. 9-19). The Levites had no cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

In the partition of the territory by Joshua and Eleazar (Josh. xix. 51), Judah had the first allotment (xv. 1). Joshua had on his first entrance into the country overrun the Shefelah, destroyed some of the principal towns and killed the kings (xv. 23-35), and had even penetrated thence into the mountains as far as Hebron and Debir (36-43); but the task of really subjugating the interior was yet to be done. After his death it was undertaken by Judah and Simeon (Judg. i. 20). In the artificial contrivances of war they were surprised by the Canaanites, and in some places, where the ground admitted of their iron chariots being employed, the latter remained masters of the field. But whatever force and vigor were in question, there the Israelites succeeded, and they obtained entire possession of the mountain district and the great corn-growing tract of Philistia (Judg. i. 19, 20). The latter was constantly changing hands as one or the other side got stronger (1 Sam. iv. v., vii. 11, etc.); but in the natural fortresses of the mountains Judah dwelt undisturbed throughout the troubled period of the Judges. Othniel was partly a member of the tribe (Judg. iii. 9), and

a On the words "Judah on Jordan," used in describing the eastern termination of the boundary of Naphtali (Josh. xix. 34), critics have strained their ingenuity to prove that Judah had some possessions in that remote locality either by allotment or inheritance. See the elaborate attempt of Von Raumer (Pall. pp. 495-410) to show that the villages of Jair are intended. But the difficulty—maximus auge insobebitis nonis, pat ultor exiprits tertis, has deflected the exegetes from the emendation; and the suggestion of Ewald (Gena. ii. 280, note) is the most feasible—that the passage is corrupt, and that Cinneroth or some other word originally occupied the place of "at Judah" is not accepted by "at Judah,"

A.

b Keil adopts this view of Raumer (see Bibl. Comm. in loc.). The district of the 60 villages on the east of the Bethlehem of which Izra is a native (xii. 8, 9) may have been Bethlehem-Judah. But even if these two tribes belonged to Judah, the tribe itself was not molest ed, and with the one exception mentioned in Judg. xx. 19, when they were called by the divine oracle to make the attack on Gibeon, they are not again found to do during the whole of that period but settle themselves in their homes. Not only did they take no part against Sisera, but they are not even rebuked for it by Deborah.

Nor were they disturbed by the incursions of the Philistines during the rule of Samuel and of Saul, which were made through the territory of Dan and of Benjamin; or if we place the Valley of Elah at the western extent of the Holy Canaan, then only on the outskirts of the mountains of Judah. On the last named occasion, however, we know that at least one town of Judah—Bethlehem—furnished men to Saul's host. The incidents of David's flight from Saul will be found examined under the heads of David, Saul, Samson, Hachilah, etc.

The main inference deducible from these considerations is the determined manner in which the tribe of Judah, as a tribe, adhered to the Ghor—neither offering its aid nor asking that of others. The same independent mode of action characterizes the foundation of the monarchy after the death of Saul. There was no attempt to set up a rival power to Ishbosheth. The tribe had had full experience of the man who had been driven from the court to take shelter in the caves, woods, and fastnesses of their wild hills, and when the opportunity offered, the men of Judah came and anointed David king over the house of Judah in Hebron" (2 Sam. ii. 4, 11). The further step by which David was invested with the sovereignty of the whole nation was taken by the other tribes, Judah having no special part therein; and though willing enough, if occasion rendered it necessary, to act with others, their conduct later, when brought into collision with Eipiraim on the matter of the restoration of David, shows that the men of Judah had preserved their independent mode of action. The king was near of kin to them; and therefore they, and they alone, set about bringing him back. It had been their own affair, to be accomplished by themselves alone, and they had gone about it in that independent manner, which looked like despising those who believed their share in David to be a far larger one (2 Sam. xix. 449). The same independent temper will be found to characterize the tribe throughout its existence as a kingdom, which is considered in the following article.

2. A Levite whose descendants, Kadmiel and his sons, were very active in the work of rebuilding the Jordan, he says, is counted as Judah's, or in Ju-

H.

a But Bethlehem appears to have been closely connected with them (2 Chr. xvi. 7, 9; xix. 1). The word here (Judg. i. 19) is Emek, entirely a different word from Shefelah, and rightly rendered a valley. It is difficult, however, to fix upon any such valley in this region sufficiently important to be alluded to. Can it be the Valley of Poes, where contests with the Philistines took place later?
the Temple after the return from Captivity (Ezr. iii. 9). Lord Hervey has shown cause for believing (Genev. i. 29, etc.) that the name is the same as HODAVIAH and HODEVAH. In 1 Esd. v. 58, it appears to be given as JUDIA.

3. ([In Ezr.] "Joas", [Vat. 160a, F. A. 160a; in Neh. xii. 8:] "Joas", [Vat. F. A. 1 Jos. 160a, Alex. "Jesd": in xii. 36, Vat. Alex. F. A. 1 omits: Judas, Judish.]) A Levite who was obliged by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 29). Probably the same person is intended in Neh. vii. 36, 56. In 1 Esd. ii. 27 his name is given as JUDAS.

4. ([Jos. 160a; Vat. Alex. 1 Jos. 160a; Judas.] A Benjaminite, son of Sennah (Neh. xi. 9). It is worth notice, in connection with the suggestion of Lord Hervey mentioned above, that in the lists of 1 Chr. ix., in many points so curiously parallel to those of this chapter, a Benjaminite, Hodaviah, son of Has-sennah, is given (ver. 7).

JUDAH, KINGDOM OF. 1. When the disruption of Solomon's kingdom took place at Shechem, only the tribe of Judah followed the house of David. But almost immediately afterwards, when Rehoboam deceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situate within the borders of Benjamin (Josh. xviii. 28, &c.), yet won from the heathen by a prince of Judah, connected the frontiers of the two tribes by an indissoluble political bond. By the erection of the city of David, Benjamin's former adherence to the temple was canceled; though at least two Benjaminite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (1 Sam. xxviii. 6; 1 K. x. 3; cf. Josh. xix. 1) and of Dan (2 Chr. xii. 10: cf. Josh. xix. 41-42) was recognized as belonging to Judah; and in the reigns of Abijah and Asa, the southern kingdom was enlarged by some additions taken out of the territory of Ephraim (1 Chr. xiii. 19, xv. 8, xvii. 2). After the conquest and deportation of Israel by Assyria, the influence, and perhaps the delegated jurisdiction of the king of Judah sometimes extended over the territory which formerly belonged to Israel.

2. In Edom a vassal-king probably retained his fidelity to the son of Solomon, and guarded for Jewish enterprise the road to the maritime trade with Ophir. Philistia maintained for the most part a quiet independence. Syria, in the height of her brief power, pushed her conquests along the northern and eastern frontiers of Judah and threatened Jerusalem; but the interposition of the territory of Israel generally relieved Judah from any immediate contact with that dangerous neighbor. The southern border of Judah, resting on the un-inhabited Desert, was not agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to Tyre. And though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggressive as a neighbor to Judah than Assyria was to Israel.

3. A singular gauge of the growth of the kingdom of Judah is supplied by the progressive augmentation of the army under successive kings. In David's time (2 Sam. xiv. 9, and 1 Chr. xxi. 5) the warriors of Judah numbered at least 500,000. But Rehoboam brought into the field (1 K. xii. 21) only 180,000 men: Abijah, eighteen years afterwards, 400,000 (2 Chr. xii. 3); Asa (2 Chr. xiv. 8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors; Jothamiah (2 Chr. xiv. 19-14), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,150,000, exactly double the army of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four inglorious reigns the energetic Amaziah could muster only 200,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (2 Chr. xxvi. 11) force of 390,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question which has been raised as to the accuracy of these numbers. So far as they are authentic, it may be safely reckoned that the population subject to each king was about four times the number of the fighting men in his dominions. [ISRAEL.]

4. Unless Judah had some other means beside pasture and tillage, of acquiring wealth as by maritime commerce from the Red Sea ports, or (less probably) from Joppa, or by keeping up the old trade (1 K. x. 28) with Egypt — it seems difficult to account for that ability to accumulate wealth, which supplied the Temple treasury with sufficient stores to be possessed by the hand of the spoiler, Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon, had each in succession a share of the pillage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (1 K. xiv. 26), again by Asa (1 K. x. 18), by Jehosh of Judah (2 K. xii. 18), by Jehosh of Israel (2 K. xiv. 14), by Ahaz (2 K. xvi. 8), by Hezekiah (2 K. xvii. 18), and by Nechochnezer (2 K. xxiv. 13).

5. The kingdom of Judah possessed many advantages which secured for it a longer continuance than that of Israel. A frontier less exposed to powerful enemies, a soil less fertile, a population harder and more united, a fixed and venerated centre of administration and religion, an hereditary aristocracy in the sacred royal caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and material prosperity of their people: still more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, was yet a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal: and lastly the popular reverence for and obedience to the Divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers: — to these and other secondary causes is to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 133 years; and lasted from n. c. 975 to n. c. 586.

6. The chronological succession of the kings of Judah is given in the article ISRAEL. A few difficulties of no great importance have been discovered in the statements of the ages of some of the kings. They are explained in the archaeological table in this article and in Keil's Commentary on the Book of Kings. A detailed history of each king will be found under his name.

Judah acted upon three different lines of policy in succession. First, animosity against Israel: secondly, resistance, generally in alliance with Israel, to Damascus: thirdly, defence, perhaps vassalage to the Assyrian king. (c) The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of reestablishing their authority over the Ten Tribes; for sixty years there was war
between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the
abandoning of Rehoboam’s forces by the authority of
Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the
irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the
fraternal harmony. The history revealed by the
daring Abijah brought to Judah a temporary accession
of territory. Asa appears to have enlarged it still further; and to have given a powerful
stimulus to the migration of religious Israelites to
Jerusalem, that Baasha was induced to fortify
Ramah with the view of checking the movement. 
Asa provided for the safety of his subjects from
invaders by building, like Rehoboam, several fenced
cities; but he resolutely carried through an
ancient Ethiopian horde; he hired the armed invasion of
Benhadad I., king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of
the true God by severe penal laws.

(b.) Hanani’s remonstrance (2 Chr. xvi. 7) prepares
us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the
policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Dan-
mascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange
races between Judah and Israel. For eighty
years, till the time of Amaziah, there was no open
war between them, and Damascus appears as their
chief and common enemy; though it rose
afterwards from its overthrow to become under Rezin
the ally of Pekah against Ahaz. Jehoshaphat,
active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from
the desert, cured the aggressive spirit of his nearer
neighbors, and made his influence felt even among
the Philistines and Arabs. A still more lasting benefit
was conferred on his kingdom by his persevering efforts for the religious instruction of the
people, and the regular administration of justice.
The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a
time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu.
Athaliah, the grand-daughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood-stained throne of David, till the
followers of the ancient religion put her to death, and crowned Jehosh the surviving scion of the
royal house. His preserver, the high-priest, ac-
quired prominent personal influence for a time; but
the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand
the power of Syria, was murdered by his own
officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the
recovery of Edom, provoked a war with his more
powerful neighbor, and finally ceased to push the
boundaries of the Syrians; and Jerusalem was entered and plun-
dered by the Israelites. But their energies were
sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the
subjugation of Damascus. Under Uzziah and
Jotham, Judah long enjoyed political and religious
prosperity, till the wanton Ahaz, surrounded by
united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of
Terror-Powers.

(c.) Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah
was yet spared for a checkered existence of almost
another century and a half after the termination
of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the repulse
of Semacheth, of the signal religious revival under
Hezekiah and under Josiah, and of the extension
of their salutary influence over the long-severed
territory of Israel, was apparently done away by the
ignominious reign of the impious Manasseh, and
the lingering decay of the whole people under the
two feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by
their treachery and inhumanity, their Assyrian master
trained in successive deportations all the strength
of the kingdom. The consumption of the ruin
 came upon them in the destruction of the Temple
by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailings of
prophets, and the taunts of heathen tribes released
at length from the yoke of David.

7. The national history of the Jews saw no
longer extant; but there was still, as there had been all
along, a spiritual life hidden within the body.

It was a time of hopeful darkness to all but
those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a
clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence
as interpreted by prophecy. The time of the division
of the kingdoms was the golden age of proph-
ey. In each kingdom the prophetic office was
required to minister to the prevailing necessities;
but in Judah the peculiar office of a mediatory
prophet was required by the circumstances of the
priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the House of
Baal and the Altar in Bethel. If, under the shadow of
the Temple, there was a depth and a grasp else-
where unequalled, in the views of Isaiah and the
prophets of Judah, if their writings touched and
elevated the hearts of thinking men in studios' re-
triment in the silent night-watches; there was,
also, in the few burning words and exhortations of the
prophets of Israel, a power to tame a law-
less multitude and to check the high-handed tyr-
anny and idolatry of kings. The organization
and moral influence of the priesthood were matured
in the time of David; from about that time to the
building of the second Temple the influence of the
prophets rose and became predominant. Some
historians have suspected that after the reign of
Athaliah the priesthood gradually acquired and
retained excessive and unconstitutional power in
Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the
conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such
power would have been manifest in the exorbitant
wealth and luxury of the priests, and in the constant
and cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of
Asa, against irreligion. But the peculiar offices
of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic
writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God’s
Word, neglect of the instruction of the laity, un-
truthfulness, and partial judgments, are the offenses
specially imputed to them, just such as might be
looked for where the priesthood is a hereditary
caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor
powerful. When the priest either, as was the case
in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, was,
in a particular manner, a teacher of a more spiritual
communion with God, ceased from living sympathy
with man, and became the mere image of an in-
teressee, a mechanical performer of ceremonial
duties little understood or heeded by himself, then
the prophet was raised up to supply some of his
deficiences, and to exercise his functions so far as
was necessary. Whilst the priests sink into ob-
scurity and almost disappear, except from the
genealogical registers, the prophets are pre-
ailing everywhere to the conscience of individuals,
in Israel as wonder-workers, calling together God’s
chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in
Judah as teachers and seers, supporting and puri-
fying all that remained of ancient piety, explaining
each mysterious dispensation of God as it was
unfolded, and pronouncing his gracious spiritual
providence in all its effects. The forward march
of Judah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in
preparing the Jews for their Captivity, cannot indeed
be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeed-
ing efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influ-
ence which they exercised on the national mind
was too important to be overlooked in a sketch
JUDAH UPON JORDAN

however brief, of the history of the kingdom of Judah.

W. T. B.

* JUDAH UPON JORDAN (A. V.), a border town of Naphtali (Josh. xix. 34). See note a, p. 1491. The Hebrew is more strictly Judah-Jordan, without a preposition. Though the tribe of Judah was in the south and Naphtali in the north, it is very conceivable that there may have been a town named after one tribe in the territory of another. Dr. Thomson's discovery gives support to this supposition. He found a place near Ramina and the Wadi er-Rubbeh (يوداَيِ الرَّحبة) or Valley of Rehoboth, marked by ruins and a tomb with a dome, revered as the tomb of a prophet by the Arabs, and called Siidi Yakhada (سيدى يخادة) "My Lord Judah." He is very confident that this is the site of the ancient Judah with its name perpetuated. (See Land and Book, i. 389 ff.) A conterminous border of Judah and Naphtali at any point is out of the question.

1. JUDASIM (יוֹדֵאתָיּ), only in Gal. i. 13, 14 in the N. T. ("Jewish religion," A. V., and 2 Macc. ii. 21 (rendered "Judaimus") and xiv. 33 twice ("Judasim") and xiv. 38 twice ("Judaism") and "religion of the Jews"). It designates the system of Jewish faith and worship in its perverted form as one of blind attachment to rites and traditions, and of bigotry, self-righteousness, and national exclusiveness. To what extent the religion of the Jews partook of this character in the time of our Lord, appears not only from his constant exposure of their formalism and self-assertion, but especially in the fact, that in John's Gospel the Jews (יוֹדֵאתָיּ) occurs more frequently than otherwise as synonymous with opposers of Christ and of his teachings. A similar usage is found in the Acts. Yet Paul recognizes the idea of a true Judaism as distinguished from its counterfeit, when he says: "He is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God (Rom. ii. 29).

Of the spirit of Judaism the Apostle himself before his conversion was a signal example. He ascribes to himself that character in various passages. He declares in Gal. i. 13, 14 that his persecution of the church was a fruit and evidence of this spirit, and that in the violence of his zeal he outstripped even of his associates or complices (ἁτρήσθης) as a zealot (ἱππότης) for the traditions of the fathers. (See also Acts ix. 1 ff.; xxvi. 9; 1 Tim. i. 13, xvi.) Such Judaism possessed in the eyes of a Jew the merit of both patriotism and piety, and hence is portrayed as such in the heroes of the Jewish apocryphal books.

2. JUDAS (יוֹדֵא), the Greek form of the Hebrew name JUDAH, occurring in the LXX. and N. T. (JUDAS).

1. [Vat. Alex. ὸδας; Codex E, ℃. f. 28, 31.] The son of Mattathias, called Macceus (1 Macc. ii. 4). [MACCEUSES.]

2. The son of Mattathias, called Macceus (1 Macc. ii. 4). [MACCEUSES.]

3. The son of Calphi (Архиепископ), a Jewish general under Jonathan (1 Macc. xi. 70).

4. A Jew occupying a conspicuous position at Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus [Aristobulus] and the Egyptian Jews (2 Macc. i. 10). He has been identified with an Es bense, consciens for his prophetic gifts (Jos. Ant. xiii. 11, 2; B. J. i. 3, 5); and with Jews Macceuses (Grinnm ad loc.). Some again suppose that he is a person otherwise unknown.

5. A son of Simon, and brother of Joannes Hyrcanus (1 Macc. xvi. 2), murdered by Ptolemaus the usurper, either at the same time (c. 135 n. c.) with his father (1 Macc. xvi. 15 ff.), or shortly afterwards (Jos. Ant. xiii. 8, 1: cf. Grinnm, ad Macc. 1. c.).

6. The patriarch Judah (Matt. i. 2, 3).

B. F. W.

7. A man residing at Damascus, in "the street which is called Straight," in whose house Saul of Tarsus lodged after his miraculous conversion (Acts ix. 11). The "Straight Street" may be with little question identified with the "Street of Bazanars," a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city, which, as in all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so-called "House of Judas" is still shown in an open space called "the Shekyh's Place," a few steps west of the "Street of Bazanars." It contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to Maundrell (Lord Torr. to Maundrell, a leading as the "tomb of Ananias." The house is an object of religious respect to Mussulmans as well as Christians (Stanley, S. P. p. 412; Conybeare and Hows. i. 102; Maundrell, l. c.; Pococke, i. 119). E. V.

* It is not certain, nor probable, that this Judas (of whom nothing further is known) was at that time a Christian. None of Saul's company were Christians, nor did they know that he had become one. Neither they, nor he, would probably know of a Christian family to which they could address him, nor would such a family have then received him. It was probably led by his companions to his intended stopping-place—possibly, a public house. It is a fair inference from the narrative, that the host and the guest were both personally strangers to Ananias.

S. W.

JUDAS, SURNAMED BAR-SABAS (יוֹדֵא־בַּר־סָבָא, Ἰουδάς ὁ ἀπὸ Δαμασκός Βαρσαβάς [Ludan. Tisch. Targ. Barabas]; Judas qui quomominatur Barba) was a Jew of Antioch, member of the Apostolic church at Jerusalem (יוֹדֵא־בַּר־סָבָא ἐν τῷ Ἀντιόχεια), Acts xx. 22, and "perhaps a member of the Presbytery" (Neeander, Pl. & Ev. i. 123), ended with the gift of prophecy (ver. 32), chosen with Silas to accompany St. Paul and St. Barnabas as delegates to the church at Antioch, to make known the decree concerning the terms of admission of the Gentile converts, and to receive the Gentile communion and character by personal communications (ver. 27). After employing their prophetic gifts for the confirmation of the Syrian Christians in the faith, Judas went back to Jerusalem, while Silas either remained at Antioch (for the reading Acts xx. 34 is uncertain; and while some MSS. followed by the Vulgate, add ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰουδάς ἐν τῇ Ἰερουσαλημ, the verse is accurate, or possibly readeth thither. Nothing further is recorded of Judas. The form of the name Bar-sabas [or Baraabas, see above]—Son of Sabas, has led to several conjectures: Wolff and Grotsch, probably enough, suppose him to have been a brother of Joseph Barbabas (Acts ii. 21); while Schott (in loc. § 163, p
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(1) takes Sabas or Zabas to be an abbreviated form of Zebedee, regards Judas as an elder brother of James and John, and attributes to him the "ad" (Add). Judas Iscariot, on the other hand (Die Katholische, Briefe, Lengy, 1801–8, ii. 80), advances the opinion, though with considerable hesitation, that he may be identical with the Apostle Ioudas Isakoues

JUDAS OF GALILEE (Ioudas Γαλαταιος: Judas Galileus), the leader of a popular revolt in "the days of the taxing" (i. e. the census, under the prefecture of P. Sulp. Quirinus, A. D. 6, A. C. c. 759), referred to by Galanell in his speech before the Sanhedrin (Acts v. 37). According to Josephus (Ant. xviii. 1, § 1), Judas was a Gaionate of the city of Gamala, probably taking his name of Gaillam from his instruction having had its rise in Galilee. His revolt had a character, the watchword of which was "we will have no Lord nor master but God," and he boldly denounced the payment of tribute to Caesar, and acknowledged no authority, as treason against the principles of the Mosaic constitution, and signifying nothing short of downright slavery. His fiery eloquence and the popularity of his doctrines and martial conduct on the other hand, by many of whom he was regarded as the Messiah (Orig. H. w. in loc. xcv.), and the country was for a time entirely given over to the lawless depredations of the fierce and licentious throng who had joined themselves to him; but the might of Rome proved irresistible: Judas himself perished, and his followers were "dispersed," though not entirely destroyed till the final overthrow of the city and nation. With his fellow insurgent Sadoc, a Pharisee, Judas is represented by Josephus as the founder of a fourth sect, in addition to the Pharisees, Saducees, and Essenes (Ant. xviii. 1, § 1, 6; B. J. ii. 8, § 1). The only point which appears to have distinguished his followers from the Pharisees was their stubborn love of freedom, leading them to despise torments or death for themselves or their friends, rather than call any man master.

The Gaunions, as his followers were called, may be regarded as the doctrinal ancestors of the Zadots and Sicarii of later days, and to the influence of his tenets Josephus attributes all subsequent insurrections of the Jews, and the final destruction of the City and Temple. James and John, the sons of Judas, headed an unsuccessful insurrection in the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander, A. D. 47; by whom they were taken prisoners and crucified. Twenty years later, A. D. 66, their younger brother Menahem, following his father's example, took the lead of a band of desperadoes, who, after pillaging the armory of Herod in the fortress of Masada, near the "gardens of Engaddi," marched to Jerusalem, occupied the city, and after a desperate siege took the palace, where he immediately assumed the state of a king, and committed great enormities. As he was going up to the Temple to worship, with great pomp, Menahem was taken by the partisans of Eleazar the high-priest, by whom he was tortured to death Aug. 15, A. D. 66 (Milman, Hist. of Jews, ii. 152, 231; Joseph. l. c.; Orig. in Matt. 7, xxv. § 25).

JUDAS ISCARIOT (Ioudas Iskarioth in Mark and Luke, Lachm. Tisch. Treg. Iskarioth: Judas Ischariotes). He is sometimes called "the son of Simon" (John vi. 71, xiii. 2, 26), but more commonly (the three Synoptic Gospels give no other name), Iscariotes (Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 19; Luke vi. 16, etc.). In the three lists of the Twelve there is added in each case the fact that he was the betrayer.

The name Iscariot has received many interpretations more or less conjectural.

(1) From Kerihoth (Josh. xvi. 23), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. קְרֵיָהוֹת, ISH KIRIOTH, passing into Ἰσκαριότης in the same way as Ὁ Ἰσκαριότης Iσκαριότης ish Tob, a man of Tob—appears in Josephus (Ant. vii. 6, § 1) as ἶσος ὁ διστάσας (Winer, Realb. s. v.). In connection with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in John vii. 71, ὁ Ἰσκαριότης, and that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscariot belong to Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis his position among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (Acts ii. 7), would be exceptional; and this has led to

(2) From Kartha in Galilee (Kartan, A. V., Josh. xxi. 32; Ewald, Gesch. Israel. v. 321). As equivalent to Ἰσκαριότης (Curtius on Matt. x. 4; Hemmatt, Misell. Groving. iii. 938, in Winer, Realb.).

(4) From Ἰσκαριότης, as "date-trees (καρπωτείς) in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (Barolocci, Bibl. Reg. iii. 10, in Winer, l. c.; Gill, Com. in Matt. x. 4)."

(5) From Ἰσκαριότης ὁ Ἰσος, a leathern apron, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and = Judas with the apron (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt. x. 4).

(6) From Ἰσκαριότης, isos = strangeling (angius), as given after his death, and confessing (Lightfoot, l. c.), or indicating that he had been subject to a disease tending to sublime previously (Helmich in Suicer. Thes. s. v. Ἰσκαριότης). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by Orig., Tract. in Matt. xxxv.

Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the Apostles, we know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sad vision of a poet (Keble, Lyres Inwoacement, ii. 15), or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (Col. Apec. N. T. Ewry. Infinit. c. 35) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. What that appearance implies, however, is that he had previously declared himself a disciple. He was drawn, as the others were, by the preaching of the Baptist, or his own Messianic hopes, or the "gracious words" of the new teacher, to leave his former life, and to obey the call of the Prophet of Nazareth. What later and more selfish motives may have mingled even then with his faith and zeal, we can only judge by reasoning backward from the sequel. Gifts of some kind there must have been, rendering the choice of such a man not strange to others, not unfit in itself, and the function which he exercised afterwards among the Twelve may indicate what they were. The position of his name, uniformly the last in the lists of the Apostles in the Synoptic Gospels, is due, it may be imagined, to the infamy which afterwards rested on his name, but, prior to that guilt, it would seem that he took his place in the group of four which always stand last in order, as possessing neither the love, nor the faith, nor the devotion which marked the sons of Zebedee and Judah.
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The choice was not made, we must remember, without a provision of its issue. Jesus knew from the beginning... 

He (John xix. 6), and the distinctiveness with which that Evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (John xii. 4, xiii. 27), leaves us with the impression that he too shrank instinctively (Bengel describes it as "singularis antipathia," Comm. V. T. on John vi. 64) from a nature so opposite to his own. We can hardly expect to solve the question why such a man was chosen for such an office. Either we must assume absolute fore-knowledge, and then content ourselves with saying with Calvin that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (Sündigeleg. Jesu, p. 97) that he was chosen that the Divine purpose might be accomplished through him; or else with Neander (Leben Jesu, § 77) that there was a discernment of the latent germs of evil, such as belong to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (John ii. 25; Matt. ix. 3; Mark xii. 15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (Mark iii. 5), or astonishment (Mark vi. 6; Luke xii. 9), admitting the thought "with men this is impossible, but not with God." Did He in the depth of that insight, and in the fulness of his compassion, seek to over-come the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many parts of our Lord's teaching, to remember that they must have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and Mammon (Matt. vi. 19-24), and the destructive power of the "cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches" (Matt. xiii. 22, 29), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "malignant Mammon" (Luke xvi. 11), the proverb of the camel passing through the needle's eye (Mark x. 25), must have fallen on his heart as meant specially for him. He was among those who asked the question, Who then can be saved? (Mark x. 26). Of him, too, we may say, that, when he sinned, he was "kicking against the pricks," letting slip his call and election; 

John vi. 70), indicate that even then, though the greed of immediate, or the hope of larger gain, kept him from "going back," as others did (John vi. 66), hatred was taking the place of love, and heading him on to a fiendish malignity. 

In what way that evil was related, what discipline was applied to counteract it, has been hinted at above. The scene at Bethany (John xii. 1-9; Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9) showed how deeply the canker had eaten into his soul. The warm outpouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utter's himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft. 

The narrative of Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv. places this history in close connection (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. It leaves the motives of the betrayer to conjecture (comp. Neander, Leben Jesu, § 294). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clutch at the bribe offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (Matt. xxvi. 15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get the thirty shekels as his own. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial" of Jesus, and the lukewarmness of the people, and the conspiracies of the priests led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewalt, Gesch. Israels, v. 441-446). There may have been the thought that, after all, the betrayal could do no harm, that his Master would provide for the care of the poor, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. p. 886, in Winer, and Whiston on Matt. xxvii. 4). 

Another motive has been suggested (comp. Neander, Leben Jesu, §; and Whately, Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith, Discourse iii.) of an entirely different kind, altering altogether the character of the act. Not the love of money, nor the fear of disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter, or James, or John; this it was that made him the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position, from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by them to the throne of his father David, then he might look forward to being foremost and highest in that kingdom, with all his desires for wealth and power gratified to the full.
Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it fails for that very reason. It attributes to the Galilean peasant a subtlety in forecasting political combinations, and planning stratagems accordingly, which is hardly compatible with his character and learning, hardly consistent either with the pettiness of the faults into which he had hitherto fallen. Of the other motives that have been assigned we need not care to fix on any one, as that which singly led him on. Crime is for the most part the result of a hundred more or less bewilderings fury through the mind of the criminal.

During the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the 'Paschal or quasi-Paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to and fro from Bethany to Jerusalem, and looked on the actual parable of the barren and condemned tree (Mark xviii. 20—24), and shed the vigils in Gethsemane (John xviii. 3). At the Last Supper he is present, looking forward to the consummation of his guilt as drawing nearer every hour. All is at first as if he were still faithful. He is admitted to the feast. His feet are washed, and for him there are the fearful words, "Ye are clean, but not all." He, it may be, receives the bread and the wine which were the pledges of the new covenant. Then he disclosing words which proved that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me." Others ask, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He too must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (Matt. xxvi. 25). He alone hears the answer. John only, and through him Peter, and the traitor himself, understand the meaning of the act which pointed out that he was the guilty one (John xiii. 26). After this there comes on him that paroxysm and insanity of guilt as of one whose human soul was possessed by the Spirit of Evil — "Satan entered into him" (John xiii. 27). The words, "What thou doest, do quickly," come as a spur to drive him on. The other disciples see in them only a command which they interpret as connected with the work he had hitherto undertaken. Then he completes the sin from which even those words might have drawn him back, and he knows that garden in which his Master and his companions had so often rested after the weary work of the day. He comes, accompanied by a band of officers and servants (John xviii. 3), with the kiss which was probably the usual salutation of the disciples. The words of Jesus, calm and gentle as they were, showed that this was what embittered the treachery, and made the suffering it inflicted more acute (Luke xxiii. 48).

What followed in the confusion of that night the Gospels do not record. Not many students of the N. T. will follow Heumann and Archip. Whately (Essays on Doubters, i. e.) in the hypothesis that Judas was "the other disciple" that was known to the high-priest, and brought Peter in (comp. Meyer on John xviii. 15). It is probable, indeed, that he who had gone out with the high priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (Matt. xxvii. 5). He repented, and his guilt and all that had tempted him to it became hateful. He will get rid of the accursed thing, will transfer it back again to those who with it had lured him on to destruction. They mock and sneer at the tool whom they have used, and then there comes over him the horror of great darkness that precedes self-murder. He has owned his sin with "an exceeding bitter cry," but he dares not turn, with any hope of pardon, to the Master whom he has betrayed. He hurls the money, which the priests refused to take, into the sanctuary (Σατέρι) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or propitiation. He is "the son of perdition" (John xvii. 12). "He departed and went and hanged himself" (Matt. xxvii. 5). He went unto his own place" (Acts 1. 25).

We have in Acts i. another account of the circumstances of his death, which it is not easy to harmonize with that given by St. Matthew. There, in words which may have been spoken by St. Peter (Meyer, following the general consensus of interpreters), or may have been a parenthetical notice inserted by St. Luke (Calvin, Olshausen, and others), it is stated —

(1.) That, instead of throwing the money into the Temple, he bought (ερημοιον) a field with it.
(2.) That, instead of hanging himself, "falling headlong, and breaking his bowels" (Acts, in Matt. xxvii. 5. comp. also Theophanes, Hom. xxvii., in Sueton, Thes. 4. v. "Locus")

The words έρημοοιοιοι in St. Peter's speech convey to our minds, probably were meant to convey to those who heard them, the impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (in loc.) quote passages from rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in Gen. xxxii. 55, and Num. xxiv. 25. On the other hand it should be remembered that many interpreters reject that explanation (comp. Meyer, in loc.), and that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, Comment. on N. T. in loc.) enters a distinct protest against it.

a Comp. the remarks on this hypothesis, in which Whately followed (unconsciously perhaps) in the footsteps of Paulinus, in Erich u. Gruber's Ἀνθ. Εὐρυπλ. Σεβ. vol. v. art. "Judas." b The question whether Judas was a partaker of the Lord's Supper is encompassed with many difficulties, both dogmatic and harmonistic. The general consensus of patristic commentators gives an affirmative, that of modern critics a negative, answer. (Comp. Meyer, Comm. on John xiii. 38.)

c The combination of the narratives of the four Gospels is not without grave difficulties, for which harmonists and commentators may be consulted. We have given that which seems the most probable result.

d This passage has often been appealed to, as illustrating the difference between μητριακὰ and μητρακία. It is questionable, however, how far the N. T. writers were in fact following him (comp. Gruber, in loc.). Still more questionable is the notion above referred to, that St. Matthew describes his disappointment at a result so different from that which he had reckoned on.

It is characteristic of the wide, far-reaching sym pathy of Origen, that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there (μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου καί δούλος) meet his Lord, and confess his guilt and ask for pardon (Tract. in Matt. xxxvii. 5. comp. also Theophanes, Hom. xxvii., in Sueton, Thes. 4. v. "Locus")

The words έρημοοιοιοι in St. Peter's speech convey to our minds, probably were meant to convey to those who heard them, the impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (in loc.) quote passages from rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in Gen. xxxii. 55, and Num. xxiv. 25. On the other hand it should be remembered that many interpreters reject that explanation (comp. Meyer, in loc.), and that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, Comment. on N. T. in loc.) enters a distinct protest against it.

a Meyer mentions some who reject the above explanation respecting έρημοοιοιοι, though he gives his own version to it.
It is, of course, easy to cut the knot, as Strauss and De Wette have done, by assuming one or both accounts to be spurious and legendary. Receiving both as authentic, we are yet led to the conclusion that the explanation is to be found in some unknown series of facts, of which we have but two fragmentary narratives. The solutions that have been suggested by commentators and harmonists are nothing more than exercises of ingenuity seeking to dovetail into each other portions of a dissected map which, for want of missing pieces, do not fit. Such as they are, it may be worth while to state the chief of them.

As to (1) it has been said that there is a kind of irony in St. Peter's words, "This was all he got." That which was bought with his money is spoken of as bought by him (Meyer in loc.).

As to (2) we have the explanations —

(a) That αὐθήμερον, in Matt. xxvii. 5, includes death by some sudden spasm of suffocation (συνίπτοντας περιφέρεις), such as might be caused by the overpowering mixture of poison, and that then came the fact described in the Acts (Snider, Thea. s. v. αὐθήμερον: Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot, and others). By some this has even been connected with the name Iscariot, as implying a constitutional tendency to this disease (Gilli).

(b) That the work of suicide was but half accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (from a tree, in one tradition) across the road, and was mangled and crushed by the carts and wagons that passed over him. This explanation appears, with strange and horrible exaggerations, in the narrative of the martyrs, quoted by Eunomius on Acts i., and in Theophylact on Matt. xxvii.

As to (3) we have to choose between the alternatives —

(a) That there were two Acedabos. [Aceldama.]

(b) That the potter's field which the priests had bought was the same as that in which the traitor met so terrible a death.

The life of Judas has been represented here in the only light in which it is possible for us to look on it, as a human life, and therefore as one of temptation, struggle, freedom, responsibility. If another mode of speaking of it appears in the N. T., it is clearly an extension which implies that all happened as it had been decreed; that the guilt and the misery were parts of a Divine plan (John vi. 64, xiii. 18; Acts i. 16), we must yet remember that this is no single, exceptional instance. All human actions are dealt with in the same way. They appear at one moment separate, free, uncontrollable; at another they are links in a long chain of causes and effects, the beginning and the end of which are in the "thick darkness of God who is," or determined by an inevitable necessity. No adherence to a philosophical system frees men altogether from inconsistency in their language. In proportion as their minds are religious, and not philosophical, the transitions from one to the other will be frequent, abrupt, and startling.

With the exception of the stories already mentioned, there are but few traditions that gather round the name of Judas. It appears, however, in a strange, hardly intelligible way in the history of the wilder heresies of the second century. The sect of Gnostics, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honored him as the only Apostle that was in possession of the true essence, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a Gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander, Church History, ii. 159, Eng. transl.; Iren. adv. Hær. i. 35; Tertull. de Pæst., c. 47). For the general literature connected with this subject, especially for monographs on the motives of Judas and the manner of his death, see Winer, Realency. For a full treatment of the questions of the relation in which his guilt stood to the life of Christ, comp. Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus, on the passages where Judas is mentioned, and in particular vol. vii. pp. 40-67, ibidem.

Question I. What was the character of Judas Iscariot?

A. What was his intellectual character?

(6) There are more signs in the Gospels that Judas had a strong and sturdy intellect than that some of the other disciples had. It may be surmised from John xii. 4-8 as compared with Matthew xxvi. 8-11 and Mark xiv. 7-11, that especially in financial affairs he had a marked influence upon his fellow apostles. He was appointed to supervise the funds, and disburse the charities of the retinue which accompanied the Messiah. At one time (Luke viii. 1-3) this retinue needed a careful, exact, and sharp-sighted treasurer. We may presume that Judas's intellectual fitness for this office was one reason for his appointment to it. Some (as Jodocus) have supposed that each of the disciples in his turn had the oversight of the money belonging to the retinue of Christ. But this more conjecture is adverse to the Biblical impression.

(6) Although the Gospels give us more intimations of shrewdness as characteristic of Judas than as characteristic of the other disciples, they do not imply that he had so extensive a reach of mind as some German theorists ascribe to him. According to these theorists he was so sharp-sighted as to reason in a manner like the following: —

"It may be inferred from certain words of the Master [Matthew xix. 28] that he will assume a temporal throne, and exalt his twelve apostles to be his twelve princes; it may be inferred from certain exhibitions of popular feeling [John xii. 17-18] that the masses of the Jews are now ready, and need only an impulse and occasion to enthrone him; the betrayal will put the Messiah into such a position that he must declare himself; the Jewish rulers will at once resist his pretensions, but the people will at once stand up for him, and under his leadership will overcome the rulers; the betrayal will thus be the means of introducing a new administration highly advantageous to the state, of expediting the royal glory of the Master, and the piously honored of the disciples; of pleasing by exalting the king, rather than of destroying by degrading him."

We do not know enough to deny outright that such a plan, or at least some parts of it, may have momentarily occurred to Judas; but the Gospels do not make upon us the impression of his having that kind of intellect which remains sternfaced in such a comprehensive plan.

B. What was the moral character of Judas?

(6) Some writers regard him as possessing a merely cold and calculating spirit insusceptible to the influences flowing from the virtues of the Messiah; as having full confidence in the superiority
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prevented. (See Neander’s *Leben Jesu*, p. 679 f. 4. April.) We are further apt to err in supposing that Judas must have had the inducing motive, or else a self-consistent system of motives for his treason. He seems to have had a spirit which was driven hither and thither by a tumult of emotions, some of which were at variance with others; to have been like a merchant on the eve of bankruptcy distracted with conflicting impul ses; to have been bewildered by the words and acts of Jesus; not to have known exactly what to expect; and indeed has been at last surprised (Meyer on Matt. xxvi. 14-16) that Jesus did not fill his adversaries and escape the crucifixion.

(n.) It has been supposed that Judas was animated, in a greater or less degree, by Jewish patriotism. He has been called by some “Ein braver Mann”; he has been thought by others to have combined certain selfish impulses with his patriotism and treachery. Jesus could not have made a mistake in selecting him as a disciple and bursar; therefore Judas must have been worthy of the selection. Mr. De Quincey, who thinks that Judas as the pursuer of the disciples had “the most of worldly wisdom, and was best acquainted with the temper of the times,” and could not “have made any gross blunder as to the wishes and secret designs of the populace in Jerusalem,” for “his official duty must have brought him every day into minute and circumstantial communication with an important order of men, namely, petty shop-keepers,” who “in all countries alike fulfills a great political function,”) supposes that Iscariot had reason to hope not only for the rising of the Jewish populace in behalf of the Messiah, but also perhaps for the ultimate aid of the Romans in defending him against the Jewish rulers. (See Thiel. *Jesu*, I. 147-177; see also above, *Qest. L. A. (n.).* But as the intellect of Judas fitted him for small though dexterous maneuvers rather than for adhering steadfastly to any great political scheme, so his heart was more ready to grasp some petty contracted strategem of selfishness, than to persevere in any large plan of patriotism. Besides, if he had engaged himself under the influence of the wide-reaching plan, he probably would not at last have summed up the history of it by the words which excluded the semblance of an apology: “I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood,” Matt. xxvii. 4: nor probably would the consideration Jesus has uttered against the “host” man, “the son of perdition,” those significant words, “Good were it for that man if he had never been born,” John xviii. 41; Matt. xxvi. 24; Mark xiv. 21: nor probably would Luke have characterized the thirty pieces of silver as “the reward of iniquity,” Acts i. 18, like Maham’s “wages of unrighteousness,” 2 Peter ii. 15; nor probably would Peter have applied to Judas those fearful predictions of the Psalms, Acts i. 16, 29, as Matthew applied the solemn words of Zechariah, Matt. xxii. 9, 11, nor would he have dissolved solitary motto, such an involuntary outflow of indignation against the traitor as appears in his gospel xii. 6, xiii. 27-30, xiv. 22 (see Meyer), vi. 70, 71; nor perhaps would the synoptists, in giving their catalogue of the Apostles, have uniformly placed at the foot of the list the name of “Judas Iscariot who also betrayed him,” Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 19; Luke vi. 15.

(c) It is a more plausible theory that Iscariot was impelled to his crime by a desire to avoid the shame of being so frequently and pointedly rebuked by the Messiah. Although he was willing to sell his kiss for thirty pieces of silver, yet he was a man, and must have had some wish to avoid the reprimands which were becoming more and more solemn and pointed.

(c.) Connected with the preceding was his desire to avert from himself the persecutions and other evils which were to come on the disciples. Even if, in his calculation of chances, he did sohe himself with the possibility of driving the Messiah up to the temple, he must have had a presentiment that the new kingdom must be speedily established. It appears far more probable that he was influenced by an aim to earn the gratitude of the Jews by delivering the Saviour to their custody, than by an aim to earn by hastening their elevation to thrones. Especially does it appear so, when we reflect that during the hours of the day preceding his formation of the traitorous purpose, he had probably heard, or heard of, those fearful words of Christ which portended violent changes in the Jewish state, and the troublous times of the Apostles (see Matt. xxiv. and xxx.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.; see also (e.) below).

(d) One of the motives which strengthened all the others for the treason was probably the traitor’s dissatisfaction with the principles of the new kingdom (Neander’s *Leben Jesu*, p. 679 f. He saw more and more distinctly, and the scene recorded in John xii. 1-9 confirmed him in the belief, that the spiritual kingdom would yield him but a meagre living. It was to require a habit of low self-denial, and was to be characterized by services to the poor. For these services he had no taste.

(e.) Mingled with his aversion to spiritual duty, was his vindictive spirit impelling him to work some undefined sort of injury to the Messiah. According to the most plausible hypothesis, he had been charmed by the fact that, although the almoner of the disciples, he yet had a lower place than Peter, James, and especially John in the esteem of his Master; his revenue, having been repeatedly inflamed by sults and censures, was at last assumed by him, and this generous woman applauded, at the feast of the union on the evening after Tuesday; stung by that disgrace, he formed his plan of the betrayal; he may not have determined the exact time of executing that plan, but having been still further irritated at the Paschal supper on the evening following Thursday, and having been goaded on by the mandate “what thou doest do quickly,” he did not sleep as the other disciples did on Thursday night, but then precipitated himself into his crime (Meyer and others suppose that he then formed his purpose of the crime). On Tuesday, during the saviour’s last visit to the Temple, the Jewish rulers had been violently incensed against him by the speeches recorded in Matt. xxi. and xxii., Mark xii., and Luke xx. On the evening after that day, when Judas was irritated by the remonstrances of his Master, he would naturally think of the Jews cut to the heart by the same reprover, and would be tempted to conspire with them against the author of these reprimands. This was the critical period for him to turn “State’s Evidence,” and to join hands with the Sanhedrim as Flate joined hands with Berosus.

(c.) Another of the motives working in the traitor’s mind was avarice. Three hundred denarii had been kept out of his purse two days before the
betrayal (John xii. 1-9), and this needless loss intensi-fied his misery as well as retaliatory spirit. It has been objected (even by Neander) that he could not have been influenced by so small a reward as eighteen dollars. It is true that the words "eighteen dollars" in American coinage represent the value of thirty shekels of silver at the time of Josephus; but according to the American standard represent a far smaller amount of purchasing power than was repre-sented by the thirty silverings of Josephus. For obtaining this sum Judas did not regard one kiss as a very great work. Besides, an arrancious man is often more affected by a small gain than a large one. A little in the hand also is more attractive to him than much in the prospect. Even if he had endeavored to encourage or excuse himself by sudden gleams of hope that he would acquire wealth by expediting the Messianic reign, these fitful gleams could not relieve his prevailing expectation that the new reign would leave him poor; and thirty shekels of silver paid down were a surer good than the spiritual honors of the uncertain kingdom.

That in the tumultuous rush of his evil thoughts the traitor was under the special power of avarice, revealed by the spiritualliments of the Messiah's kingdom is intimated in Scriptures like the following: Luke xxii. 3; John vi. 12 and 70, xii. 6, xiii. 2, 10, 11, 27.

Question III. Why did Christ select and retain Judas as one of the Apostles?

We may consider the call of Judas as made by sex, and as made by God.

A. Regarding it as made merely by the sex, theologians have maintained, with more or less distinctness, the following theories:

\[ (a. ) \] At the first Christ understood the financial abilities, but not the thievish or treacherous ten-dencies of Iscariot. These were not discovered until they were developed in the passion week, or at least not until it was too late to eject him from the Saviour's family. The reasons for retaining were different from those for originally appointing him. This traitor could have been influenced by the expulsion, and would have precipitated the delivery of Jesus to his enemies before the full accomplish-ment of the Messianic work. "That Jesus knew from the beginning that Judas was a thoroughly bad man, and yet received him among the twelve is altogether impossible." Schenkel's Character of Jesus portrayed, vol. ii. p. 218; see also Ullmann's Staattheit Jesu, Sect. 3; Winer's Real-wörter, art. Judas.

\[ (b. ) \] From the first Christ was perfectly certain of the traitor's miserly and dishonest aims; but he knew the necessity of being delivered up to be cruci-fied; he must have some instrument for being given over to the power of his enemies: he singled out Judas as that instrument, and the discipleship as a convenience for that work.

\[ (c. ) \] A more plausible account than either of the proceeding is: The Messiah perceived Iscariot's business talents, economical habits and other to us unknown qualifications for the discipleship: he per-ceived also the disqualifications which were less prominent in Iscariot's earlier than in his later life. For they became more and more aggravated as the disciple hardened his heart in resisting the influence of the Master; when the appointment was made the other Apostles do not appear to have dis-persed the matter: they wondered at it, many to as unknown circumstances conspiring to justify it, while the Saviour knew the evil tendencies of Judas and ex-pected that these germs of iniquity would unfold themselves in embezzlement and treason (John ii. 25, vi. 64, 70; Matt. ix. 4: Mark ii. 8), still he encouraged in himself a hope that he might counteract those wrong proclivities, and that the world's spirit would be refined and elevated by the apostol-ic example of the other honors of it (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30), by the powers belonging to it (Luke xii. 19), by the personal instructions given to the occupants of it (especially such instructions as Matt. vi. 19-34, xiii. 22, 23; Mark viii. 36, x. 25; Luke xvi. 11), by the indefinable endearments of being "with Jesus" (Mark iii. 14 compared with Acts i. 17; Acts iv. 13; Phil. i. 23; Col. iii. 3, 4: I Thess. iv. 17; see Dr. N. F. Dar's Hours among the gospels, xxviii.), while the Saviour could not fully believe that his efforts would be successful in reforming the traitor, still he could not doubt that they would be successful in improving the character of other men—that the patience, forbearance, fortu-tude, caution, gentleness, persevering love mani-fested in his treatment of the pursue-bearer (as in washing the traitor's feet, and in giving him the sweetening of the sum, would be a useful example to the church, that his own character and his life be set off with more distinctness by its contrast with that of Judas—good contrasted with evil, moral strength amid physical weakness illustrated by moral weak-ness amid physical strength—and that such a con-fession as "I have betrayed the innocent blood" would retain through all time a marked historical importance, and would be a symbol of the triumph of virtue over vice. Could the liekeness have cherished any degree of anticipation Jesus might win Iscariot to a life of virtue, and at the same time have believed that he should not succeed? The human mind often cherishes a feasible expecta-tion of favorable results, and at the same time believes on the whole that the results will be un-favorable; makes unfruitful efforts for a good, and in one view of it faintly expects to succeed, but in another view of it fully anticipates a failure. Amid this conflict of hopes and fears, called by the lastmen spes impropria, one man "against hope believed in hope," Rom. iv. 18, and other men "against hope" have disbelieved and labored "in hope."

B. Regarding the call of Judas to the apostle-ship, as made by God, theologians have used it for a test of their speculations on the nature of moral government, etc. In reality there is no other kind of objection to the fact that the Most High in his providence allowed Judas to be one of the first preachers of the Gospel, than to the fact that he has in his providence allowed other unmitte men to be eminent preachers of it, or that he was allowed unworthy men to sit on the bench of justice, or to reign on the throne which, even although they were "ordained of God," they have tarnished. The mystery here is the old mystery of moral evil: see Oskansen on Matthew xxvii. 3-10. As men differ in their speculations in regard to the general sub-ject of sin and moral government, they differ, of course, in regard to the sin of Judas as related to that government.

\[ (n. ) \] Some maintain that Iscariot was called to his office on the ground of his constitutional fitness and without any prevision of his treason, sin being "altogether arbitrary and inconsequential," and thus incapable of being foreknown by any mind.

\[ (m. ) \] Others maintan that, his treason was fore-known, but was not included in the divine plan.
just as all other sin is said to be foreseen, but not predetermined; and just as many vile men are providentially called to occupy offices which it is foreseen they will disgrace.

(c) Others maintain that his treason was contemplated in the divine plan (as may be inferred from John xii. 18-26, Acts i. 16-20, Acts iv. 28; see Meyer on Matt. xxvi. 14-27, John vi. 70); but still the sin was included in this plan not directly, but incidentally; the plan was adopted not in any degree on account of the sin, but in despite of it, and Judas himself was appointed to his office not because the appointment was directly a good or a means of good, but because it was incidentally to the means of good which were directly predetermined.

(6) Others maintain, that the appointment and conduct of Judas were parts of the plan of God, just as directly as the movements of matter are parts of that plan. Of these divines, one class assigns various uses for which the appointment was designed, and these are all the uses which in fact result from it; another class regard the reasons for the appointment and interwoven in a mystery which does not admit an investigation.

QUESTION IV. — How can we reconcile the apparent discrepancies in the Biblical narratives of Judas?

A. One of these discrepancies relates to the manner of the betrayal. According to Matthew xxvi. 48-50, Mark xiv. 44-46, Luke xxi. 47, 48, the Saviour was pointed out to his captors by Judas tenderly embracing him. According to John xviii. 4-8 the Saviour came forward and voluntarily made himself known to the captors while Judas was standing with them. One of the various methods in which the two accounts may be harmonized, is the following: Judas had stipulated to designate the Messiah by a kiss; the Messiah, as soon as he saw his captors approaching, advanced to meet them: they, noticing his approach, halted (perhaps in amazement); Judas went forward, gave the significant embrace, returned, and stood with the captors: Jesus continued his walk toward them, and when sufficiently near, addressed them in the words cited by John. The fact of the kiss had been mentioned by the Synoptists, and had thus become generally known before John wrote; therefore he did not attribute to it. The fact of Christ's own voluntary approach of himself may not have been so generally known, therefore John made it prominent. (See Tholuck and Meyer on John xviii. 4-7.)

A less probable version is, that Judas, in order to fulfill his engagement, gave the promised sign after Jesus had announced himself. Another is, that the sign was given twice; at first was not observed (for it was night) by the captors, and was therefore given the second time.

B. The most important of the alleged discrepancies relate to the last developments of Judas.

It is said in Matthew xxvii. 6, 7, that the chief priests bought the Potter's Field; but it is said in Acts i. 18, that Judas bought it with the thirty silverlings. Among the various allowable methods of reconciling these passages, the following is adopted by the majority of the best interpreters: the word ἐξαγαγαν may denote not only "purchased," but also "caused to be purchased," "gave occasion for the purchase," and thus we glean from the two accounts the connected narrative that in consequence of Judas's treachery and the eighteen dollars obtained by it, the chief priests some time after his death purchased the Field of Blood. This field is sometimes thought to be the identical field on which Judas died. But we are not so informed by the Evangelists. The field which was purchased may have been on the Hill of Evil Council over the Valley of Hinnom, and it may have been called the Field of Blood for two reasons; first, it was purchased with "the price of blood;" secondly, with the money obtained from him "whose bloody end was so notorious" (Hackett's Comm. on Acts i. 19).

It is said in Matthew xxviii. 5, that Judas hanged himself; and Acts xii. 18 that he fell headlong into the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Several of the terrible legends in regard to Judas have been suggested by these narratives; see Hofmann, Leben Jesu nach den Apostelgesch., § 77. We cannot affirm that there is a contradiction between the statements when there is a plausible hypothesis on which the two can be reconciled. There are several hypotheses on which these two statements can be harmonized. One of these hypotheses which is in striking uniformity with an old tradition, and is in itself so credible that some of the most decided rationalists (as Fritzsche) have adopted it in the main, is that Matthew describes the beginning, and Luke the end of the death-scene: that the traitor suspended himself on a bough which hung over a precipice, and the rope broke, or the bough broke, or some one, unwilling to have such a spectacle exhibited during the holy week, cut the rope or the bough, and the traitor fell with such physical results as Luke describes. Travellers in Palestine exploring the Valley of Hinnom have been impressed with the probability of this hypothesis; see especially Hackett's Illustrations of Scripture, pp. 294-298. No jury in the world would hesitate to adopt an hypothesis similar to the preceding for the reconciliation of two apparently conflicting testimonies given in court.

Partly on account of these imagined discrepancies, without any external evidence, however, not only by such critics as Strauss and Renan, but also by most conservative scholars, that either Matthew xxviii. 5-10, or else that Acts i. 18, 19, must be spurious. Prof. Norton (in his book on "The Evidence of the Gospels," pp. 438-441) gives the following among other reasons for rejecting Matthew xxviii. 3-10.

(1.) "At first view this account of Judas has the aspect of an interpolation. It is inserted so as to disjoin a narrative, the different parts of which, when it is removed, come together as if they had been originally united." But the same may be said of numerous passages not only in the Gospels, but also in the Old Testament.

(2.) "Whether it be or be not an interpolation, it is clearly not in a proper place." "As the account is now placed, it is said that in the morning Judas, was affected with bitter remorse, because he saw that Jesus was condemned; but no condemnation had yet been passed upon him by the Roman governor," etc. Some commentators (as Fritzsche) would here reply that the "condemnation" spoken of in Matt. xvii. 3, is the condemnation by the Sanhedrin, and this had taken place before Jesus was sent to Pilate, and before Judas repented; but the more plausible reply is that Matthew's narrative of the traitor's death is out of the historical order, and instead of being inserted between the
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...and the 11th verses, should, for preserving the sequence of time, be inserted between the 30th and the 31st verses of his xxviith chapter; as John's narrative of the supper at Bethany is out of the historical order, and instead of being inserted between the 2d and 9th verses, should, for preserving the sequence of time, be inserted at the end of his 12th chapter. Deviations from the exact order of time are so frequent in the Biblical narratives as to warrant no suspicion that a paragraph thus deviating is spurious. Sometimes they are designed not for "tracings" but for historical explanations, as John's narrative of the meting (xiii. 3-10) may have been designed to explain the motive of Judas's treason, and prepare the reader for the otherwise unaccountable assertion in John xiii. 12 (see Question II. (c.) above).

(3.) The account of Matthew "represents Judas as having had an interview with the chief priests and the elders (that is, with the Sanhedrin) in the Temple," but Matthew "could not have described the Sanhedrin as holding a council in the house of Caiaphas, and proceeding thence to the house of Pilate, and also as being in the Temple, where Judas returned them their money," etc. To this some writers would reply, that the Sanhedrin condemned Jesus in the Temple which was the regular place for holding the assemblies of the council; and they condemned him early in the morning, "soon after five," etc., which St. John would naturally describe by ερρος, because "earlier than sunrise," ερρος, though much later than the dawn of the day, and therefore coincident with the time when preparations usually began for the morning sacrifice, and when the priests must necessarily be at the Temple (Greswell's 42d Dissertation). But the more plausible reply is that after Jesus had been condemned by the Roman governor, some, perhaps many, of the priests returned to the "inner court," or "holy place," of the Temple; and Judas, not being allowed to step within the "court of the priests," came to the entrance of it, and threw his silverings into it, perhaps upon the floor.

(4.) "In the conclusion of the account found in Matthew's Gospel there is an extraordinary misuse of a passage of Zechariah, which the writer professes to quote from Jeremiah," and the words of which are altogether inapplicable to the purpose for which they are cited in Matthew xxii.

In regard to the word Jeremiah used instead of Zechariah, some critics have supposed that it was an error not of Matthew but of the copist. There is no important external evidence for this supposition, and it may appear a singular attempt to save the genuineness of an entire paragraph by giving up the genuineness of one word in it. But while a mere date or proper name is obviously wrong, there is more reason for questioning its genuineness than there would be if the doubtful word were suggestive of a moral idea or religious sentiment. An accidental error is the more easily committed and overlooked where the copist is not guided by any impression on his heart. Dr. Henderson says:

Augustine mentions, that in his time some MSS. omitted the name of Ieropolito. It is also omitted in the Latin MS. of 1573; in the Syriac, which is the most ancient of all the Eastern versions in this passage, and in a Persic MS. in my possession, bearing date 1507; in the modern Greek; in the Verona and Vercelli Latin MSS., and in a Latin MS. of Luc Brug. The Greek MS. 22 reads Σαναδιου, as also do the Philoxenian Syriac in the margin, and an Arabic MS. quoted by Bengel. Origen and Eusebius were in favor of this reading." Prof. Henderson mentions the conjecture that "Ieropolito was written by some early copyist instead of Ζαναδιου, and thus the mistake of Jeremiah" for "Zechariah" was easily transmitted. See Henderson's Commentary on Zechariah, xi. 12, 13; also Robinson's Harmony, p. 227.

In regard to the propriety of the citation of Matthew from Zechariah we may remark, that the entire book from which the citation was made is one of the obscurest in the Bible, and our difficulties in determining its precise import should make us modest in asserting that the Evangelist has made a wrong use of it. It is not true, however, that we can discover no propriety in the quotation. Among the various methods of explaining it, one is the following: The prophet is speaking of himself as a type of Christ, and of his opposers as types of Christ's opposers. In this typical style he predicts the sufferings of Christ, and also the malice of Christ's opposers. As the chief priests and Judas were among the most conspicuous enemies of Christ, the prophet may be considered as typically referring in the most conspicuous manner to them. He describes himself as appraised by his foes at a "spickedy" (i.e. despicable) price, thirty pieces of silver (the sum paid for a common slave, Exodus xxii. 32), and this money was given to the potter for his field. The Evangelist, fixing his eye upon the salient points of the prophecy and quoting ad sensum rather than ad litteram, says that Jesus was appraised at the same contemptible price, and this was given to the potter for his field. The events described by Zechariah are thus typical and in this sense prophetical of the events described by Matthew. There is no more reason for regarding Matthew's quotation as spurious than for regarding many other quotations in the New Testament as such. This is a common style of the New Testament writers. Even De Wette in his old age conceded: "The entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of Him who was to come, and has come." — The typological comparison, also, of the Old Testament with the New was by no means a mere play of fancy; nor can it be regarded as altogether the result of accident, that the evangelical history, in the most important particulars, runs parallel with the Mosaic. (See the passage cited in Fairbairn's Typology, i. 34. See also pp. 342, 334.)

Another and kindred explanation of the passage is this: As Psalms lixx. 25 and cix. 8 contain prophecies of the generic or ideal righteous man of whom Christ is the prototype, so they contain prophecies of the generic or ideal unrighteous man of whom according to Acts i. 16-20 Judas is an antitype, and this prophecy of Zechariah may be interpreted as thus generic or ideal in its reference to the Messiah and his persecutors.

E. A. P.

JUDE, OR JUDAS, LEBBEUS AND THADDEUS ('Ioúdha Lebbéou: Judas Jus-
codi: A. V. "Judas the brother of James"), one of the Twelve Apostles; a member, together with his name, of the list of the persons in the procession of Al-

phus, and Simon Zeolates, of the last of the three sections of the apostolic body. The name Judas only, without any distinguishing mark, occurs in the lists given by St. Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13; and in John xiv. 22 (where we find "Judas not Iscariot")
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Among the Apostles, but the Apostle has been generally identified with "Lebbeus whose surname was Thaddæus" (λέββαιος ὁ ἀνεπνευματικός Θαδαίος), Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18, though Schleiermacher (Crit. Essay on St. Luke, p. 93) treats with scorn any such attempt to reconcile the lists. In both the last quoted places there is considerable variety of reading; some MSS. having both in St. Matt. and St. Mark λέββαιος, or Θαδαίος alone; others introducing the name Ιωάς or Judas Zebêtes in St. Matt., where the Vulgate reads Θαδαίου alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (H. E. ii. 13), where the name of Thomas the twin to Thaddæus was "Seventy" identified by Jerome in Matt. x. with "Judas Jacōbi" (Θαδαίου); as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the "Levi" (Λευνίς τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) of Mark ii. 14, Luke vi. 27, who is called "Lebæus" (Λεββαίος). While the exegetical difficulties are as great as the identity of names with Thadæus, were three names for the same Apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome (in Matt. x. to have been "trinitymen," rather than introduce confusion into the apostolic catalogues, and render them erroneous either in excess or defect.

The interpretation of the names Lebbeus and Thadæus is a question best left with almost equal difficulty. The former is interpreted by Jerome "hasty," curadum, as from ἐκ, cur, and Thadæus has been erroneously supposed to have a cognate signification, homo peccator, as from the Syriac "πεκτος, pectus" (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 235).

Bengel; Matt. x. 3), the true signification of Ιωάς being aewma (Anglo. text), Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. 2565. Winer (Rechub. s. v.) would combine the two and interpret them as meaning Herodes. Another interpretation of Lebbeus is the young Ion (ιονικός) as from Νείβου, νείβος (Schleusner, s. v.), while Lightfoot and Baumg-Crusins would derive it from Lebor, a maritime town of Galilee mentioned by Pliny (Hist. Nat. v. 19), where, however, the ordinary reading is Ζῆλος. Thadæus appears in Syriac under the form Αζόλ, and Michaelis admits the idea that Αζόλ, Thadæus, and Judas, may be different representations of the same word (v. 770), and Wordsworth (Gr. Text. in Matt. x. 3) identifies Thadæus with Judas, both from Ιωάς, to "praise." Chrysostom, De Prod. Jud. i. c. 2, says that there was a "Judas Zebêtes" among the disciples of our Lord, whom he identifies with Judas the twin to Thomas. In the midst of these minor taints no decision can be arrived at, and all must rest on conjecture.

Much difference of opinion has also existed from the earliest times as to the right interpretation of the words Ιωάς λακδοβο. The generally received opinion is that there is an ellipse of the word λακδοβο, and that the A. V. is right in translating "Judas the brother of James." This is defended by Winer (Rechub. s. v.); Gramm. of N. T. Dict. (Clark's edition, i. 293), Arndt (Recher. Crit. sur l'Eph. de Jude), and accepted by Barbon, Allford, Tregelles, Michaelis, etc. This view has received strength from the belief that the "Epistle of Jude," the author of which expressly calls himself "brother of James," was the work of this Apostle. But if, as will be seen hereafter, the arguments in favor of a non-apostolic origin for this epistle are such as to lead us to assign it to another author, the mode of supplying the ellipse may be considered independently; and since the dependent genitive almost universally implies the filial relation, and is so interpreted in every other case in the apostolic catalogues, we may be allowed to follow the Pesbito and Arabic versions, the Benedictine editor of Chrysostom, Hom. XXXIII, in Matt. x. 2, and the translation of Luther, as well as nearly all the most eminent critical authorities, and render the words "Judas the son of James," is, either "Judas the son of Alphæus," with whom he is coupled, Matt. x. 3, or some otherwise unknown person.

The name of Jude only occurs once in the Gospel narrative (John xiv. 22), where we find him taking part in the last conversation with our Lord, and sharing the low temporal views of their Master's kingdom, entertained by his brother Apostles. Everything is certainly known of the later history of the Apostle. There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Algarus king of Edessa" (Euseb., H. E. ii. 17, Jerome, Comment. in Matt. x.) (Tadæus.).

Niceneus (H. E. ii. 40) makes Jude die a natural death in that city after preaching in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred at Phoenicia on his return; while that of the west makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom.

The tradition preserved by Hegesippus, which appears in Eusebius, relative to the descendants of Jude, has reference, in our opinion, to a different Jude. See next article. E. V.

JUDAS, THE LORD'S BROTHER.

Among the brethren of our Lord mentioned by the people of Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 5) occurs a "Judas," who has been sometimes identified with the Apostle of the same name; a theory which rests on the double assumption that "Judas Judæus" Thadæus is the Apostle, and that the twin to Thomas was the brother of James," and that "the sons of Alphæus" were "the brethren of our Lord," and is sufficiently refuted by the statement of St. John vi. 5, that "not even his brethren believed on him." It has been considered with more probability that he was the writer of the epistle which bears the name of "Jude the brother of James," to which the Syriac version incorporated with the later editions of the Peshito adds "and of James" (Origen in Matt. xxxii. 55; Clem. Alex. Adumb. 6; Allford, Gk. Text., Matt. xxxii. 55). [Jude, Epistle of James.]

Eusebius gives us an interesting tradition of Hegesippus (H. E. iii. 20, 32) that two grandsons of Jude, "who according to the flesh was called the Lord's brother," were born (i.e. 1 Cor. ix. 5), were educated and carried to Rome by orders of Domitian, whose apprehensions had been excited by what he had heard of the mighty power of the kingdom of Christ. But that the Emperor having discovered by their answers to his inquiries, and the appearance of their hands, that they were poor men, supporting them-

Jude, or Judas.
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I. Its Authorship.—The writer of this epistle styles himself, ver. 1, "the brother of James" (ἀδελφός Ἰάκωβου), and has been usually identified with the Apostles Judas Lebaborus or Thaddaeus, called by St. Luke, vi. 16, ὁδειάς ἰακώβου, A. V. "Judas the brother of James." It has been seen above (Judas Leb.

Euc.roc) that this mode of supplying the ellipse, though not directly contrary to the usual conjectures, is, to say the least, questionable, and that there are strong reasons for regarding the words "Judas the son of James:" and inasmuch as the author appears, ver. 17, to distinguish himself from the Apostles, and bases his warning rather on their authority than on his own, we may agree with eminent critics in attributing the epistle to another author. Jerome, Tertullian, and Origen, among the ancients, and Calvin, Haunold, Humphrey, Lange, Vatablus, Arnaud, and Tregelles, among the moderns, agree in assigning it to the Apostle. Whether it were the work of an Apostle or not, it has from very early times been attributed to "the Lord's brother" of that name (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3): a view in which Origen, Jerome, and (if indeed the Adubamationes be rightly assigned to him) Clemens Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (Hom. 48 in Jesu.), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syrian version, and is accepted by most modern commentators, Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jessen, Olhausen, Tregelles, etc. The objection that has been felt by Neander (Pl. and Tr. i. 392), and others, that if he had been "the Lord's brother" he would have directly styled himself so, and not merely "the brother of James," has been anticipated by the author of the "Adubamationes" (Bunsen, Adum. Ante-Nic. i. 530), who says, "Jude, who wrote the Catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself His brother; but what said he? 'Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ,' as his Lord, but 'brother of James.'" We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and Him who had been declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (of 2 Cor. v. 18); that both St. Jude and St. James forbore to call themselves the brethren of Jesus. The arguments concerning the authorship of the epistle are ably summed up by Jessen (de Authent. Ep. Jud. Lips. 1821), and Arnaud (Recher. Critiq. sur l'Ep. de Jude, Strasb. 1851; transl. Brit. and For. Ev. Rec. Jud. 1850); and though it is by no means clear of difficulty, the most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, not the Apostle the son of Alpheus, but the Bishop of Jerusalem, of whose dignity and authority in the church he avails himself to introduce his epistle to his readers.
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II. Genuineness and Canonicity.—Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called Antilegomena, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of Holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spured; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the Canon.

This question was gradually decided in its favor, and the more widely it was known the more generally it was received as canonical, until it took its place without further dispute as a portion of the volume of Holy Scripture.

The state of the case as regards its reception by the church is briefly as follows:—

It is wanting in the Peshito (which of itself proves that the supposed Evangelist of Edessa could not have been its author), nor is there any trace of its use by the Asiatic churches up to the commencement of the 4th century; but it is quoted as apostolic by Ephrem Syrus (Opp. Syr. i. p. 136).

The earliest notice of the epistle is in the famous Muratorian Fragment (circa A. D. 170) where we read "Epistola sive Jude et superscripti Johannis capititer" (Bunsen, Auct. Ante-Nic. i. 152, reads "Catholicis") "halentur."

Clement of Alexandria is the first father of the church by whom it is recognized (Pothag. l. iii. c. 8, p. 239, ed. Syria; Strumn. l. iii. c. 2, p. 431, Adub. l. c.). Eusebius also informs us (H. E. vi. 14) that it was among the books of Canonical Scripture, of which explanations were given in the Hypotyposes of Clement; and Cassiodorus (Bunsen, Auct. Ante-Nic. i. 390-394) gives some notes on this epistle drawn from the same sources.

Origen refers to it expressly as the work of the Lord's brother (Comment. in Matt. xiii. 55, 56, t. x. § 17): "Jude wrote an epistle of but few verses, yet filled with vigorous words of heavenly grace." He quotes it several times (Homil. in Gen. xxiii.; in Jos. viii.; in Eccles. iv.; Comment. in Matt. l. xiii. 27, xx. 27, xvii. 30; in Johann. l. xii. § 57; in Mark. l. iii. § 6, v. § 1; De Præcip. l. iii. c. 2, § 1), though he is in some places of doubt as to its canonicity, "if indeed the Epistle of Jude be received" (Comment. in Matt. xxii. 23, t. xvii. § 30).

Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) distinctly classes it with the Antilegomena, which were nevertheless recognized by the majority of Christians; and asserts (ii. 23) that, in common with the Epistle of James, it was "deemed spurious" (ποθετεσται), though together with the other Catholic Epistles publicly read in most churches.

Of the Latin Fathers, Tertullian once expressly cites this epistle as the work of an Apostle (de Hab. Malchis. l. 3), as does Jerome. "from whom (Enoch) the Apostle Jude in his epistle has given a quotation" (in Tit. c. h. p. 708), though on the other hand he informs us that in consequence of the quotation from this apocryphal book of Enoch it is rejected by most, adding that "it has obtained such authority from antiquity and use, that it is now reckoned among Holy Scripture" (Catal. Scrip. Eccles.). He refers to it as the work of an Apostle (Epist. ad Paulin. iii. 3).

The epistle is also quoted by Malchon, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alex-
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andria and Rome (Enoseh. H. E. vii. 30), and by
Paradise the period of Chrysostom (Chrys. Opy.
t. viii., Did. ec. 18, 20), and is contained in the
Laodicean (A. v. 363), Carthagian (397), and so-
called Apostolic Catalogues, as well as in those
emanating from the churches of the East and West,
with the exception of the Synopsis of Chrysostom,
and those of Cassiodorus and Eled Jesus.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in
receiving this epistle, and the doubts long pre-
valent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author,
and its standing in the church, the unimportant
nature of its contents, and their almost absolute
identity with 2 Pet. ii., and the supposed quota-
tion of apocryphal books, would all tend to create
a prejudice against it, which could be only over-
come by time, and the gradual recognition by the
leading churches of its genuineness and canonicity.

At the Reformation the doubts on the canonical
authority of this epistle were revived, and have
been shared in by modern commentators. They
were more or less entertained by Grotius, Luther,
Calvin, Berenger, Bolen, Pahl, Michaels, and the
Magdeburg Centurarians. It has been ably defended

III. Time and Place of Writing.—Here all is
conjecture. The author being not absolutely cer-
tain, there are no external grounds for deciding the
point; and the internal evidence is but small. The
question of its date is connected with that of its
relation to 2 Peter (see below, § vi.), and an earlier
or later period has been assigned to it according as
it has been considered to have been anterior or pos-
terior to that epistle. From the character of the
errors against which it is directed, it cannot be
placed very early: though there is no sufficient
ground for Schleiermacher’s opinion that “in the
last time” (2 Pet. iii. 3, 18; cf. 1 John ii. 18, τῇ ἐκα
tέρα ἡμῶν) symbolises our plac-
ing it in the apostolic age at all. Larner places
it between A. D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A. D.
70, Cremer A. D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and
Xenander, after the death of all the Apostles but
John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem;
although considerable weight is to be given to the
argument of DeWette (Einl. in N. T. p. 300), that
if the destruction of Jerusalem had already
taken place, some warning would have been drawn
from so signal an instance of God’s vengeance on
the ungodly.

There are no data from which to determine the
place of writing. Burton however, is of opinion
that inasmuch as the descendants of “Judas
the brother of the Lord,” if we identify him with
the author of the epistle, were found in Palestine,
he probably lived and ministered from his
native country, and that the epistle was published
there, since he styles himself “the brother of
James,” “an expression not likely to be used in
a country where James was well known” (Eccles.
Hist. i. 334).

IV. For what Readers designed.—The readers
are nowhere expressly defined. The address (ver.
1) is applicable to Christians generally, and there
is nothing in the character of the epistle to limit its
reference; and though it is not improbable that the
author had a particular portion of the church in
view, and that the Christians of Palestine were
the immediate objects of his warning, the dangers
described were such as the whole Christian world was
exposed to, and the adversaries the same which had
eyet has to be guarded against.

V. Its Object, Contents, and Style.—The object
of the Epistle is plainly enough announced, ver. 3:
“it was needful for me to write unto you and ex-
hort you that ye should earnestly contend for the
faith which was once delivered unto the saints:” the
reason for this exhortation is given ver. 4, in the
stealthy introduction of certain ungodly men,
turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness,
and denying the only Lord God and our Lord
Jesus Christ.” The remainder of the epistle is
almost entirely occupied by a minute depicition of
these adversaries of the faith — not merely teach-
ers (as has been sometimes supposed), which con-
stitutes a marked distinction between this epistle
and that of St. Peter — whom in a torrent of im-
pasioned invective he describes as stained with unnat-
ural lusts, like “the angels that kept not their first
estate” (whom he evidently identifies with the
“sons of God,” Gen. vi. 2), and the inhabitants of
Solomon and Gomerah — as despisers of all legiti-
mate authority (ver. 8) — murderers like Cain —
covetous like Balaam — rebellious like Korah (ver.
11) — destined from of old to be signal monuments
of the Divine vengeance, which he confirms by
reference to a prophecy current among the Jews,
and traditionally assigned to Enoch (vv. 14, 15).

The epistle closes by briefly reminding the read-
ers of the oft-repeated prediction of the Apostles
— among whom the writer seems not to rank him-
self — that the faith would be assailed by certain
enemies as he has depicted (vv. 17-19), exhorting
them to maintain their own steadfastness in the
faith (vv. 20, 21), while they earnestly sought to
rescue others from the corrupt example of those
lucrative livers (vv. 22, 23), and commending
them to the power of God in language which forc-
ibly recalls the closing benediction of the epistle

This epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as
we learn from St. Jerome, caused its authority to
be impeached in very early times — the supposed
citation of apocryphal writings (vv. 9, 14, 15).

The former of these passages, containing the
reference to the context of the archangel Michael
and the Devil “about the body of Moses,” was
supposed by Origen to have been founded on a
Jewish work called the “Ascension of Moses” (shown
quoted also by Eusebius (ib. 629). Origen’s words are express, “which
little work the Apostle Jude has made mention of
in his epistle” (de Principi. iii. 2, i. 138); and
some have sought to identify the book with the
πνευμάτων, οὐ τῆς θανάτου τοῦ Μωϋσέως.”
This is, however, proved by Michaelis (iv. 382) to
be a modern composition. Attempts have also
been made by Larner, Macknight, Vitringa, and others,
to interpret the passage in a mystical sense, by
reference to Zech. iii. 1, 2; but the similarity is too
distant to afford any weight to the idea. There
is, on the whole, little question that the writer
here making use of a Jewish tradition, based on
Pent. xxxiv. 6, just as facts unrecorded in Scrip-
ture are referred to by St. Paul (2 Tim. iii. 8;
gal. iii. 19): by the writer of the Epistle to the
Hebrews (ii. 2, xi. 21); by St. James (v. 17), and

As regards the supposed quotation from the
Book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether
St. Jude is making a citation from a work already
in the hands of his readers — which is the opinion
of Jerome (l. c.) and Tertullian (who was in con-
nection with the Church of Rome).
JUDE, EPISTLE OF

JUDE, EPISTLE OF 1507

quency inclined to receive the Book of Enoch as canonical Scripture, and has been held by many modern critics — or is employing a traditionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which has been propounded, "Enoch prophesied " אֶרֶץ יְבְנֵי־אֲדֹנָי " וַיִּשָׁבֵד אֶלֶף אֵלֶּה " 'אָבִי אֲנָשִׁים) rather to favor), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named [Enoch, the Book of]. This is maintained by Tregelles (Horne's Introd. 10th ed., iv. 621), and has been held by Cave, Hofmann (Schriftbeweise, i. 420), Lightfoot (ii. 117), Witsius, and Calvin (cf. Jerom. Comment. in Epph. c. v. p. 647, 648; in Tit. c. 1, p. 54).

The main body of the epistle is well characterized by Alfred (Gr. Test. iv. 147) as an impassioned invective, in the imperious whirlwind of which the writer is hurried along, collecting example after example of Divine vengeance on the ungodly; leaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and as it were laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the apostates against whom he is warning the church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The epistle is said by DeWette (Einleit. in N. T. p. 300) to be tolerably good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmidt (Einleit. i. 314) and Bertholdt (vi. 3194) to imagine an Aramaic original.

VI. Relation between the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter. — It is familiar to all that the larger portion of this epistle (ver. 3-16) is almost identical in language and subject with a part of the Second Epistle of Peter (2 Pet. ii. 1-19). In both, the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. This question is examined in the article Peter, Second Epistle of.

As might be expected from the comparatively unimportant character of the epistle, critical and exegetical editions of it have not been numerous. We may specify Arnaud, Recherches Crit. sur l'Epître de Jude, Strass. and Par. 1851; Laumann, Not. Crit. et Comment. in Ep. Jud., Groninge, 1813; Scharling, Jacob. et Jud. Ep. Cathol. comment., Hauvие, 1841; Stier, On the Epistles of James and Jude; Herder, Briefe. etc. Bruder Jesu, Lemgo, 1775; Angusti, Wielcker, Benson, and Macknight, on the Catholic Epistles. E. V.

* It is impossible in a limited space to discuss the relations between this epistle and the Second of St. Peter; but it may be assumed that an attentive consideration of them will show that the two epistles could not have been written independently. Less certain, and yet probable, is the conclusion that the Epistle of St. Jude was the earlier of the two. If this be accepted, then the date of the death of St. Peter in A. D. 68 becomes a fixed point in determining the date of the Epistle of St. Jude, and the question of date is thus brought within narrow limits, as the whole contents of the epistle prove it to have been comparatively late.

It is extremely unlikely that two epistles so similar and so nearly of the same date should have been addressed primarily to the same readers. It may therefore be argued negatively that the Epistle of St. Jude was not first sent to the Christians of Asia Minor. As the earliest testimony to the epistle comes from Alexandria, it has been suggested that Egypt may have been the original destination of the epistle.

The expression in the first paragraph of section V., in the preceding article, "these adversaries of the faith — not heretical teachers (as has been sometimes supposed) which constitutes a marked distinction between this epistle and that of St. Peter" — is not easily understood in connection with the statement in VI., "In both the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence." Certainly the terms in both epistles are quite similar, and must refer to the same class of persons. It is plain enough that they were persons within the church; "men crept in unawares" (Jude 4), "spots in your feast of charity, when they feast with you" (12). St. Peter expressly calls them teachers (ii. 1); St. Jude describes their teaching and its effects.

The analysis of the epistle may be given somewhat more fully, since notwithstanding its warmth and gravity it is most thoroughly planned and fully arranged. After the salutation (1, 2), and the reason for writing (3, 4), follows an argument for the certain punishment of the ungodly from a series of historical examples (5, 6, 7). The application of this is made in the following verse, and then, in contrast, an example is given of godly conduct (9) and a further application (10). After this follows a denunciation of the ungodly by a series of examples (11), and by five comparisons (12, 13). The certain punishment of the ungodly is then further shown by prophecy; first, the prophecy of Enoch, as the most ancient possible, and its application (14-16), then as the most recent, thus showing perfect accord in all time, the prophecy of the Apostles, with its application (17-19). This concludes the argumentative part of the epistle, and then follows an exhortation to the faithful, (a.) in regard to their own spiritual warfare (20, 21), and (b.) in regard to those corrupted by the ungodly (22, 23). The epistle closes with a benediction (24) and doxology (25).

There is nothing in the epistle to indicate that the author identified "the angels that kept not their first estate" (6) with the "sons of God" mentioned in Gen. vi. 2. This was an interpretation current in the church of the second century; but the sin of the angels here mentioned must have occurred before man was placed upon the earth.

In regard to the quotation from Enoch, the remark above made, that it does not appear that St. Jude quoted from any book, is very just. It is certain that he could not have made use of our present "book of Enoch," as that work bears decisive internal evidence of not having been written before the middle of the second century. In the article Enoch, the book of; a great variety of opinions will be found given on this matter. The only ground however, on which it seems possible to assign an earlier date to this volume than to the writings of the New Testament, is that of its having been subsequently largely altered and interpolated — a supposition which makes it to have been originally a different book from that which we now have. Without denying the possibility of there having been another more ancient "book of Enoch," from which our present has been drawn, it is sufficient to say that such a supposition deprives it of all interest in the present connection, and it
remains that St. Jude could not have quoted from the book as we now have it. Such suppositions however, are always cumbersome, useless, and unsatisfactory, in the al-sense of any proof and it is far more reasonable to be guided by the ordinary means of evidence to consider the whole book as a forgery of the second century — a period when works of this character abounded.

F. G.

* Literature. — For references to the more important general commentaries which include the Epistle of Jude, see the addition to John, First Epistle of. The following special works may also be noted: H. Witsius, Comm. in Epist. Jude, Lugd. Bat. 1703, 4to, reprinted in his Mekentsew Loci Theol. Ebd. 1759. C. F. Schmidt, Grundriss einer Erklärung der Apost. Briefe (xxv. of Sehr. dl. Bcrl.). Leipzig, 1847. 3rd Aue. bearb. von B. Brückner, 1865 (Bd. iii. Th. i. of his Kuzzejf, exeget. Handb.). Huther, Krit. exeget. Handbucb ab. d. 1. Brief d. Petrus, d. Brief d. Judas u. d. 2. Brief d. Petrus, Gött. 1852, 3d Aufl. 1867 (Abth. xii. of Meyer’s Commentary). M. F. Rump, Der Brief Jude, hist. krit. exeget. betrachtet, Salzb. 1834. Froinmüller, Die Briefe Petri u. d. Brief Jude theologisch kommentirt, Biechel, 1825, 2nd Aufl. 1862 (Theil vii. of Lange’s Bibliothek); translated, with additions, by J. L. Momber, New York, 1867 (part of vol. ix. of Lange’s Student). Wiesinger, Der zweite Brief des Apost. Petrus u. d. Brief d. Judas erklärt, Königsb. 1862 (Bd. vi. Abth. iii. of Olshausen’s Bibl. Comm.). Theol. Schott, Der zweite Brief Petri u. d. Brief Jude erklärt, Erlang. 1865. Holtzmann, German transl. and brief notes, in Olshausen’s Bibliothek, vol. iv. (1864), p. 639 ff., comp. vol. vi. p. 590. In English, some of the old Puritan divines expatiated at great length on this epistle, as W. Perkins (66 sermons), W. Jenkyn, and T. Manton (Lond. 1638). Jenkyn’s Exposition, 2 parts, Lond. 1652-54, 4to, has been several times reprinted (Lond. 1656; Glasgow, 1783; Lond, 1839; Edinburgh, 1863). Practical expositions have also been given by W. Mair (1822), E. Eickersteth (1846), and W. Mangillivray (1846); see Darling’s Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, (Subjects), ed. 1. 278. In our own country we have Barnes’ Notes (Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude, New York, 1847); The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of John and Jude, and the Revelation; translated from the Greek, with notes (by the Rev. John Liflitt), New York, 1854, 4to (Amer. Bible Union); and the English Version Gardner’s The Last of the Epistles, a Commentary on the Epistle of St. Jude, Boston, 1856, with Exкурsus, and an Appendix on the similarity between this epistle and the Second of St. Peter (abridged from his art. in the Bibl. Sccna for January, 1854).

On the critical questions relating to the epistle one may consult, in addition to the Introductions to the New Testament by De Wette, Renaux, Bleek, Hengstenberg, and others, J. C. G. Budde, De apostolica Epist. Petrowe posterioris et Jude, Rost. 1867.

* The expression ἵστατος ἄνδρας (Num. xv. 14) is remarkable, and seems to mean the patriarchal
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L. A. Arnaud, Essai sur l’autheuticité de l’Epître de Jude, Strasbourg, 1853; F. Brun, Introduct. crit. à l’Epître de Jude, Strasbourg, 1842; and A. Ritschel, Lehrbuch der Bibelkunde, 3d ed. 1859, have each written a discussion on the position of the Second Epistle of Jude in the canon.

A.

* JUDEA. [Judea.]

* JUDETH. [Judith, 2.]

JUDGES. The administration of justice in all early eastern nations, as amongst the Arabs of the desert to this day, rests with the patriarchal seniors;* the judges being the heads of tribes, or of chief houses in a tribe. Such from their elevated position would have the requisite leisure, would be able to make their decisions respected, and through the wider intercourse of superior station would decide with fuller experience and riper reflection. Thus in the book of Job (xxix. 7, 8, 9) the patriarchal magistrates are represented as going forth "to the gate" amidst the respectful silence of elders, princes, and nobles (comp. xxxii. 9). The actual chieftains of individual tribes are mentioned on various occasions. The last notice of the time of David is that his service in the commonwealth (Num. vii. 2, 10, 11, xvii, 6, or 17 in Heb. text: xxxiv. 18; Josh. xxii. 14, so perh. Num. xvi. 2, xxii. 18). Whether the princes of the tribes mentioned in 1 Chr. xxvi. 16, xxvii. 1, are patriarchal heads, or merely chief men appointed by the king to govern, is not strictly certain; but it would be foreign to all ancient eastern analogy to suppose that they preferred the judicial prerogative, until reduced and overshadowed by the monarchy, which in David’s time is contrary to the tenor of history. During the oppression of Egypt the ascendant people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead; and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of theft, violence, and other matters of police. Yet the question put to Moses shows that a “prince and a judge” were connected even then in the popular idea (Ex. ii. 14; comp. Num. xvi. 19). When they emerged from this oppression into national existence, the want of a machinery of judicature began to press. The patriarchal seniors did not instantly assume the function, having probably been depressed by bondage till rendered unfit for it, not having become experienced in such matters, nor having secured the confidence of their tribesmen. Perhaps for the reasons Moses at first took the whole burden of judicature upon himself, then at the suggestion of Jethro (Ex. xviii. 14-24) instituted judges over numerically graduated sections of the people. These were chosen for their moral fitness, but from Deut. i. 15, 16, we may infer that they were taken from amongst those to whom primogeniture would have assigned it. Save in offenses of public magnitude, criminal cases were not yet to be have been adjudged from civil. In the duty of teaching the people the knowledge of the law which pertained to the Levites, doubtless included such instruction as would assist the judgment of those who were thus to decide according to it. The Levites were thus the ultimate sources of ordinary jurisprudence, and perhaps the “teaching” aforesaid may merely mean the expounding the law as applicable to difficult cases arising in

senior of a subdivision of the tribe (comp. 1 Chr. iv. 36, Judg. v. 3, 15).
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practice. Beyond this, it is not possible to indicate any division of the provinces of deciding on points of law as distinct from points of fact. The judges mentioned as standing before Joshua in the great assemblies of the people must be understood as the successors to those chosen by Moses, and had doubtless been elected with Joshua's sanction from among the same general class of patriarchal seniors (Josh. iv. 2, 4, xii. 14, xxiv. 1).

The judge was reckoned a sacred person, and secured even from verbal injuries. Seeking a decision at law is called "inquiring of God" (Ex. xvii. 15). The term "gods" is actually applied to judges (Ex. xx. 6; comp. Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6). The judge was told, "thou shalt not be afraid of the face of men, for the judgment is (God's);" and thus, whilst human instrumentalities was indispensability, the source of justice was upheld as divine, and the purity of its administration only sunk with the decline of religious feeling. In this spirit speaks Ps. lxxxi., —a lofty charge addressed to all who judge: comp. the qualities regarded as essential at the institution of the office, Exx. xvii. 21, and the strict admonition of Deut. xvi. 18-20. But besides the sacred dignity thus given to the only royal function, which, under the Theocracy, lay in human hands, it was undeniably popularly vested in those who led public feeling, and its importance in the public eye appears from such passages as Ps. lxxix. 12 (comp. cxxx. 23), lxxxi., cxxxviii. 11; Prov. viii. 15, xxxi. 4, 5, 23. There could have been no considerable need for the legal studies and expositions of the Levites during the wanderings in the wilderness while Moses was alive to solve all questions, and while the law which they were to expound was not wholly delivered. The Levites, too, had a charge of cattle to look after in that wilderness like the rest, and seem to have acted also, being Moses' own tribe, as supports to his executive authority. But then few of the greater entanglements of property could arise before the people were settled in their possession of Canaan. Thus they were disciplined in smaller matters, and under Moses' own eye, for greater ones. When, however, the community had been indeniyed, the elders shone the in all thy gates." (Deut. xvi. 18), came to be fulfilled in Canaan, there were the following sources from which those officials might be supplied: 1st, the ex officio judges, or their successors, as chosen by Moses; 2dly, any surplus left of patriarchal seniors when they were taken out (as has been shown from Deut. i. 15, 16) from that class; and 3dly, the Levites. On what principle the non-Liturgical judges were chosen after Divine supervision
tendence was interrupted at Joshua's death is not clear. A simple way would have been for the existing judges in every town, etc., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against the introduction of corruption, would have been a choice of a judge, and, taken in connection with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice. The suggestion that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 19; Lev. xix. 15; Num. xxxv. 24; Deut. i. 16, xvi. 18, xxxv. 1). And all that we know of the facts of later history confirms the suggestion. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentment which followed the verbal or partial judge. The fact that justice reposed on a popular basis of administration largely contributed to keep up this spirit of independence, which is the ultimate check on all perversions of the tribunal. The popular aristocracy of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying nomenclature, and rose from the opus consil, or more citizens, upwards. The more common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (Judg. viii. 14; Ex. xii. 14; Job xxix. 7, 8, 9; Ezr x. 8). These orders were the popular element of judicature. On the other hand the Levitical body was imbued with a keen sense of allegiance to God as the Author of Law: and to the Covenant as his embodiment of it, and somehow involved whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield: hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the ruder lay element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allots separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch, there is reason to think, from the general concurrence of phraseology amidst much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and "elders" had their analogues, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognized, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Suceoth c (Judg. viii. 14) may be taken

• This term is used for want of a better; but as regards privileges of race, the tribe of Levi and house of Aaron were the only aristocracy, and these, by their pravity as regards holding lands, were an aristocracy very unlike what has usually been by that name.

b A number of words — e. g. ἴνις, ἴς, ἴς, ἴς
and (especially in the book of Job) ἴς — are sometimes rendered "prince" in the A. V.; the first most nearly uniform so, which seems designative of the more eminent of high birth or position; the next, ἴς, ἴς, expresses active and official authority. Yet as the ἴς was most likely, nay, in the earlier annals, certain, to be the ἴς, we must be careful of excluding from the person called by the one title the qualities denoted by the other. Of the two remaining

• This is the base of Ex. xviii. and Deut. i. 16, strongly suggests that 70 + 7 were the actual components; although they are spoken of rather as regards functions of ruling generally than of judging specially, yet we need not separate the two, as is clear from Deut. i. 16. Such division of labor assurely found little place in primitive times. No doubt these men presided in the gate. The number of Jacob's family (with which Suceoth was traditionally connected, Gen. xxxiii. 17)
marks upon the first thirteen, contained in the book of Judges, are made in the following article. The chronology of this period is discussed under CHRONOLOGY (vol. i. pp. 444).

This function of the priesthood, being, it may be presumed, in abeyance during the period of the judges, seems to have merged in the monarchy.

The example of Samuel and Abin delayed the assertion of the external title to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of his only two recorded judicial acts, the one (1 Sam. xi. 13) was the mere remission of a penalty popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (ibid. xiv. 44, 45) which, if it was sincerely intended, was overruled in turn by the right sense of the people.

In David’s reign it was evidently the rule for the king to hear causes in person, and not merely be passively, or even by deputy (though this might also be included), the “fountain of justice” to his people. For this purpose, perhaps, it was prospectively ordained that the king should “write him a copy of the Law,” and “read therein all the days of his life” (Deut. xvii. 18, 19). The same class of cases which were reserved for Moses would probably fail to his lot; and the high-priest was of course ready to assist the monarch. It is further presumed from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the subjection of all Israel to David’s sway caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 1–4); but the rate at which cases were disposed of can hardly have been slower among the ten tribes after David had become their king, than it was during the previous anarchy. It is more probable that during David’s uniformly successful wars wealth and population increased rapidly, and civil cases multiplied faster than the king, occupied with war, could attend to them, especially when the summary process customary in the East is considered. Perhaps the arrangements, mentioned in 1 Chr. xxiii. 4, xxv. 29 (comp. v. 52), under which twenty special judges, called Levites, were appointed to act as “officers and judges,” and amongst them specially “Chena and his sons:” with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon’s character, whose reign of peace would surely be fertile in civil questions, the “wisdom to judge” was the fitting first quality (1 K. iii. 19; comp. Ps. lxxii. 1–4). As a judge Solomon shines “in all his glory” (1 K. iii. 16, 17). No criminal was too powerful for his justice, as some had been for his father’s (2 Sam. iii. 39; 1 K. ii. 5, 6, 33, 54). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2 Sam. i. 15, iv. 9–12, where sentence is summarily executed, and on the supposed case of 2 Sam. xiv. 1–21.
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as an example. Evidently the ex officio judges of Moses’ choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Succoth pertained (Josh. xiii. 27), settled in its territory and towns: and what would be more simple than that the whole number of judges in that tribe should be allotted to its towns in proportion to their size? As such judges, they were hence by theology, they would fall into their natural places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also were apportioned on the whole equally among the tribes; and if they preserved their limits, there were probably few parts of Palestine beyond a day’s journey from a Levitical city.

One great hold which the priesthood had, in their jurisdiction, upon men’s ordinary life was the custody in the Sanctuary of the standard weights and measures, to which, in cases of dispute, reference was doubtless made. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that in most towns sufficiently exact models of them for all ordinary questions would be kept, since to refer to the Sanctuary at Shiloh, Jerusalem, etc., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (Ex. xxx. 13; Num. iii. 47; Ex. xiv. 12). Above all these, the high-priest in the antecedent period was not in short of weight in difficult cases (Deut. xvii. 12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and who would in case of need be perhaps unequally directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli; nor is any judicial act recorded of him; though perhaps his not restraining his sons is meant to be noticed as a failure in his judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judges. It is also a part of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called judges of the judicial lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high-priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume, that save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judge in the last resort from Joab to Samuel. Indeed the current phrase of those deliverers that they “judged” Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might “judge them,” rather than that he might “fight their battles” (1 Sam. viii. 5, 29).

The denunciation of 2 Sam. xii. 5 6. is, though not formally judicial, yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the cases of Joab and Shimel (1 K. ii. 34, 46; comp. 2 K. xiv. 5, 6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavorable to the local independence connected with the practice of justice in private persons; and whereas the Levites were in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralize, and we read of large numbers of king's officers appointed to this and cognate duties (1 Chr. xxiii. 4, xxvi. 29-32). If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reconstitution. Being to some extent detached, both locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the priests at Nob, 1 Sam. xxi. 17). Hence it is probable that the Levites generally superseded the local elders in the administration of justice. But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingship of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. Thus they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (1 K. xxi. 8-13). There is in 2 Chr. xix. 5, 6., a special notice of a reappointment of judges by Jehoshaphat and of a distinct court, of appeal perhaps, at Jerusalem, composed of Levitical and of lay elements. In the same place (as also in a previous one, 1 Chr. xxvi. 32) occurs a mention of "the king's judges" (the officers of the branch of jurisprudence. The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these may have grown probably into a department, somewhat like our exchequer.

One more change is noticeable in the pre-Babylonian period. The "princes" constantly appear as a powerful political body, increasing in influence and privileges, and having a fixed centre of action at Jerusalem. Till in the reign of Zedekiah, they seem to exercise some of the duties of a privy council; and especially a collective jurisdiction (2 Chr. xviii. 21; Jer. xxvi. 10, 16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction; but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant abuse of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy, which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigor was left in the state, and encroached on the sovereign attribute of justice. The employment in offices of trust and encomium would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolize such employment. Hence the constant burden of the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption, of judicial functionaries (Is. i. 17, 21, v. 7, x. 2, xxviii. 7, xvi. 1, xix. 4; Jer. ii. 8, v. 1, vii. 5, xiii. 12; Ez. xxi. 27, xiv. 8, 9; Hos. v. 10, viii. 5, 7, Amos vi. 24, vi. 13; Nah. i. 4). Still, although far changed from its broad and simple basis in the earlier period, the administration of justice had little resembling the set and rigid system of the Sanhedrin of later times. [See SANHEDRIN.] This last change arose from the fact that the patriarchal seniority, degenerate and corrupted as it became before the Captivity, was by that event broken up, and a new basis of judicature had to be sought for.

With regard to the forms of procedure little more is known than may be gathered from the two examples, Ruth iv. 2, of a civil, and 1 K. xxii. 8-14, of a criminal character: to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well-known "judgment" of Solomon. Is az apparently enunciates as it were the first ten "elders" whom he meets "in the gate," the well-known case of the orphans, the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of its elders (Josh. xx. 4), and this failing, or the congregation deciding against his claim to sanctuary there (though how its sense was to be taken does not appear), he was not put to death by act of public justice, but left to the "avenger of blood" (Dent. xix. 12). The expressions between "blood and blood," between "plea and plea" (Dent. xvii. 8, 9), indicate a presumption of legal intrigue arising: the latter expression seeming to imply something as what we call a "cross-suit." We may infer from the sanctity, or rather almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them to be provided for as the necessity for them arose, it being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chicanery. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors: Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of 1 Sam. xii. 3, that such transactions would have been regarded as corrupt. There is another question how far advocates were usual. There is no reason weak either of government or of personal charac-

weakness, or EITHER DRIT. own criminality with Batsheeba it is superfluous to assert, since the matter was by divine interference removed from the cognizance of MZAN law.

a. From Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, it would seem that after 50 years of age the Levites were excused from the service of the tabernacle. This was perhaps a provision meant to favor their usefulness in deciding on points of law, since the maturity of a judge has hardly begun at that age, and before it they would have been junior to their lay coadjutors.

b. That some of the heads of such houses, however, walled their proper sphere, seems clear from Jer.

21, 17, where "elders of the land" address an assembly of the people. Still, the occasion is not judicial.

c. The Sanhedrin is, by a school of Judaism once more prevalent than now, attempted to be based on the 70 elders of Num. xi. 18, and to be traced through the O. T. history. Those 70 were chosen when judia
cature had been already provided for (Ex. xvii. 25), and the chief office was to assist Moses in the duty of governing. But no influence of any such body is traceable in later times at any eras of history. They seem in fact to have left no successors.

d. The example of Susannah and the elders is a suspicious an authority to be cited.
to think that until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on σωτήρος and παράδοσις, any proselyted class of pleaders existed. Yet passages abound in which the pleading of the cause of those who are unable to plead their own case, is spoken of as a thing proper to the nation, a noble act of charity; and the expression has even (which shows the popularity of the practice) become a basis of figurative allusion (Job xxi. 21; Prov. xxiii. 23, xxvii. 9; Ez. i. 17; Jer. xxx. 13. l. 34. fi. 36). The blessedness of such acts is forcibly dwelt upon, Job xxiii. 12, 13.

There is no mention of any distinctive dress or badge as pertaining to the judicial officer. A staff or sceptre was the common badge of a ruler or prince, and this perhaps they bore (Is. xiv. 5; Am. i. 5, 8). They would, perhaps, when officiating, be more than usually careful to comply with the regulations about dress laid down in Num. xv. 38, 39; Deut. xxii. 12. The use of the "white ass" (Judg. v. 10), by those who "sit in judgment," was perhaps a convenient distinctive mark for them when journeying where they would not usually be known.

For other matters relating to some of the forms of law, see OATHS, OFFICERS, WITNESSES.

II. H.

JUDGES, BOOK OF (جملة : Kpe \r¡\r¡ : {\b\r¡\r¡}). 1. Title.—The period of history contained in this book reaches from Joshua to Eli, and is thus more extensive than the time of the Judges. A large portion of it also makes no mention of them, though belonging to their time. But because the history of the Judges occupies by far the greater part of the narrative, and is at the same time the history of the people, the title of the whole book is derived from that portion. The book of Ruth was originally a part of this book. But about the middle of the fifth century after Christ it was placed in the Hebrew copies immediately after the Song of Solomon. In the LXX. it has preserved its original position, but as a separate book.

II. Arrangement.—The book at first sight may be divided into two parts—i.—xvi. and xvii.—xxiv.

A. I.—xvi. The subdivisions are: (a.) i.—ii. 5, which may be considered as a first introduction, giving a summary of the results of the war carried on against the Canaanites by the several tribes on the west of Jordan after Joshua's death, and forming a continuation of Josh. xi. 1. It is placed first, as in the most natural position. It tells us that the people did not obey the command to expel the people of the land, and contains the reproof of them by a prophet. (b.) ii. 6—vi. 5. This is a second introduction, standing in nearer relation to the following history. It informs us that the people fell into idolatry after the death of Joshua, and his generation, and that they were punished for it by being unable to drive out the remnant of the inhabitants of the land, and by falling under the hand of oppressors. A parenthesis occurs (ii. 16—19) of the highest importance as giving a key to the following portion. It is a summary view of the history: the people fall into idolatry; they are then oppressed by a foreign power; upon their repentance they are delivered by the judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry. (c.) iii. 7—xvi. The words, "and the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," which had been already used in ii. 11, are employed to introduce the history of the 13 judges comprised in this book. An account of six of these 13 is given at greater or less length. The account of the remaining seven is very short, and merely attached to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows: (1) The history of Gideon and his son Abimelech is contained in vi.—ix., and followed by the notice of Tola, x. 1, 2, and Jair, x. 5—5. This is the only case in which the history of a judge is continued by that of his children. (2) The history of Jephthah, x. 6—xii., which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of his family by Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who in their turn become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorized anticipation of the kingly government of later times. (3.) The history of Barak, x. 21—xxvii. 7; to which is added the mention of Heber, xxviii. 10; Elon. 11, 12; Abdon, 13—15. (4.) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, xiii.—xxvi. We may observe in general on this portion of the book, that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance; there are no sectarian allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not afterwards to the time of Othniel; and the greater part of the judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

B. xvii.—xxiv. This part has no formal connection with the preceding, and is often called an appendix. No mention of the judges occurs in it. It contains allusions to "the house of God," the ark, and the high-priest. The period to which the narrative relates is simply marked by the expression "when there was no king in Israel" (xxix. 1; 1 Kings. i. 1). It records (a) the conquest of Laish by a portion of the tribe of Dan, and the establishment there of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah already instituted by Micah in Mount Ephraim. The date of this occurrence is not marked, but it has been thought to be subsequent to the time of Deborah, as her song contains no allusion to any northern settlements of the tribe of Dan. (b) The almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin, and the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its becoming complete. The date is in some degree marked by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (xx. 28), and by the proof of the unanimity still prevailing among the people.

1. "6-sign. The passage already seen that there is an unity of plan in i.—xvii., the clue to which is stated in ii. 16—19. There can be little doubt of the design to enforce the view there expressed. But the words of that passage must not be pressed too closely. It is a general view, to which the facts of the history correspond in different degrees. Thus the people is contemplated as a whole; the judges are spoken of with the reverence due to God's instruments; and the deliverances appear complete. But it would seem that the people were in no instance under exactly the same circumstances, and the judges in some points fall short of the ideal This Gideon, who in some respects is the most
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Joh. xv.-xxii. must be compared with Judg. i. in order to understand fully how far the several tribes failed in expelling the people of Canaan. Nothing is said in ch. i. about the tribes on the east of Jordan, which had been already mentioned (Josh. xiii 13), nor about Levi (see Josh. xiii. 33, xvi. 1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by Josh. xiv. 28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and it, it is presumed, resumes the narrative, suspended by i.-ii. 5, with the same words as are used in concluding the history of Joshua (xxiv. 28-31). In addition to this the following passages appear to be common to the two books: compare Judg. i. 10-15, 20, 21, 27, 29, with Josh. xv. 14-19, 13, 63, xvii. 12, xvi. 10. A reference to the conquest of Laish (Judg. xviii.) occurs in Josh. xix. 47.

(13) To the books of Samuel and Kings. — We find in i. 28, 30, 33, 35, a number of towns upon which, "when Israel was strong," a tribute of bond-service was levied; this is supposed by some to refer to the time of Solomon (1 K. ix. 13-22). The conduct of Saul towards the Kenites (1 Sam. xx. 6), and that of David (1 Sam. xxxv. 29), is explained by i. 16. A reference to the continuance of the Philistine wars is implied in xiii. 5. The allusion to Abimelech (2 Sam. xi. 21) is explained by ch. ix. Chapters xxvii.-xxviii. and the book of Ruth are more independent, but they have a general reference to the subsequent history.

The question now arises whether this book forms one link in an historical series, or whether it has a closer connection either with that which preceded or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its view and spirit with those of the other books of the Old Testament. By its position in the canon we may conclude that it was not an independent book originally. The history ceases with Samson, excluding Eli and Samuel; and then at this point two historical pieces are added — xvii.-xxvi. and the book of Ruth, independent of the general plan and of each other. This is sufficiently explained by Ewald's supposition that the books from Judges to 2 Kings form one work. In this case the histories of Eli and Samuel, so closely united between themselves, are transferred on account of their close connection with the rise of the monarchy. And Judg. xvi.-xxi. is inserted both as an illustration of the sin of Israel during the time of the Judges, in which respect it agrees with i.-xxvi., and as presenting a contrast with the better order prevailing in the time of the kings. Ruth follows next, as touching on the time of the judges, and containing information about David's family history which does not occur elsewhere. The connection of these books, however, is denied by Retheau (Einzeldichtung, 2, 163, 170) only recognizes the use of speeches in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (On Judges, pp. xxvii.-xxxii.) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are united in one plan, points to the incorporation of parts of previous histories. Thus, according to him, the author found the substance of iv. 2-24 already accompanying the song of Deborah, and of iv. 25-31 two distinct authorities are used — a life of Gideon, and a history of Jael and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samuel is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (Eich. iv. 181 f. ii. 490 f.).

V. Relation to other Books. — (A.) To Joshua.

...
In but originally, as Ewald thinks (Gesch. i. 282, 283), the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, Introduction, 649, 650). Again, the writer of the appendix lived when Shiloh was no longer a religious centre (xviii. 31); he was acquainted with the regal form of government (xviii. 6, xviii. 1). There is some doubt as to xviii. 90. It is thought by some to refer to the Philistine oppression. But it seems more probable that the Assyrian captivity is intended, in which case the writer must have lived after 721 B.C. The whole book therefore must have taken its present shape after that date. And if we adopt Ewald's view, that Judges to 2 Kings form one book, the final arrangement of the whole must have been after the thirty-seventh year of Jehoiachin's captivity, or c. 562 (2 K. xxv. 27). Bertheau's suggestion with respect to Ezra brings it still lower. But we may add, with reference to the subject of this and the two preceding sections, that, however interesting such inquiries may be, they are only of secondary importance. Few persons are fully competent to conduct them, or even to pass judgment on their discordant results. And whatever obscurity may rest upon the whole matter, a more important consideration is that we have, through God's providence, a continuous history of the Jewish people, united throughout by the conviction of their dependence upon God and government by Him. This conviction finds its highest expression in parts of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets; but it was confirmed by the events of the history—although, at times, in a manner which gave room to Faith to use its power of perception, and allowed men in those days, as well as in these, to rush to recognize it.

VII. Chronology.—The time commonly assigned to the period contained in this book is 299 years. But this number is not derived directly from it. The length of the interval between Josua's death and the invasion of Cushan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shangar was judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 440 years, reckoned from the capture of Jerusalem by Solomon in 960 B.C. and from the 40th year of Eli in 410 B.C. (Judg. xiv. 6). This would show that this was the computation commonly adopted, as the 450 years seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by x. 26, and in a still greater degree by I. K. vi, 1, where the whole period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple is stated at 489 years (440, LXX.). The solution questions the genuineness of the date in I Kings. Keimcott pronounces against it (Dis. teor. 81, § 3), because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. And it is urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period, if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Tholusius (ad loc.), and is generally adopted partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporary. But all these combinations are arbitrary. And this may be said of Keil's scheme, which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively as far as 1008; but makes Judah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (cf. x. 6-xiii. 1); and by compressing the period between the division of the land and Cushan-rishathaim into 10 years, the Philistine wars to the death of Saul into 30, he arranges ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations—differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the Exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning. On the whole, it seems safer to give up the attempt to ascertain the chronology exactly. The successive narratives give us the history of only parts of the country, and some of the occurrences may have been contemporary. But there seems to have been used—the number 40 occurs four times; and two of the periods are without any date. On this difficult subject see also Chronology, vol. i. p. 444 f.


E. R. O.

* Other references.—Among the older commentators (see above) are also J. Prusius, "ad loca" case, adding together the years from the birth of Isaac regarded as the pledge of the promesse de joue (Gen. xxv. ii), the age of Jacob on going into Egypt 130, the sojourn in Egypt 215, as required by 31st ii. 17, and the time of the wandering in the wilderness (47), we have as the result 452 years between Jacob and the judges. Never so conveniently that this form of the chronology is correct (Apostolisch-p. 221, ed. 1849); but it is singular that so many of the best authorities agree in this variation. For fuller details on this question see the writer's Commentary on the Acts, pp. 157 f. and 214 f.
difficulties in the sentence, such as the use of the term "similar" and the phrase "Deborah's pp." which might be interpreted as suggesting a lack of clarity or precision in the author's writing.

Regarding the events of the period, it is noted that the "Judgment Day" was a significant event in Jewish history, as it marked the end of the Roman occupation and the beginning of a new era of freedom and independence for the Jews.

The author then goes on to discuss the various interpretations of the event, ranging from the Roman perspective to the Jewish perspective, and how each side viewed it differently.

A crucial point in this discussion is the role of Pilate, the Roman governor of Judaea, who is described as "doubtless inhabiting the palace of his father" (Luke xxvii. 7). The author notes that Pilate was "lived there at one time" (Phil. iv. 11, 12), and further describes how his residence was "in the palace of Herod, which was then and long afterwards the citadel of Jerusalem." (Jerusalem, p. 1326 a.)

The author then discusses the events that took place in Jerusalem during "the time of the trial of Christ," including the "doubtless inhabiting the palace of his father" (Luke xxvii. 7) and the "lived there at one time" (Phil. iv. 11, 12).

The author then discusses the events that took place in Jerusalem during "the time of the trial of Christ," including the "doubtless inhabiting the palace of his father" (Luke xxvii. 7) and the "lived there at one time" (Phil. iv. 11, 12).
JUDITH, THE BOOK OF

With this direct personal sense we might expect the dative without "of", as in the other clause (comp. also Acts iv. 16, vii. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 15). But with the local sense as the direct one and the personal as indirect as in Ewald’s "im ganzen Prautorium unter den Kriegen," see his "Handbuch zur Altpreußischen Geschichte". The variation in position is natural. See Meyer’s note on this passage; also the art. Censar’s Household (Amst. ed.).

4. The word prautorium occurs also in Matt. xxvii. 27, where it is translated "a common hall" [A. V. marg. "court or governor’s house"], and in Mark xv. 16. In both places it denotes Pilate’s residence in Jerusalem.

W. T. B.

* JUDGMENT-SEAT, the translation (A. V.) in various passages of Bůmá, and once of sýrīsírō. [Gábrithal; JUDGMENT-HALL; PRÉTORIUM.] Some critics adopt this sense of sýrīsírō in 1 Cor. vi. 2: 4 (see Meyer in loc. and comp. James ii. 6, A. V.).

JUDITH. 1. [Jóvdth:] [see below]: [Juodth:] [Alex. Jóvdb: Judith:]; "The daughter of Beeri the Hittite," and wife of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 34; Aboth Kedamah).

2. [Jóvdth:] Vat. Sin. Alex. Júvadeth: Ahd. Jóvadith, Jóvadèth.] The heroine of the apocryphal book which bears her name, who appears as an ideal type of piety (Jud. viii. 6), beauty (xi. 21), courage, and chastity (xvi. 22 f.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (iv. 2) and the manner in which she refers to his revered dead (Gen. xxxiv. 25 ff.), mark the conception of the character, which evidently belongs to a period of stern and perilous conflict. The most unscrupulous daring (xiii.) is combined with zeal and ritualism (xii. 1 f.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (xiv. 31 ff.). Clement of Rome (Ep. i. 55) assigns to Judith the epithet given to Jadh ("Jóvdeth, Jóvadèth") and Jerome sees in her exploit the image of the victory of the Church over the power of evil (Ep. lxxix. 11, p. 508; "Judith . . . in typo Ecclesiastici dimitto capite transevit; " cf. Ep. xxi. 21, 1805).

The name is properly the feminine form of Jóvadh, Júvados (cf. Jer. xxxvi. 14, 21). In the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of Jadh, i. e. "prised." B. F. W.

* In the A. V. ed. 1611 and other early editions the name of the heroine of this book is uniformly spelt Judith, as in the Geneva version. This orthography was doubtless derived from the Aldine edition, which reads "Jóvdeth" in the heading, and often, though not uniformly, in the text of the book.

JUDITH, THE BOOK OF, like that of Tobit, belongs to the earliest specimens of historical fiction. The narrative of the reign of "Nebuchadnezzar king of Nineveh" (i. 1), of the campaign of Holobernes, and the deliverance of Bethulia, through the strategem and courage of the Jewish heroine, contains too many and too serious difficulties, both historical and geographical, to allow of the supposition that it is either literally true, or even carefully moulded on truth. The existence of a kingdom of Nineveh and the reign of a Nebuchadnezzar are in themselves inconsistent with a date after the return; and an earlier date is excluded equally by internal evidence and by the impossibility of placing the events in harmonious connection with the course of Jewish history. The latter, together with the later character of the book, contradict the priority of its composition.

The variations of opinion among those critics who have endeavored to maintain the veracity of the story, Nebuchadnezzar has been identified with Cambyses, Xerxes, Esarhaddon, Klinshad, Merodach Baladan, etc., without the slightest show of probability. But apart from this, the text evidently alludes to the position of the Jews after the exile, when the Temple was rebuilt (v. 18, 19; iv. 3) and the hierarchical government established in place of the kingdom (xxv. 8, 9; γραφή των νεων Ισραήλ: cf. iv. 4, Samaria; viii. 6, προσάββατον, προσμάρτυρας); and after the Return the course of authentic history absolutely excludes the possibility of the occurrence of such events as the book relates. This fundamental contradiction of which underlies the whole narrative, renders it superfluous to examine in detail the other objections which may be urged against it. (c. iv. 6, vi. 31, vi. 441); "The book is exhibited in these traits, affords the best indication of its date: for it cannot be wrong to refer its origin to the Macedonian period, which it reflects not only in its general spirit but even in smaller traits. The impious design of Nebuchadnezzar finds a parallel in the prophetic description of Antiochus (Dan. xi. 31 ff.), and the triumphant issue of Judith's courage must be compared not with the immediate results of the invasion of Apollonius (as Pehlrbôth, Ful, 2553 ff.), but with the victory which the author pictured to himself as the reward of faith. But while it seems certain that the book is to be referred to the second century n. c. (175-100 n. c.), the attempts which have been made to fix its date within narrower limits, either to the time of the war of Alexander Jannaeus (105-4 n. c., Movers) or of Demetrius II. (129 n. c., Ewald), rest on very inaccurate data. It might seem more natural (as a mere conjecture) to refer it to an earlier time, e. 170 n. c., when Antiochus Epiphanes made his first assault upon the Temple.*

3. In accordance with the view which has been given of it, the character and date of the book, it is probable that the several parts may have a distinct symbolic meaning. Some of the names can scarcely have been chosen without regard to their derivation (e. g. Achior: Brother of Light; Judith = Jewess; Bethulia = Βηθελία, the virgin of Jehovah), and the historical difficulties of the person of Nebuchadnezzar disappear when he is regarded only be noticed in passing, as it assumes the spuriousness of the First Epistle of Clement (§ 9).
and these variations can only be explained by going back to some still more remote source (cf. Bertholdt, Einl. 2968 ff.), which was probably an earlier Greek copy.  

6. The existence of these various recensions of the book is a proof of its popularity and wide circulation, but the external evidence of its use is very scanty. Josephus was not acquainted with it, or it is likely that he would have made some use of its contents, as he did of the apocryphal additions to Esther (Jos. Ant. xi. 6, § 1 ff.). The first reference to its contents occurs in Clem. Rom. (Ep. i. 55), and it is quoted with marked respect by Origen (Sed. in Jerem. 23: cf. Hom. ix. in Jud., I Hilary (in Paul. cxxv. 6), and Lucifer (De mon. parc. p. 395). Jerome speaks of it as "reckoned among the Sacred Scriptures by the Synod of Nice," by which he probably means that it was quoted in the records of the Council, unless the text be corrupt. It has been wrongly inserted in the catalogue at the close of the Apostolic Canons, against the best authority (cf. Hody, De Bibli. Text. 646 a), but it obtained a place in the Latin Canon at an early time (cf. Hier. Prof. in Ps. 15), which it commonly maintained afterwards. [CASMAN.]

7. The Commentary of Fritzsche (Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch, Leipzig, 1855) is by far the best which has appeared; within a narrow compass it contains a good critical apparatus and scholarlike notes.

B. F. W.

* Literature.—Besides the Introductions and other general works referred to under the art. APOCRYPHA, the following essays and treatises may be noted: Reuss, art. Judith in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encycl., Sect. ii. Theil xxviii. pp. 98-103. Vaininger, in Herzog's Real-Encycl. vii. 115-142. Ginsburg, in Kittel's Cyclop. of Bibli. Lit., 3d ed., ii. 692-696. "G. B." in the Journ. of Soc. for July, 1856, pp. 342-363, and B. L. Cowper, The Book of Judith and his Commentary (in the Journ. of Soc. for July, 1856, pp. 421-440. O. Wolff (Cath.), Das Buch Judith als geschichtliche Urkunde vertheigt u. ehrhrt, Leipzig, 1861, of little or no value. The most elaborate and remarkable among the recent publications relating to the book is that of Volkmar, Handb. d. Einl. in die Apokryphen, 3rd Theil, " A nth. Judith, Tub. 1860. He maintains that the book was composed in the first year of the reign of Hadrian, near the end of A. D. 117 or the beginning of 118, and that it describes, under the disguise of fictitious names, the war of Trajan against the Parthians and Jews, and the triumph of the latter in the death of Lusius Quietus, the general of Trajan and governor of Judaea. Nebuchadnezzar stands for Trajan; Nineveh is Antioch "the great," as the chief city under the Roman sway in the East; and Assyria accordingly stands for Syria as the representative of the power which oppressed the Jews, the region where that power was concentrated.

"Arphaxad the king of the Medes" represents the Parthian Arsacids; Ecbatana is Nisibis, Holophernes Lusius Quietus, and the beautiful widow Judith symbolizes Judaea in her desolation, but still faithful to Jehovah, and destined to triumph over her enemies. This explanation is carried out into detail with great learning and ingenuity.

HERZOG'S ENCYC. s. v.; FRITZSCHE, Einl. § 2.; DE WETTE, Einl. § 386, e.).

* Of modern versions the English follows the Greek and that of Luther the Latin text.

JULII (Ἰουλία: [Vat. Ioana, but joined with the following word: ] Julet). I. 1 Esdr. ix. 34. [Vat.]

2. (Vat. Omna), but joined with the preceding word:] Jesse. I. 1 Esdr. ix. 35. [Joel, 13.]

JULIA (Ἰουλία: [Judith, acc.:]), a Christian woman at Rome, probably the wife, or perhaps the sister of Philoheus, in connection with whom she is saluted by St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 15). Origen supposes that they were master and mistress of a Christian household which included the other persons mentioned in the same verse. Some modern critics have conjectured that the name may be that of a man, Julius. W. T. B.

JULIUS (Ἰούλιος: [Julius]), the courteous centurion of a "Augustus’ band," to whose charge St. Paul was delivered when he was sent prisoner from Cesar’a to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1, 9). [Cust.]

Augustus’ band has been identified by some commentators with the Italian band (Acts x. 1) by others, less probably, with the body of cavalry denominated Scytheni by Josephus (Ant. ix. 9, § 2, d). Conder and Howson (Life of St. Paul, ch. 2) adopt in the main Wiedener’s opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the German Guards attached to the person of the Roman governor at Cesarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Priscus (Tacit. Hist. ii. 92, iv. 11), sometime centurion, afterwards prefect of the Procurators. [Italian Band. Amer. ed.]

W. T. B.

JUNIA (Ἰουνία, i. e. Junias: [Junium, acc.]), a Christian at Rome, mentioned by St. Paul as one of his kinsfolk and fellow-prisoners, of note among the Apostles, and in Christ before St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 7). Origen conjectures that he was possibly one of the seven disciples. Hammond also takes the name to be that of a woman, Junias, which would be a contraction (as Winer observes) of Junimias or Juniamia. [Andronicus.]

Chrysostom, holding the more common, but perhaps less probable, hypothesis that the name is that of a woman, Junia, remarks on it, "How great is the devotion of this woman, that she should be counted worthy of the name of Apostle!" Nothing is known of the imprisonment to which St. Paul refers Origen supposes that it is that bondage from which Christ makes Christians free.

W. T. B.

JUPITER (Ζεύς), from Ζεύς, "blessed," Gesen. p. 1317; Ἰουάνας, υμεῖς, 1 K. xiv. 4, 5: Junipens). It has been already stated [Cedar] that the ocycedrus or Phoenician juniper was the tree whose wood, called "cedar-wood," was ordained by the law to be used in ceremonial purification (Ex. v. 4; Num. x. 9). The word, however, which is rendered in A. V. juniper, is beyond doubt a sort of brome, Genista monspurium, Genista retama of Forskal, answering to the Arabic Rethim, which is also found in the desert of Sinai in the neighborhood of the true juniper (Hollinsop, ii. 124). It is mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (1 K. xiv. 4, 5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for human food (Ps. cxxv. 4: Job xxxvii. 20). It is very abundant in the desert of Sinai, and affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm, to travellers (Vig. Georg. ii. 434, 436). Its roots are very bitter, and would thus serve as food only in extreme cases: but it may be doubted whether "Junipera" (Job xxxvii. 4) is to be restricted to roots only, or to be taken in a wider sense of product, and thus include the fruit, which is much liked by sheep, and may thus sometimes served for human food (Ges. p. 1484). The roots are much valued by the Arabs for charcoal for the Cairo market. The fruit, which affords shade to Eljiah may have furnished also the "ceals" or ashes for baking the cake which satisfied his hunger (1 K. xiv. 6; see also Ps. cxxv. 4, "ceals of juniper"). The Rethem is a leguminous plant, and bears a white flower. It is found also in Spain, Portugal, and Palestine. Its abundance in the Sinai desert gave a name to a station of the Israelites, Bithnah (Num. xxxiii. 18, 19; Burckhardt, Syria, pp. 484, 542; Robinson, i. 294, 295; Lord Lindsay, Letters, p. 183: Phyth. Hist. xiv. 9, 65; Balfe’s, Plants of the Bible, p. 50; Stanley, S. & P. p. 20, 79, 521; Thomson, Lord and Book, i. 436 f., and especially Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 339 f. (Loud. 1867). — H. J.

W. H. P.

JUPITER (Zeus. LXX. [and N. T.: Jupiter]). Among the chief measures which Antiochus Epiphanes took for the entire subversion of the Jewish faith was that of dedicating the Temple at Jerusalem to the service of Zeus Olympus (2 Macc. vi. 2), and at the same time the rival Temple on Gerizim was dedicated to Zeus Xenius (Jupiter Hospitalis, Vulg.). The choice of the first epithet is easily intelligible. The Olympian Zeus was the national god of the Hellenic race (Thucyd. iii. 14), as well as the supreme ruler of the heathen world, and as such formed the true opposite to Jehovah, who had revealed Himself as the God of Abraham. The application of the second epithet, "the God of heights," to Zeus on Gerizim, was more obscure. In 2 Mace. vi. 2 it is explained by the clause, "as was the character of those who dwelt in the place," which may, however, be an ironic comment of the writer (cf. Curt. iv. 5, 8), and not a sincere encomium of the hospitality of the Samaritans (as Ewald, Gesch. iv. 334 n.).

Jupiter or Zeus is mentioned in one passage of the N. T., on the occasion of St. Paul’s visit to Lystra (Acts xiv. 12, 13), where the expression...
JU\'SHAB-HE\'SED

"Jupiter, which was before their city," means that his temple was outside the city.\footnote{The name Jupiter also occurs in the A. V. in Acts xix. 35, where "the image [of the goddess Artemis] which fell down from Jupiter" is the translation of το\'ι Δε\'υνα.} B. F. W.

* The Lystrans on that occasion called Barnabas Jupiter (ver. 12), because Paul being "the chief speaker" and therefore Mercury, the god of eloquence, they supposed the other visitor must be Jupiter, whom they specially worshipped. They had a tradition also that these two gods had once travelled in disguise among them (see Ovid, Met. viii. 611). It has been suggested too that Barnabas may have been the elder man of the two, and more imposing than Paul in his personal appearance (comp. 2 Cor. x. 1, 10).

JU\'SHAB-HE\'SED (יו\'ש חֶסֶד): Aso\'b\'le\'a; [Vat. Ap\'o\'b\'a\'n\'a]; Alex. Ap\'o\'b\'a\'n\'a; [Comp. \'Yu\'b\'he\'e\'se\'e\'a; \'J\'u\'b\'he\'e\'e\'e\'e\'a;].

1. Jutah, son of Zerubbabel (1 Chr. iii. 29). It does not appear why the five children in this verse are separated from the three in ver. 19. Bertheau suggests that they might be by a different mother, or possibly born in Judæa after the return, whereas the three others were born at Babylon. The name of Jushab-hese, i.e. "Loving-kindness is returned," taken in conjunction with that of his father and brothers, is a striking expression of the feelings of pious Jews at the return from Captivity, and at the same time a good illustration of the nature of Jewish names.

A. C. H.

JUSTUS (יו\'ש\'ע\'ד): [Justus, "just"]; S_lockett-
gen (Hor. Hebr. in Act. Ap.) shows by quotations from rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews.\footnote{This — with one t — is the form given in Iahab's text of xv. 55: Michaelis and Walton insert a dagesh, but it was apparently unknown to any of the old translators in those versions (with the exception of the Alex. LXX), whatever shape the word assumes, it retains a single t.} 1. A surname of Joseph called Barsabas (Acts i. 23). [Joseph Bara\'ba\'s.]

2. A Christian at Corinth, with whom St. Paul lodged (Acts xviii. 7). The Syr. and Arab. have Titus, while the Vulg. combines both names Titus Justus.

Paul did not lodge with Justus at this time, but having left the synagogue preached at the house of Justus, which being near the synagogue was so much the more convenient for that purpose (ver. 8). For ought that appears, he abode still with Aquila (ver. 3 after this separation from the Jews. Nor is Justus spoken of as a Christian, but as a Jewish proselyte (σεβο\'μενο\'ν το\'ν θεο\'ν), though evidently he had more sympathy with Paul than with the Jews, and no doubt soon became a believer.


JUTTAH (יו\'תָח), i. e. Jutah; also in xxi. 16, י תָח [extended, included]: Tr\'dv. Alex. Ier\'a: Tarb. Alex. omits: Jot\'h, Jot\'h\'a, a city in the mountain region of Judah, in the neighborhood of Maon and Carmel (Josh. xv. 55). It was allotted to the priests (xvi. 16), but in the catalogue of 1 Chr. vi. 57-59, the name has escaped. In the time of Ezechias it was a large village (אָנָּוֹן אָגֵלָו), 18 miles southward of Cletheropolis (Onomasticum, "Jattan"). A village called Jut\'h\'a was visited by Robinson, close to M\'i\'n and Kurdy (Gild. Res. 1st ed. ii. 192, 628), which doubtless represents the ancient town.

KA\'DESH, KA\'DESH BARNE\'A 1519

Roland (Pol. p. 870) conjectures that Jutta is the το\'ι Διο\'νο\'σιο\'ν (A. V. a city of Judah") in the hill country, in which Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, resided (Luke i. 39). But this, though feasible, is not at present confirmed by any positive evidence. [Juda, City of, Amer. ed.]

K.

KA\'SE\'E\'EL (ק\'ס\'א\'י\'א): [see below]: [in Josh.] Bara\'se\'la\'h, Alex. Bara\'se\'la\'h; [Comp. Bara\'se\'la\'h, Al\'d. Bara\'se\'la\'h: in 2 Sam.], Kasa\'se\'la\'h; [Vat. Kar\'a\'se\'b\'e\'a]; Comp. Al\'d. Kasa\'se\'la\'h: in 1 Chr.]. Bara\'se\'la\'h: Gab\'e\'e\'l, one of the "eights" of the tribe of Judah; the first named in the enumeration of those next Edom, and apparently the farthest south (Josh. xv. 21). Taken as Hebrew, the word signifies "collected by God," and may be compared with Jok\'tfe\'e\'l, the name bestowed by the Jews on an Edomite city. Kaza\'be\'el is memorable as the native place of the great hero Bena\'lah\'i\'n-Je\'hoida, in connection with whom it is twice mentioned (2 Sam. xxiii. 20: 1 Chr. xi. 22). After the Captivity it was reinaugurated by the Jews, and appears as Je\'k\'a\'se\'e\'el.

It is twice mentioned in the Onomasticon — as Bara\'se\'la\'h and Copes\'el: the first time by Eusebius only, and apparently confused with Carmel, unless the conjecture of Le Clerc in his notes on the passage be accepted, which would identify it with the site of Elijah's sleep and vision, between Beer-sheba and Horeb. No trace of it appears to have been discovered in modern times.

* KA\'DE\'S (ק\'ד\'ס): Vulg. omits, Jud. i. 9, perhaps the same as Kade\'sh (see below), or Kede\'sh, Josh. xv. 23.

KA\'DE\'S, KA\'DE\'S BARNE\'E [Heb. Barne\'a] (ק\'ד\'ש ק\'ד\'ש ברנ\'א): [see in the art. and notes]: Kadesh [L. xiiil. 19, Rom. Vat. Ka\'di\'a], Kadesh Bar�by, Kadesh vuj Barby [Num. xxxiv. 4; Ovid, Cadberian]. This place, the scene of Miriam's death, was the farthest point to which the Israelites reached in their direct road to Canaan; it was also that whence the spies were sent, and where, on their return, the people broke out into murmuring, upon which their strictly penal term of wandering began (Num. xiii. 32, 36, xiv. 29-33, xvi. 1; Deut. ii. 14). It is probable that the term "Kadesh," though applied to signify a "city," yet had also a wider application to a region, in which Kadesh-Meriba, certainly, and Kadesh-Barnea probably, indicates a precise spot. Thus Kadesh appears as a limit eastward of the same tract which was limited westward by Shur (Gen. xx. 1). Shur is possibly the same as Sihor, "which is before Egypt" (xviii. 18; Josh. xiii. 3; Jer. ii. 18), and was the first portion of the wilderness on which the people emerged from the passage of the Red Sea. [MICR.] "Between Kadesh and Iared" is another indication of the site of Kadesh as an eastern limit (Gen. xvi. 14), for the point so fixed is "the fountain on the way to Shur" (v. 7), and
KADESH

the range of limits is narrowed by selecting the western one not so far to the west, while the eastern one, Kadesh, is unchanged. Again, we have Kadesh as the point to which the foray of Chedorlaomer returned—a word which does not imply that they had previously visited it, but that it lay in the direction, as viewed from Mount Seir and Paran mentioned next as fixed at "unto the land of Chinnereth" which was that of the point from which Chedorlaomer had gone, namely, the North. Chedorlaomer, it seems, coming down by the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, smote the Zoanites (Ammon, Gen. xiv. 4; Deut. ii. 20), and the Emims (Moab, Deut. ii. 11), and the Horites in Mount Seir, to the south of that sea, unto "El-Paran that is by the wildernes." He drove these Horites over the Arinah into the et-Tih region. Then "returned," i.e. went northward to Kadesh and Hazazon Tamar, or Engedi (comp. Gen. xiv. 7; 2 Chr. xx. 2). In Gen. xiv. 7 Kadesh is identified with En-Mishpat, the fountain of judgment, and is connected with Tamar, or Hazazon Tamar, just as we find these two in the comparatively late book of Ezekiel, as designed to mark the southern border of Judah, drawn through them and terminating seaward at the "River to (or toward) the Great Sea." Precisely thus stands Kadesli-Barnac in the books of Numbers and Joshua (comp. Ex. xiii. 19, xviii. 28; Num. xxxiv. 4; Josh. xx. 3). Unless then we are prepared to make a double Kadesh for the book of Genesis, it seems idle with Rehob (Palestine, p. 114-17), to distinguish the "En-Mishpat, which is Kadesli," from that to which the spies returned. For there is an identity about all the connections of the two, which, if not conclusive, will compel us to abandon all possible inquiries. This holds especially as regards Paran and Tamar, and in respect of its being the eastern limit of a region, and also as being the first point of importance found by Chedorlaomer on passing round the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. In a strikingly similar manner we have the limits of a route, apparently well-known one at the time, indicated by three points, Horae, Mount Sabe, Kadesh-Barnac, in Den. i. 2, the distance between the extremity being fixed at "11 days' journey," or about 115 miles, allowing 15 miles to an average day's journey. This is one element for determining the site of Kadesh, assuming of course the position of Horae ascertained. The name of the place to which the spies returned is "Kadesli" simply, in Num. xiii. 26, and is there closely connected with the "wilderness of Paran." Yet the "wilderness of Zin" stands in near conjunction, as the point where the "search" of the spies commenced (ver. 21). Again, in Num. xxxii. 8, we find that it was from Kadesli-Barnac that the mission of the spies commenced, and in the rehearsed narrative of the same event in Den. i. 19, Num. ix. 23, the name "Barnac" is also added.

n Another short article of Jerome's, apparently required to be Stanley (N. & P. 95 note), as relating likewise to En-mishpat, should seem to mean something wholly different, namely, the well of Isaac and Abimelech in Gezer: φραγμὸς κρίσεως εἰς τὰν εἰς τον θόρυβον βορείως (πρὸς δοξολογίαν καλοδομην τῇ Γεζερ). There is a remarkable interpolation in the LXX., or (as seems less probable) omission in the present Heb. text of Num. xxxii. 35, where, in following the various stages of the march, we find respectively so follows.

Thus far there seems no reasonable doubt of the identity of this Kadesli with that of Genesis. Again, in Num. xx., we find the people encamped in Kadesli after reaching the wilderness of Zin. For the question whether this was a second visit (supposing the Kadesli identical with that of the spies), or a continued occupancy, see Wilderness of Wandering. The mention of the wilderneses of Zin and Paran, is in favor of the identity of this place with that of Num. xiii. The reasons which seem to have fostered a contrary opinion are the absence of water (ver. 2) and the position assigned—"in the uttermost of the border" of Edom. Yet the murmuring seems to have arisen, or to have been more intense on account of their having encamped there in the expectation of finding water: which affords again a presumption of identity. Further, "the wilderness of Zin along by the coast of Edom" (Num. xxxiv. 3; Josh. xvi.) destroys any presumption to the contrary arising from that position. Jerome clearly knows but of one and the same Kadesli—"where Moses smote the rock," where "Miriam's monument," he says, "was still shown, and where Chedorlaomer smote the rulers of Amalek." It is true Jerome gives a distinct article on Kodepsi, ἕνα ἡ πηγή τῆς κρίσεως, i.e. En-mishpat, but only perhaps in order to record the fountain as a distinct local fact. The apparent ambiguity of the position, first, in the wilderness of Paran, or in Paran; and secondly in that of Zin, is no real increase to the difficulty. For whether these tracts were contiguous, and Kadesli on their common border, or ran into each other, and embraced a common territory, to which the name "Kadesli," in an extended sense, might be given, is comparatively unimportant. It may, however, be observed, that the wilderness of Paran commences, Num. x. 12, where that of Sinai ends, and that it extends to the point, whence in ch. xiii. the spies set out, though the only positive identification of Kadesli with it is that in xiii. 26, when on their return to rejoin Moses they come "to the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesli." Parah then was evidently the general name of the great tract south of Palestine, commencing soon after Sinai, as the people advanced northwards—that perhaps now known as the desert et-Tih. Hence, when the spies are returning southerly they return to Kadesli, viewed as in the wilderness of Paran; though, in the same chapter, when starting northwards on their journey, they commence from that of Zin. It seems almost to follow that the wilderness of Zin must have overlapped that of Paran on the north side: or must, if they were parallel and lay respectively east and west, have had a further extension northwards than this latter. In the designation of the southern border of the Israelites also, it is observable that the wilderness of Zin is mentioned as a limit, but nowhere that of Paran (Num. xxxiv. 3, Josh. vi. 1), unless the dwelling

HEBREWS

καὶ εἰς τὴν καταγωγήν οἴκων ἐν τῇ εἰς τὸν οἰκήμα τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸν οἰκήμα τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸν οἰκήμα τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸν οἰκήμα τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸν οἰκήμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

GREEK

καὶ εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων εἰς τὴν καταγωγὴν οἴκων.
of Ismael "in the wilderness of Paran" (Gen. xxi. 21) indicates that, on the western portion of the southern border, which the story of Hagar indicates as his dwelling-place, the Paran nomenclature prevailed.

If it be allowed, in the dearth of positive testimony, to follow great natural boundaries in suggesting the limits of these adjacent or perhaps overlapping wildernesses, it will be seen, on reference to Kiepert's map (ib. in Robinson, vol. i, see also Russegger's map of the same region), that the Arabah itself and the plateau westward of it are, when we leave out the commonly so-called Sidonitic peninsula (here considered as corresponding in its wider or northerly portion to "the wilderness of Sinai"), the two parts of the whole region most strongly partitioned off from and contrasted with one another. On this western plateau is indeed superimposed another, no less clearly marked out, to judge from the map, as distinct from the former as this from the Arabah; but this higher ground, it will be further seen, probably corresponds with the mountain of the Amorites. The Arabah, and its limiting barrier of high ground on the western side, differ by about 400 to 900 feet in elevation at the part where Robinson, advancing from Petra towards Hebron, ascended that barrier by the pass el-Khârâr. At the N. W. angle of the Arabah the regularity of this barrier is much broken by the great wadies which converge thither; but from its edge at el-Khârâr the great floor stretches westward, with no great interruption of elevation, if we omit the superimposed plateau, to the Egyptian frontier, and northward to Rhinocoula and Gaza. Speaking of it apparently from the point of view at el-Khârâr, Robinson (ii. 585, 587) says it is "not exactly a table-land, but a higher tract of country, forming the first of the several steps or offsets into which the ascent of the mountains in this part is divided."

It is now known as the wilderness et-Tih. A general description of it occurs in Robinson (i. 261, 262), together with a mention of the several travellers who had then per per the visited it. Its configuration is given, ib. 294. If this et-Tih region represents the wilderness of Paran, then the Arabah itself, including all the low ground at the southern and southwestern extremity of the Dead Sea, may stand for the wilderness of Zin. The superimposed plateau has an eastern border converging, towards the north, with that of the general elevated tract on which it stands, i.e. with the western barrier aforesaid of the Arabah, but losing towards its higher or northern extremity its elevation and preciseness, in proportion as the general tract on which it stands appears to rise, till, near the S. W. curve of the Dead Sea, the higher plateau and the general tract appear to blend. The convergence in question arises from the general tract having, on its eastern side, i.e. where it is to the Arabah a western limit, a barrier running more nearly N. and S. than that of the superimposed plateau, which runs about E. N. E. and W. S. W. This highest of the two steps on which this terrace stands is described by Williams (Holy City, i. 463, 464), who approached it from Hebron — the opposite direction to that in which Robinson, mounting towards Hebron by the higher pass es-Sâfâh, came upon it — as "a gigantic natural rampart of lofty mountains, which we could distinctly trace for many miles E. and W. of the spot on which we stood, whose precipitous promontories of naked rock, forming as it were bastions of Cyclopean masonry, were covered with irregular masses from the mountain-barrier into the southern wilderness, a confused chaos of chalk."

Below the traveller lay the Wady Murreeh, running into that called el-Fîrekh, identifying the spot with that described by Robinson (ii. 587) as "a formidable barrier supporting a third plateau" (reckoning apparently the Arabah as one), rising on the other, i.e. northern side of the Wady el-Fîrekheh. But the southern face of this highest plateau is still more strongly defined wall of mountains. The Israelites must probably have faced it, or wandered along it, at some period of their advance from the wilderness of Sinai to the more northern desert of Paran. There is no such boldly-marked line of cliffs north of the et-Tih and el-Ubâneh ranges, except perhaps Mount Seir, the eastern limit of the Arabah, or 400 or more feet, as in Deut. i. 7, 19, 20, "the mountain of the Amorites," which, besides those of Seir and Hor, is the only one mentioned by name after Sinai, and which is there closely connected with Kadesh Barnea. The wilderness (that of Paran) "great and terrible," which they passed through after quitting Horeb (vv. 6, 7, 19), was "by the way of" this "mountain of the Amorites." "We came," says Moses, "to Kadesh Barnea: and I said unto you, ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites." Also in ver. 7, the adjacent territories of this mountain-region seem not obscurely intimated; we have the Sefehelh ("plain") and the Arabah ("vale"), with the "hills" ("hill-country of Judah") between them; and "the South" is added as that debatable outlying region, in which the wilderness strives with the inroads of life and culture. There is no natural feature to correspond so well to this mountain of the Amorites as this smaller higher plateau superimposed on et-Tih, forming the watershed of the two great systems of wadies, those north-westward towards the great Wady el-Arish, and those northeastward towards the Wady Jerâfelh and the great Wady el-Jebel. Indeed, in these converging wady-systems on either side of the "mountain," we have a desert-continuation of the same configuration of country, which the Sefehelh and Arabah with their interposed water-shedding highlands present further north. And even as the name Arabah is plainly continued from the Jordan Valley, so as to mean the great arid trough between the Dead Sea and Edath; so perhaps the Sefehelh ("vale") might naturally be viewed as continued to the *river of Egypt." And thus the "mountain of the Amorites" would merely continue the mountain-mass of Judah and Ephraim, as forming part of the land which the Lord our God doth give unto us." The southwestern angle of this higher plateau, is well defined by the bluff peak of Jebel "Arâfîj, standing in about 30° 22' N., by 34° 30'

---

a Called, at least throughout a portion of its course, Jebel el-Bayânah.
b There are three nearly parallel passes leading to the same level: this is the middle one of the three. Schubert (Res. ii. 441-4) appears to have taken the same path; certainly that on the W. side, el-Temen.
KADeSH

E. Assuming the region from Wady Feiran to the Jebel Moum, as a general basis for the position of Horeb, nothing farther south than this Jebel 'Arar,1 appears to give the necessary distance from it for Kadesh, nor would any point on the west side of the western face of this mountain region suit, until we get quite high up towards Beer-sheba. No, the evidence was not to be gained by the last direction here given, is it easy to account for the way of Mount Seir,2 being mentioned as it is, Deut. i. 2, apparently as the customary route from Horeb. But if, as further reasons will suggest, Kadesh lay probably near the S. W. curve of the Dead Sea, then Mount Seir3 will be within sight on the E. during all the latter part of the journey from Horeb. This mountain region is in Kiepert's map laid down as the territory of the Asirimah, but is said to be so wild and rugged that the Bedouins of all other tribes avoid it, nor has any road ever traversed it (Robinson, i. 186). Across this then there was no pass; the choice of routes lay between the road which, leading from Elath to Gaza and the Shefeleh, passes to the west of it, and that which ascends from the northern extremity of the Arabah by the Mt. 'Akedh Akrabbin towards Mount Horeb. But the reason given that the Israelites took this latter course are, that if they had taken the western, Beer-sheba would seem to have been the most natural route of their first attempted attack (Robinson, i. 187). It would also have brought them, not so near to the land of the Philistines, which it seems to have been the Divine purpose that they should avoid. But above all, the features of the country, scantily as they are noticed in Num., are in favor of the eastern route from the Arabah and Dead Sea.

One site fixed on for Kadesh is the 'Ain es-Shek-âbeh on the south side of this "mountain of the Amorites," and therefore too near Horeb to fulfill the conditions of Deut. i. 2. Messrs. Rawlonds and Williams ('Holy City, i. 463-68) argue strongly in favor of a site for Kadesh on the west side of this whole mountain region, towards Jebel Hebel, where they found "a large single mass of solid rock, a spur of the mountain to the north of it, immediately rising above it, the only visible naked rock in the whole district." They found salient water rushing from this rock into a basin, but soon losing itself in the sand, and a grand space for the encampment of a host on the S. W. side of it. In favor of it they allege, (1) the name Kidês or Kados, pronounced in English Kudsâ or Kudês, as being exactly the form of the Hebrew name Kadesh; (2) the position, in the line of the southern boundary of Judah; (3) the correspondence with the order of the places mentioned, especially the places Ahdar and Azmon, which these travellers recognize in Aidhirat and Aseirâh, otherwise (as in Kiepert's map) Aidhirat and Aseirâh; (4) its position with regard to Jebel el-Hus, or Jebel Hebel; (5) its position with regard to the mountain to the east, the "mountain of the Amorites" (which they seem to identify with the western face of the plateau); (6) its situation with regard to the grand S. W. route to Palestine by Beer-lahai-roi from Egypt; (7) its distance from Sinai, and the goodness of the way thither; (8) the accessibility of Mount Hor from this region. Of these, 2, 4, 5, and 8, seem of no weight; (1) is a good deal weakened by the fact that some such name seems to have a wide range in this region; 3 is of considerable force, but seems overbalanced by the fact that the whole position seems too far west; arguments 6 and 7 rather tend against than for the view in question, any western route being unlikely (see text above), and the "goodness" of the road not being discoverable, but rather the reverse, from the Mosaic record. But, above all, how would this accord with the "way of the Amorites" being that from Sinai to Kadesh Barnea? (Deut. i. 2).

In the map to Robinson's last edition, a Jebel el-Kudeis is given on the authority of Abeken. But this spot would be too far to the west for the fixed point intended in Deut. i. 2 as Kadesh Barnea. Still, taken in connection with the region endeavored to be identified with "mountain of the Amorites," it may be a general testimony to the prevalence of the name Kadesh within certain limits; but it is further supported by the names given below.

The indications of locality strongly point to a site near where the mountain of the Amorites descends to the low region of the Arabah and Dead Sea. Tell Arad is perhaps as clear a local monument of the event of Num. xxi. 1, as we can expect to find. 〔A-R-A-D.] "The Canaanish king of Arad" found that Israel was coming "by the way of the spies," and "fought against," and "took some of them prisoners." The subsequent defeat of this king is clearly connected with the pass es-Sâfît, between which and the Tell Arad a line drawn ought to give us the direction of route intended by "the way of the spies;" accordingly, within a day's journey on either side of this line produced towards the Arabah, Kadesh-Barnea should be sought for. 〔H-O-H-M-I-N.] Nearly the same ground appears to have been the scene of the previous discomfiture of the Israelites rebelliously attempting to force their way by this pass to occupy the "mountain" where the Amalekites and Amorites were "before them" (Num. xiv. 45; Judg. i. 17); further, however, this defeat is said to have been "in Seir" (Deut. i. 44). Now, whether we admit or not with Monck (8. p. 94 note) that Falam had at this period no territory west of the Arabah, which is perhaps doubtful, yet there can be no room for doubt that "the mountain of the Amorites" must at any rate be taken as their western limit. Hence the overthrew in Seir must be cast of that mountain, or, at furthest, on its eastern edge. The "Seir" alluded to may be the western edge of the Arabah below the es-Šâfît pass. When thus driven back, they "walked in Kadesh many days" (Deut. i. 46). The city, whether we prefer Kadesh simply, or Kadesh-Barnea, as its designation, cannot have belonged to the Amorites, name for the well-known hill Madâr, or Madârah, lying within view of the point described above, from Wady Hebel. 〔H-O-H-M-I-N.] This is towards the east, a good deal nearer the Dead Sea, and so far more suitable. Further, Robertson's map in Stewart's The Tent and the Khan places an 'Ain Khânâr near the junction of the Wady Awd with the Wady el-Arish; but in this map are taken in some confusion in the drawing.

---

1 What is more disputable than the S. boundary line? Jebel Hebel derives its sole significance from a passage not specified in Jeremiah, or the "mountain of the Amorites," as shown above, need not be that western face. Mt. Hezor is accessible from elsewhere.

2 Seezen's last map shows a Wady Kidês corre-

sponding in position nearly with Jebel el-Kederâse given in Kiepert's, on the authority of Abeken. Zimmer-

mann's Atlas, sect. x., gives el-Gafriân as another
for these after their victory would probably have disputed possession of it; nor could it, if plainly Amoritical, have been "in the uttermost of the border" of Edom. It may be conjectured that it lay in the debatable ground between the Amorites and Edom, which the Israelites in a message of courtesy to Edom might naturally assign to the latter, and that it was possibly then occupied in fact by neither, but by a remnant of those Horites whom Edom (Deut. ii. 12) dislodged from the "mount" Seir, but who remained as refugees in that arid and unenviable region, which perhaps was the sole remnant of their previous possession, and which they still called by the name of "Seir," their patriarch. This would not be inconsistent with "the edge of the land of Edom" still being at Mount Hor (Num. xxxviii. 37), nor with the Israelites regarding this debatable ground, after disposing the Amorites from "their mountain," as pertaining to their own "south quarter." If this view be admissible, we might regard it "Ararim," as a Hebraized remnant of the Horite language, or of some Horite name.

The nearest approximation, then, which can be given to a site for the city of Kadesh, may be probably attained by drawing a circle, from the pass es-Sa'af, at the radius of about a day's journey; its southwestern quadrant will intersect the "wilderness of Paran," or el-Twain, which is there overhung by the superimposed plateau of the mountain of the Amorites; while its southeastern one will cross what has been designated as the "wilderness of Zin." This seems to satisfy all the conditions of the passages of Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, which refer to it. The nearest site in harmony with this view, which has yet been suggested (Robinson, ii. 175), is undoubtedly the 'Alm el-Wadib. To this, however, is opposed the remark of a traveller (Stanley, S. O. P. p. 96) who went probably with a deliberate intention of testing the local features in reference to this suggestion, that it does not afford among its "stony shelves of three or four feet high" any proper "cliff" (סֵפֶר), such as is the word specially describing that "rock" (A. V.) from which the water gushed. It is however nearly opposite the Wady Ghawar, the great opening into the steep eastern wall of the Arabah, and therefore the possible "path" by which to "pass through the border" of Edom. But until further examination of local features has been made, which owing to the frightfully desolate character of the region seems very difficult, it would be unwise to push identification further.

Notice is due to the attempt to discover Kadesh in Petra, the metropolis of the Nabataeans (Stanley, S. O. P. p. 94), embedded in the mountains to which the name of Mount Seir is submitted by all authorities to appear, and almost overhanging Mount Hor. No doubt the word סֵפֶר, "cliff," is used as a proper name occasionally, and may probably in 2 K. xiv. 7; Is. xvi. 1, be identified with a city or spot of territory belonging to Edom. But the two sites of Petra and Mount Hor are surely far too close for each to be a distinct camping station, as in Num. xxxiii. 36, 37. The camp of Israel would have probably covered the site of the city, the mountain, and several adjacent valleys. But, further, the site of Petra must have been as thoroughly Edomitish territory as was that of Bozrah, the then capital, and could not be described as being "in the uttermost" of their border. "Mount Seir" was "given to Esau for a possession," in which he was to be unmolested, and not a foot's breadth of his land was to be taken. This seems irreconcilable with the quiet encampment of the whole of Israel and permanency there for "many days," as also with their subsequent territorial possession of it, for Kadesh is always reckoned as a town in the southern border belonging to Israel. Neither does a friendly request to be allowed to pass through the land of Edom come suitably from an invader who had seized, and was occupying one of its most difficult passes; nor, again, is the evident temper of the Edomites and their precautions, if they contemplated, as they certainly did, armed resistance to the violation of their territory, consistent with that invader being allowed to settle himself by anticipation in such a position without a stand being made against him. But, lastly, the conjunction of the city Kadesh with "the mountain of the Amorites," and its connection with the assault repulsed by the Amalekites and Canaanites (Deut. i. 44, Num. xiv. 45), points to a site wholly away from Mount Seir.

A paper in the Journal of Sacred Literature, April, 1860, entitled A Critical Enquiry into the Route of the Exodus, discards all the received sites for Sina, even that of Mount Hor, and fixes on Elusa (el-Kades) as that of Kadesh. The arguments of this writer will be considered, as a whole, under WILDERNESS OF WANDERING.

Kadesh appears to have maintained itself, at least as late as the days of the prophet Ezekiel (l. c) and those of the writer of the apocryphal book of Judith (i. 9 [A. V. Kades]). The "wilderness of Kades" occurs only in l. xxi. 8, and is probably undistinguishable from that of Zin. As regards the name "Kadesh," there seems some doubt whether it is originally Hebrew.

\[\textit{a} \text{ Fürst has suggested } \text{סֵפֶר, son of wonder}, \text{ = Beelzeb;} \text{ but } \text{סֵפֶר does not occur as } ^{\text{son}} \text{.}\]

\[\text{in the writings of Moses. The reading of the LXX. in Num. xxxiv. 4, Kâdes tōr Bāqer, seems to favor the notion that it was regarded by them as a man's name. The name } \text{Meribah} \text{ is accounted for in Num. xx. 13. [MERRIM.] [Simonis as cited by Gesenius regards } \text{סֵפֶר as from } \text{סֵפֶר, open country, and סֵפֶר, wondering, r. סֵפֶר. - n.}\]

\[\text{b It may be perhaps a Horite word, corrupted so as to bear a significance in the Hebrew and Arab.; but, assuming it to be from the root meaning } ^{\text{holiness}}, \text{ which exists in various forms in the Heb. and Arab., there may be some connection between that name, supposed to indicate a shrine, and the Es-Mispat = constancy of Judgment. The connection of the prophetical and judicial functions, having for its root the regarding as sacred whatever is authoritative, or the deducing all subordinate authority from the highest, would support this view. Compare also the double functions united in Shiloh and Qadesi. Further, on this supposition, a more forcible sense accrues to the name Kadesh } \text{Meribah} \text{ = "strife" or } ^{\text{contention}}, \text{ being as it were a perversion of Mispat = judgment = a taking it in partem detestatior. For the Heb. and Arab. derivatives from this same root see } \text{Lxx. s. v. } \text{Σάνας, varying in senses of } ^{\text{to be holy}}, \text{ or } ^{\text{to sanctify, as a priest, or to keep holy, as the Sabbath, and (legal) its passive }} \text{also Goit LXX. Arab. Lat. i age. Bat. 1653, s. v. } \text{Σάνας. The derived sense, } \text{Σάνας, a male}\]
Almost any probable situation for Kadesh on the grounds of the Scriptural narrative is equally opposed to the impression derived from the aspect of the region thereabouts. No spot, perhaps, in the locality above indicated, could now be an eligible site for the host of the Israelites "for many days," Jerome speaks of it as a "desert" in his day, and makes no allusion to any city there, although the tomb of Miriam, of which no modern traveller has found any vestige, had there its traditional site. It is possible that the great volume of water which in the rainy season swamps by the great El Jezel and other wadis into the S. W. corner of the Ghor, might, if duly husbanded, have once created an artificial oasis, of which, with the neglect of such industry, every trace has since been lost. But, as no attempt is made here to fix on a definite site for Kadesh as a city, it is enough to observe that the objection applies in nearly equal force to nearly all solutions of the question of which the Scriptural narrative admits.

KADMIEL (כדמיל) [who stands before God, i.e. his servant]: KADEMIAH; [in Neh. vii. 43, Vat. KADMBHA; MS. Caballal], one of the Levites who with his family returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, and was probably a representative of the descendants of Hodaiah, or, as he is elsewhere called, Hodecah or Judah (Ezr. ii. 40; Neh. vii. 43). In the first attempt which was made to rebuild the Temple, Kadnemil and Joshua, probably an elder member of the same house, were, together with their families, appointed by Zerubbabel to superintend the workmen, and officiate in the thanksgiving-service by which the laying of the foundation was solemnized (Ezr. iii. 9). His house took a prominent part in the confession of the people on the day of humiliation (Neh. ix. 4, 5), and with the other Levites joined the princes and priests in a solemn compact to separate themselves to walk in God's law (Neh. x. 9). In the parallel lists of 1 Esdr. he is called KADMIEL.

KADMONITES, THE (כדמוני, i.e. "the Kadmonite" [hetheler in the east]: חדמנים; Alex. omits: Cudmannus, a people named in Gen. xv. 19 only; one of the nations who at that time occupied the land promised to the descendants of Abram. The name is from a root קדמ, signifying "eastern," and also "ancient." (Gen. Thes. p. 1195).

Beccart (Chan. i. 19; Pohl, iv. 36) derives the Kadmonites from Cadmus, and further identifies them with the Hivites (whose place they fill in the above list of nations), on the ground that the Hivites occupied Mount Hermon, "the most easterly part of Canaan." But Hermon cannot be said to be on the east of Canaan, not, if it were, did the Hivites live there so exclusively as to entitle them to an appellation derived from that circumstance (see vol. ii. p. 1082). It is more probable that the name Kadmonite in its one occurrence is a synonym for the Bnai Kedem — the "children [sons] of the East," the general name which in the Bible appears to be given to the tribes which roved in the great waste tracts on the east and southeast of Palestine.

G.

The Kadmonites even at Jerom might be said to be on the east as compared e. g. with the Zidonians on the west, "he said, "as the sun," says Thacker- son, "is still preserved among the Nusairiyeh north of Tripoli, and they have a tradition that their ancestors were expelled from Palestine by Joshua. It is curious also that a fragment of this strange people still cling to their original home at 'Ain Fit, Zorah, and Gibeah, near the foot of Hermon. I have repeatedly travelled among them in their own mountains, and many things in their physiognomy and manners gave me the idea that they were a remnant of the most ancient inhabitants of this country " (Loud & Buck, i. 242).

KAL-LAI [2 syl.] ( calves, swine of one, one): KALAI; [Vat. Alex. F. omits: F. 8 ΧΑΛΛΑΙ (èrò)]: a priest in the days of Joakim the son of Joshua. He was one of the chiefs of the fathers, and represented the family of Salsib (Neh. xii. 20).

KANAH (קנה) [place or place of reeds]: Kana'; Alex. KANA: Cuma, one of the places which formed the landmarks of the boundary of Asher: apparently next to Zidon-rabhab, or "great Zidon" (Josh. xix. 28 only). If this inference is correct, then Kanah can hardly be identified in the modern village Kana', six miles inland, not from Zidon, but from Tyre, nearly 20 miles south thereof. The identification, first proposed by Robinson (Bibl. Res. ii. 456), has been generally accepted by scholars (Wilson, Loud, ii. 238; Porter, Handbook, 365; Schwarz, 192; Van de Velde, i. 180). Van de Velde (i. 209) also treats it as the native place of the "woman of Canaan" (גנה כנענית) who cried after our Lord. But the former identification, not to speak of the latter — in which a connection is assumed between two words radically different — seems untenable. An "Abi Kana" is marked on the map of Van de Velde, about 8 miles S. E. of Sidon (Zidon), close to the conspicuous village Jarjir, at which latter place Zidon lies full in view (Van de Velde, i. 437). This at least answers more nearly the requirements of the text. But it is put forward as a mere conjecture, and must abide further investigation.

G.

That the village of אָלָּא mentioned by Robinson (Bibl. Res. ii. 456) and generally accepted by travelers, is the one referred to in Josh. xix. 28 seems probable for various reasons. Assuming BETEN (which see) to have been, as Eusebius claims, eight miles east of Ptolemais, we must take our point of departure in giving the boundaries of Asher (Josh. xix. 25) a little south of Achzib, or Edlipa, the sitewhich of which may be laid down with certainty. Passing by Helkath and Hali, the site of which is lost, we come to Beten on the road southward toward Carmel. That Beten by inland might be imagined, inasmuch as the Asherites did not drive not the inhabitants of the sea-coast from Arzib to Archi (Alkev). The border then passed
KANAAN, THE RIVER southward to Achshaph, which is probably Hlaphi',  חלפיא, of the present day (see Achshaph). Passing by Abonamlick (cf. Wady el-Melkh north of Carmel) and Anam and Mishech, two unknown sites, we come to Carmel. This fixes the direction of the route by which the border is designated. From this point the border turns eastward, and at its juncture with the lot of Zebahun its direction plainly turns northward, and passing places identified with a degree of probability, it reaches Kana, and the border of the great Zidon. Now it is objected that Tyre is much nearer this Kana than Zidon. But it must be remembered that at this early period Zidon was probably greater than Tyre, and that the inhabitants of Tyre are themselves called Zidonians. It may have been, that at that period the territory of Zidon extended nearer to Kana than it did in later times when Tyrian power had interfered between it and Zidon. In any case, the eastern border is simply said to have extended from Kana even unto great Zidon.

This does not make it necessary that the city walls should be understood, which supposition would be forbidden by the historical fact that the territory of Zidon remained unoccupied; and whether we suppose that the territory of Asher stretched to the northward of the parallel of Tyre, toward Zidon, or not, in either case it is inadmissible to extend it to the city gates, just as it is inadmissible to extend it (ver. 29) to the gates of Tyre itself. The existence of the name Kanaan, unchanged by centuries, in a spot having so many chains for recognition as the one intended (Josh. xix. 28), must fix the identification with a reasonable degree of certainty, and forestall the attempt to establish the site at the obscure ' Ain Kanana near Jerjew, S. E. of Sakhita.

Van de Velde's attempt (i. 292) to establish this site as the place of birth of the "woman of Canaan" is to be rejected on philological grounds. Kanaanah is derived from Kanaan, not from Kana. Furthermore, for Kanaanah (Matt. xv. 22), Mark (vii. 26) has Σωτόφοινα, designating race and nationality, not place of birth or residence. It would have been possible for a Jewess to have resided in Kana or be born there, but the Evangelist wishes to designate this woman as not a Jewess, but a foreigner, a Canaanita. G. E. P.

KANA'A, THE RIVER (קנאה; קנה) the torrent or wady K.: Χαλααα, φάραγγι Καραά; Alex. χαλαάα γᾶ κανα και φαραγγί καραα; Vullis arwordeliteli, a stream falling into the Mediterranean, which formed the division between the territories of Ephraim and Manasseh, the former on the south, the latter on the north (Josh. xvi. 8, xvii. 9). No light appears to be thrown on its situation by the Ancient Versions or the Onomasticon. Dr. Robinson (iii. 135) identifies it "without doubt" with a wady, which taking its rise in the central mountains of Ephraim, near Akrobot, some 7 miles S. E. of Nobbha, crosses the country and enters the sea just above Jaffa as Nahar el-Ajjech, bearing part of its course the name of Wady Kannah. But this, though perhaps sufficiently important to serve as a boundary between two tribes, and though the retention of the name is in its favor, is surely too far south to have been the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh. The conjecture of Schwarz (51) is more plausible—that it is a wady which approaches west of and close to Nobbha, at ' Ain el-

KANAH, and falls into the sea as Na'ar Faleh, and which bears also the name of Wady al-Khasah— the reedy stream. This has its more northerly position in its favor, and also the agreement in signification of the names (Kanah meaning also reedy). But if it should not be forgotten that the name Khashah is borne by a large tract of the maritime plain at this part (Stanley, S. & P. 290) Porter pronounces for N. Akhlab, close below Cesarea.

G.

K AP E R on C A P E R (from κάτωπαρι and in Lat. caputari). Many suppose this fruit or plant, to be meant in Eccles. xii. 5 by θηρίον το αυτον, "the caper," instead of "desire" (A. V.). The word occurs only in that passage. The meaning then is that, as one of the signs and effects of old age, the caper (acconsemed to be eaten for its stimulating properties) shall at length lose its power to excite the appetite of the aged or restore to them their last vigor. The article in the Hebrew (as above) and the verb's semi-figurative sense (θηρίον, "shall break" sc. its compact or promise) favor this explanation. Celsius (Hierob. i. 209 ff.) mentions some of the authorities in support of this view. Prof. Stuart adopts it. (Commentary on Ecclesiastes, p. 327 f.)

KARA'A (קאראא; Kaper; Coree), the father of Johann and Jonathan, who supported Gedaliah's authority and avenged his murder (Jer. xi. 8, 13, 15, 16, xii. 11, 13, 14, 16, xiii. 1, 8, xilii. 2, 4, 5). He is elsewhere called CAREA.

KARKA'A (with the def. article, כרה; כארא; כארא) [bottom, foundation]: Καρας, in both MSS.; Synn. translating, Καρας: Corov; one of the landmarks on the south boundary of the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 3), and therefore of the Holy Land itself. It lay between Adhar and Azmon, Azmon being the next point to the Mediterranean (Wady el-Arish). Karka, however, is not found in the specification of the boundary in Numb. xxiv., and it is worth notice that while in Joshua the line is said to make a detour (כרה צור) to Karka, in Numbers it runs to Azmon. Nor does the name occur in the subsequent lists of the southern cities in Josh. xv. 21-32, or xix. 2-8, or in Neh. xi. 25, 46. Eusebius (Onomasticon, Ακαραε) perhaps speaks of it as then existing (καραε εστιν), but at any rate no subsequent traveller or geographer appears to have mentioned it.

KARKOR (with the def. article, כרה or כרה; כארו; כארו) foundation, Ges.; or perh. flat and soft ground, Distr.): Kapeda: Alex. Kapera: Vulg. translating, requiescensbot), the place in which the remnant of the host of Zebah and Zalmunna which had escaped
the rear of the Jordan Valley were encamped, when Gideon burst upon and again dispersed them (Judg. viii. 10). It must have been on the east of the Jordan, beyond the district of the towns, in the open wastes inhabited by the nomadic tribes — "the land that dwelt on the east of Nohab and Juezhebah" (ver. 11). But it is difficult to believe that it can have been so far to the south as it is placed by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. Capch and "Carech"), namely one day's journey (about 15 miles) north of Petra, where in their time stood the fortress of Caracara, as in ours the Fastle of Kirc ch-Shebek (Durellanit, 19 Aug. 1858). The scene is somewhat similar to that of Characa, or Charcha, a place on the east of the Jordan, mentioned once in the Macabean history; but there is nothing to be said either for or against the identification of the two.

If Kamar be KENATH, on which Nohab bestowed his own name (with the usual fate of such innovations in Palestine), then we should look for Karthar in the desert to the east of that place; which is quite far enough from the Jordan Valley, the scene of the first encounter, to justify Josephus's expression, παρα σας τολα (Ant. vii. 6, § 5), and the careless "security" of the Midianites. But no traces of such a name have yet been discovered in that direction, or any other than that above mentioned.

KARTAH (קַרְתָּה. 8.21. [city]; בַּקָּדָשָׁה: Alex. קַפָּה: Carthah), a town of Zebulun, which with its "suburbs" was allotted to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi. 34). It is not mentioned either in the general list of the towns of this tribe (xix. 10-16), or in the parallel catalogue of Levitical cities in 1 Chr. vi. nor does it appear to have been recognized since.

* Van de Velde inserts a Tell Kircbing on his Map of Palestine, in the plain a little inland from Kafaij. He speaks of this as probably the Karthah of Josh. xxii. 34. An ancient null and numerous old building stones mark the site. (Syv. of Pal. i. 293.)

KARTAN (קַרְתָּן. 21.21. [double city]; קַפָּה: Alex. Karpiai; [Comp. Ab. קַפָּה: Carthah], a city of Naphtali, allotted with its "suburbs" to the Gershonite Levites (Josh. xxii. 32). In the parallel list of 1 Chr. vi. the name appears in the more usual form of KERTATHAM (ver. 74), of which Kartan may be either a provincialism or a contraction. A similar change is observable in Dothan and Dothaim. The LXX. evidently had a different Hebrew text from the present.

KATTATH (קַתָּתָה. small or young); Karet: Alex. Kartath: Cethath), one of the cities of the tribe of Zebulun (Josh. xix. 15). It is not mentioned in the Onomasticon. Schwartz (172) reports that in the Jerusalem Me'garoth, Kattath "is said to be the modern Kattim," which he seeks to identify with Kama Lark, — most probably the Gena of Galilee of the N. T., 5 miles north of Scythopolis, partly on the ground that Gena is given in the Syriac as Kattah, and partly for other but not very palpable reasons.

KEQAR (קֶקֵר), black skin, black shaven man, Gen.: קַקְרָדָה: Kedar), the second in order of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 13: 1 Chr. ii. 29), and the name of a great tribe of the Arabs, settled on the northwest of the peninsula and the confines of Palestine. This tribe seems to have been, with Tena, the chief representative of Ishmael's sons in the western portion of the land they originally peopled. The "glory of Kedar" is recorded by the prophet Isaiah (xviii. 13-17) in the burden upon Arabia; and its importance may also be inferred from the "princes of Kedar," mentioned by Ez. (xxvii. 21), as well as the pastoral character of the tribe: "Arabia, and all the princes of Kedar, who occupied with thee in lands, and rams, and goats, in these be ye they merchants." But this characteristic is maintained in several other remarkable passages. In Cant. i. 5, the black tents of Kedar, black like the goat's or camel's hair tents of the modern Bedawee, are forcibly mentioned, "as [am] black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon." In Is. vi. 7, we find the "flocks of Kedar, together with the rams of Nebaioth; and in Jer. xlix. 21, "concerning Kedar, and concerning the sons of Hazor," it is written, "Arise ye, go up to Kedar, and spoil the men of the Fast [the Dā'awī-Kēdār]. Their tents and their flocks shall they take away: they shall take to themselves their tent-curtais, and all their vessels, and their camels" (28, 29). They appear also to have been, like the wandering tribes of the present day, "archers" and "mighty men" (Is. xxi. 17; comp. Ps. cxxv. 5). They also settled in villages or towns, we find from that magnificent passage of Isaiah (xli. 11), "Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up [their voice], the villages [that] Kedar doth inhabit: let the inhabitants of the rock sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains;"—unless encampments are here intended. But dwelling in more permanent habitations than tents is just what we should expect from a far-stretching tribe such as Kedar certainly was, covering in their pasture-lands and watering places the western desert, settling on the borders of Palestine, and penetrating into the Arabian peninsula, where they were to be the fathers of a great nation. The archers and warriors of these tribes were probably engaged in many of the wars which the "men of the Fast" (of whom Kedar is probably the only settlement, and the most probably a part wagged, in alliance with Midianites and others of the Bene-Kedem, with Israel see M. Camun de Pereval's Ezors, i. 180, 181, on the war of Gideon, etc.). The tribe seems to have been one of the most conspicuous of all the Ishmaelite tribes, and hence the Rabbin call the Arabinians universally by this name.

In Is. xxii. 17, the descendants of Kedar are called the Bene-Kedar. As a link between Bible history and Mohammdan traditions, the tribe of Kedar is probably found in the people called the Cedri or Fliny, on the confines of Arabia Petraea to the south (N. B. v. 11); but they have, since classical times, become merged into the Arab nation, of which so great a part must have sprung from them. In the Mohammdan traditions, Kedar ( وهي) is the ancestor of Mohammed, and through him, although the genealogy is broken for many generations, the neces-
try of the letter from Ishmael is carried. (See Caussin, ibid., i. 175 ff.). The descent of the bulk of the Arabs from Ishmael we have elsewhere shown to rest on indisputable grounds. [Istmael.]

E. S. P.

KEDEMMAH (קֶדֶמָ֣ה, i. e. eastward: Kēdēmāh [Alex. in 1 Chr. Kēdēmu], the youngest of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15; 1 Chr. i. 31).  

KEDE'MOTH (קֶדֶמֹות; in Deut. and Chron. קֶדֶמֹות; in Josh. קֶדֶמֹות [beginnings, origin]): Kēdemoth, Bekevehāth, Ḥēderēm, Ḫēdēmāt; [Vat. in Josh. xiii. Bekevehāth, in 1 Chr. Kēdēma]! Alex. Kēdēmoth, Kēdēmāt, ʿĪdēmāth, Kēdemoth; Gedēmāth, Gedēmoth, Kēdēmāth (Cedemoth, Cēdēmāth [Cedemoth])], one of the towns in the district east of the Dead Sea allotted to the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 18); given with its “suburbs” to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi. 37; 1 Chr. vi. 79); in the former of these passages the name, with the rest of the verses 36 and 37, is omitted from the Rec. Hebrew Text, and from the Vulg. It possibly conferred its name on the “wilderness, or uncultivated pasture land” (Milhîr), of Kedemoth, “in which Israel was encamped when Moses asked permission of Sihon to pass through the country of the Amorites; although, if Kedemoth be treated as a Hebrew word, and translated = East ern,” the same circumstance may have given its name both to the city and the district. And this is more probably the case, since “Aroer on the brink of the torrent Arnon” is mentioned as the extreme (south) limit of Sihon’s kingdom and of the territory of Reuben, and the north limit of Mos. Kedemoth, Jahazah, Hazchon, and other towns, being apparently north of it (Josh. xiii. 16; &c.), while the wilderness of Kedemoth was certainly outside the territory of Sihon (Deut. ii. 26; 27, &c.), and therefore south of the Arnon. This is supported by the terms of Num. xxi. 23, from which it would appear as if Sihon had come out of his territory into the wilderness; although on the other hand, from the fact of Jahaz (or Jahazah) being allotted to Reuben (Num. ii. 23), it seems doubtful whether the towns named in Josh. xiii. 16-21 were all north of Arnon. As in other cases we must await further investigation on the east of the Dead Sea. The place is but casually mentioned in the Omission (—Kedemoth “), but yet so as to imply a distinction between the town and the wilderness. No other Græveller appears to have noticed it. (See Ewald, Gesch. ii. 271.) [DARAH.]

KE'DESH (קדש; the name borne by three cities in the Palestine. 1. (Kādēṣ; Alex. Kēdēṣ; Cēdēs) in the ex-

a Some of the variations in the LXX. are remarkable. In Judg. iv. 3, 10, Vat. has Kēdēs and Alex. Kēdēṣ; but in ver. 11, [and 1 Chr. vi. 70], they both have Kēdēs. In 2 Chr. 29 both have Kēdēṣ. In Judg. iv. and elsewhere, the Peshito Version has Recem-Naphthali for Kedesh, Recem being the name which in the Targums is commonly used to the Southern Kadesh, K. Barnesa. (See Stanley, S. & P. 94 note.)  

b Πρὸς Βορρᾶν πέλας τῆς Γαλαάσας τῆς Ἀαρ. Κεδῆς τοῦ ωτοῦ, J. D. Michaelis (Orient. und Exeg. Bibliothek, 1773, No. 84) argues strenuously for the admitted person of Beroth and Kedes in this passage with Berucy (Berucia) and Kedes, near Tamar (see above); yet interesting and ingenious is as the attempt, the

treme south of Judah (Josh. xv. 23). Whether this is identical with Kadesh-Barnna, which was actually one of the points on the south boundary of the tribe (vii. 3; Num. xxxiv. 4), it is impossible to say. Against the identification is the difference of the name,—hardly likely to be altered if the famous Kadesh was intended, and the occurrence of the name elsewhere showing that it was of common use.

2. (Kēdēṣ; Alex. Kēdēṣ; Cēdēs), a city of Issachar, which according to the catalogue of 1 Chr. vi. was allotted to the Gershonite Levites (ver. 72). In the parallel list (Josh. xxi. 28) the name is Keshon, one of the variations met with in these lists, for which it is impossible satisfactorily to account. The Kedes mentioned among the cities whose kings were slain by Joshua (Josh. xii. 22), in company with Megiddo and Jokneam of Carmel, would seem to have been this city of Issachar, and not, as is commonly accepted, the northern place of the same name in Naphtali, the position of which in the catalogue would naturally have been with Hazor and Shimron-Meron. But this, though probable, is not conclusive.

3. Kedesheh (Kādēṣ, Kādēṣ, Kēdēṣ, Kēdēṣ; Alex. also Kēdēṣ; Cēdēs): also Kedesheh in GALL-LEE (גַּלְלֵי), i.e. “K. in the Galiil:” Ḫādēṣ, etc.) in τῇ Γαλαάσα (Vat.-Alex.; Cēdēs in Gal-lée): and once, Judg. iv. 6, Kedesheh-NAPHTALI (נַפְתַּלִי), one of the fortified cities of the tribe of Naphtali, named between Ha-azor and Edrah (Josh. xix. 37); appointed as a city of refuge, and allotted with its “suburbs” to the Gershonite Levites (xx. 7, xxi. 32; 1 Chr. vi. 76). In Josephus’s account of the northern wars of Joshua (Ant. v. 1, § 18), he apparently refers to it as marking the site of the battle of Merom, if Meron be intended under the form Beroth.” It was the residence of Barak (Judg. iv. 6), and there he and Deborah assembled the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali before the conflict (9, 10). Near it was the tree of Zaanannim, where was pitched the tent of the Kenites Heber and Jaal, in which Sisera met his death (ver. 11). It was probably, as its name implies, a “holy place” of great antiquity, which would explain its selection as one of the cities of refuge, and its being chosen by the prophets as the spot at which to meet the warriors of the tribes before the commencement of the struggle “for Jehovah against the mighty.” It was one of the places taken by Tidhar-Ṭilesar in the reign of Pekah (Jos. Ant. ix. 11, § 1, Kīṭāra: 2 K. xv. 29); and here again it is mentioned in immediate connection with Hazor. Its next and conclusion cannot be tenable. (See also a subsequent paper in 1774, No. 116.)

c From the root קדש, common to the Semitic languages (Gesenius, Theor. 1105, 8). Whether there was any difference of signification between the Southern Kadesh and Kedesh, does not seem at all clear. Gesenius places the former in connection with a similar word which would seem to mean a person or thing devoted to the infamous rites of ancient heathen worship—“Σαρκαρίων, ταυρόμενον, ταύρον ταυροῦν. " But he does not absolutely say that the false god resided in the name of the place Kadesh.” To Kedesh he gives a favorable interpretation — "Sacrarium." The other interpreters, as Hilfer and Simonia do not recognize the distinction.
KEILAH

last appearance in the Bible is as the scene of a battle between Jonathan Maccabaeus and the forces of Demetrius (1 Macc. xi. 63, 73, A. V. Cades; Jos. Ant. xiii. 5, § 6, 7). After this time it is spoken of by Josephus (B. J. ii. 18, § 1; iv. 2, § 3, πάρος Κωδοσσος) as in the possession of the Phoenician king, Xerxes, and well fortified, and with a great number of inhabitants: and he mentions that, during the siege of Giscala, Titus removed his camp thither—a distance of about 7 miles, if the two places are correctly identified—a movement which allowed John to make his escape.

By Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. "Cedes") it is described as lying near Enaaces, and 20 miles from Tyre, and as called Kudossos or Chlisim. Brocadus (Devar. ch. iv.) describes it, evidently from personal knowledge, as 4 leagues north of Safed, and an abounding in ruins. It was visited by the Jewish travellers, Benjamin of Tudela (A. d. 1170) and ha-Parchi (A. d. 1315). The former places it one day's, and the latter half-a-day's, journey from Kanna (Hebrew of Tudela by Asher, i. 82 B. M.), according to a previous imperfect knowledge and errors in transcription, there is a tolerable agreement between the above accounts, recognizable now that Dr. Robinson has with great probability identified the spot. This he has done at Kesh, a village situated on the western edge of the basin of the Ain el-Huleh, the great depressed basin or tract through which the Jordan makes its way into the Sea of Merom. Kedha lies 10 English miles N. of Safed, 4 to the N. W. of the upper part of the Sea of Merom, and 12 or 13 S. of Boniia. The village itself "is situated on a rather high ridge, jutting out from the western hills, and overlooking a small green vale or basin. Is its site a splendid one, well watered and surrounded by fertile plains? There are numerous sarcophagi, and other ancient remains (Rob. iii. 396–408; see also Van de Velde, ii. 417. Spaleni, 365, 368). In the Greek (Κεδεσχ) and Syriac (Keshel di Naphtholi) texts of Tob. i. 2,—though not in the Vulgate or A. V.—Kedesh is introduced as the birthplace of Tobias. This is exceedingly corruptions, but some little support is lent to this reading by the Vulgate, which, although omitting Kedesh, mentions Safed,—"post viam que duxit ad Occidentem, in simulacris et sarcophagis,"—of Tobias, in similitudinem civitatis Sapheth. The name Kedesh exists much farther north than the possessions of Naphtali appear to have extended, attached to a lake of considerable size on the Orontes, a few miles south of Hama, the ancient Emessus (Rob. iii. 549; Thomson, in Ritter, Itiner. Islam., 1002, 1004). The lake was well known under that name to the Arabic geographers (see, besides

the authorities quoted by Robinson, Abu-l-Feda in Schulten's Index Geogr., "Fluvius Orontes" and "Kudomus"), and they connect it in part with Alexander the Great. But this and the origin of the name are alike uncertain. At the lower end of the lake is an island which, as already remarked, is probably the site of Kesheth, the capture of which by Sibele is preserved in the records of the Egyptian king. [Jerusalem, vol. ii. p. 198, note c.]

KEHILATAH (קְהִלָּתָה) [assembly, or congregation]—Macrælia: [Alex. Macræs] (Cethilah), a desert encampment of the Israelites (Num. xxxiii. 22, 23), of which nothing is known. H. H.

KEILAH [3 syl.] (קֵילָה), but in 1 Sam. xiii. 5, [Ketesh, fortress, Sim. Ges.]:—Kideitch, Keilad [Vat. Alex. KICelA [Vat. once Keeilad]—Joseph. Kilia; and the people of Kilaoroi and of Kajatir: Cult: Luth. Keylaf, a city of the Shefelah or lowland district of Judah, named, in company with Cezirah and Mackeyah, in the next group to the Philistine cities (Josh. xv. 44). Its main interest consists in its connection with David. He rescued it from an attack of the Philistines, who had fallen upon the town at the beginning of the harvest (Josh. Ant. vi. 13, § 1), plundered the corn from its threshing-floor, and driven off the cattle (1 Sam. xxiii. 1). The prey was recovered by David (2–5), who then remained in the city till the completion of the building. It was then a fortified place, as with walls, gates, and bars (1 Sam. xxiii. 7, and Joseph.). During this time the massacre of Nob was perpetrated, and Keilah became the repository of the sacred Ephod, which Abiathar the priest, the sole survivor, had carried off with him (ver. 6). But it was not destined long to enjoy the presence of these brave and hallowed inhabitants, nor indeed was it worthy of such good fortune, for the inhabitants soon plotted David's betrayal to Saul, then on his road to besiege the place. Of this intention David was warned by Divine intimation. He therefore left (1 Sam. xxiii. 7–13).

It will be observed that the word Bani is used by David to denote the inhabitants of Keilah, in this passage (vv. 11, 12; A. V. "men"); possibly pointing to the existence of Canaanites in the place (Haim, vol. i. p. 287 n.).

We catch only one more glimpse of the town, in the times after the captivity, when Hashabiah, the ruler of one half the district of Keilah (or whatever the word Pehes, A. V., "part," may mean), and Davai ben-Hemedal, ruler of the other half, assisted Nebuchadnezzar in the repair of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 17, 18). Keilah appears to have been a congregation, with the local suffix ת, which many of these names carry. Compare the name of another place of encampment ת, that appears to be from the same root.

This is said by Gezer-ina and others to be the signification of the name "Keilah." If this be so, there would probably appear to be a reference to this and the contemporary circumstances of David's life, in Ps. xxxiii.; not only in the expression (ver. 21), "marvelous kindness in a strong city" (קֵילָה תַּתָּא), but also in verse 8, and in the general tenor of the Psalm.
KELAIAH

KENEZITE

known to Eusebius and Jerome. They describe it in the Onomasticon as existing under the name Kašd, or Cela, on the road from Eleutheropolis to Hebron, at 8 a miles distance from the former. In the map of Lieut. V. Van de Velde (1858), the name Kila occurs attached to a site with ruins, on the lower road from Beit Jibrin to Hebron, at very nearly the right distance from B. Jibrin (almost certainly Eleutheropolis), and in the neighborhood of Beit Na'd (Neziq) and Mounts (Maresiah). The name was only reported to Lieut. V. (see his Memoir, p. 328), but it has been since visited by the indefatigable Tobler, who completely confirms the identification, merely remarking that Kila is placed a little too far south on the map. Thus another is added to the list of places which, though specified as in the "lowland," are yet actually found in the mountains: a puzzling fact in our present ignorance of the principles of the ancient boundaries. [Litt. Jud. 1: 1490 &c.]

In the 4th century a tradition existed that the prophet Habakkuk was buried at Keila (Onomasticon, = Cela); *Nicaephorus, H. E. xii. 48; Cassiodorus, in Sozomen, H. E. vii. 29); but another tradition gives this honor to Hukkok.

In 1 Chr. iv. 19, "Keila the Garmithe" is mentioned, apparently—though it is impossible to say with certainty—as a descendant of the great Caleb (ver. 15). But the passage is extremely obscure, and there is no apparent connection with the town Keila.

G.

KELAIAH [3 syll.] (כֶּלַּיָּה) [derert]: Koleia; Alex. Koleia; [Vat.] FA. Koleia; Celio = Kelaiah (Ezr. x. 23). In the parallel list of 1 Esdr. his name appears as Colius.

KELITA (כֶּלְיָתָא) [derert]: Koleitas, [Vat. FA.1] Koleio, FA.2 Koleitas; Koleit in Neh, x. 10 (Vat. FA.1 omit); Celio; Celita in Ezr. x. 23), one of the Levites who returned from the Captivity with Ezra, and had intermarried with the people of the land (Ezr. x. 23). In company with the other Levites he assisted Ezra in expounding the law (Neh. viii. 7), and entered into a solemn league and covenant to follow the law of God, and separate from admixture with foreign nations (Neh. x. 10). He is also called Kelaiah, and in the parallel list of 1 Esdr. his name appears as Colitas.

KEMU'EL (כֶּעֶמְעֵל) [assembly of God]: Kaunah(A): Camatia). 1. The son of Nahor by Milcah, and father of Aram, whom Ewah (Gesch, i. 414, note) identifies with Ram of Job xxiii. 2, to whose family Eliphaz belonged (Gen. xxvii. 21). 2. The son of Shiphan, and prince of the tribe of Ephraim; one of the twelve men appointed by Moses to divide the land of Canaan among the tribes (Num. xxxiv. 24).

3. [Vat. Σοροια]. A Levite, father of Hashshah, prince of the tribe in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxvii. 17).

KENAN (כֶּנָּן) [possession]: Cainan; Cainan = Cainan the son of Enos (1 Chr. i. 2), whose name is also correctly given in this form in the margin of Gen. v. 9.

KENATH (כֶּנָּת) [possession]: Kad; Alex. Kavanah; in Chron. both MSS. [rather, Rom. Alex.] Kavanah; [Vat. Kavanah]: Canath, Canathah, one of the cities on the east of Jordan, with its daughter-town (A. V. "village") taken possession of by a certain Nahia, who then called it by his own name (Num. xxxii. 42). At a later period these towns, with those of Jair, were recaptured by Geshur and Aram (1 Chr. ii. 23). In the days of Eusebius (Onom. "Canath") it was still called Kanatha, and he speaks of it as "a village of Araba . . . near Bozra." Its site has been recovered with tolerable certainty in our own times as Kenatha, a ruined town at the southern extremity of the Lejik, about 20 miles N. of Basrah, which was first visited by Burekhardt in 1810 (Syria, 83-86), and more recently by Porter (Onomasticon, ii. 87-115; Howelk. 512-14), the latter of whom gives a lengthened description and identification of the place. The suggestion that Kenatha was Kenath seems, however, to have been first made by Gesenius in his notes to Burekhardt (A. D. 1823, 505). It is another Kenath which is marked on Van de Velde's map, about 10 miles farther to the west.

The name furnishes an interesting example of the permanence of an original appellation. Norah, though conferred by the conqueror, and apparently at one time the received name of the spot (Judg. viii. 11), has long since given way to the older title. Compare Achcho, Kelaiah-Aria, etc.

KENAZ (כֶּנָּצ) [chose, hunting]: Kevef; [Alex. in Judg. i. 13, Kevef; in 1 Chr. i. 36, Kevefs]: Cenez. 1. Son of Eliphaz, the son of Esau. He was one of the dukes of Edom, according to both lists, that in Gen. xxxvi. 15, 42, and that in 1 Chr. i. 36, and the founder of a tribe or family, who were called from him Kenozites (Josh. xiv. 14, etc.). Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, and Othniel, were the two most remarkable of his descendants. [Caleh.]

2. [Kevef (Vat. Kevefsai, Kevefs)]. One of the same family, a grandson of Caleb, according to 1 Chr. iv. [13], where, however, the Hebrew text is corrupt. Another name has possibly fallen out before Kenaz.

A. C. H.

KENZITE (written KEN TzzIITE, A. V. Gen. xv. 19: Keneitos; Kevefios; [Alex. in Josh. xiv. 14, Kevefios]: Cenexizes), an Edomish tribe (Num. xxxix. 12; Josh. xiv. 6, 14). [Kenz.] It is difficult to account for the Kenzites existing as a tribe so early as before the birth of Isacc, as they appear to have done from Gen. xv. 19. If this tribe really existed then, and the enumeration of tribes in ver. 19-21 formed a part of what the Lord said to Abram, it can only be said, with Bochart (Phelog. iv. 36), that these Kenzites are mentioned here only, that they had ceased to exist in the time of Moses and Joshua, and that whatever is known of their origin or place of abode. But it is worth consideration whether the enumeration may not be a later explanatory addition by Moses or some later editor, and so these Kenzites be descendants of Kenaz, whose adoption should be, "And Geshur and Aram took the Havoth-Jalir, with Kenath and her daughters, sixty cities. [See Bertheau, Chronic: Zuna's version; Targum of Joseph, etc., etc.]
into Israel took place in the time of Caleb, which
was the reason of their insertion in this place.

A. C. H.

KERNITE, THE, and KENITES, THE
(ךֵֻלְוַי) and (ךַּפְּלִי), i.e. "the Kenite," in Chron.
מַעְרָב; but in Num. xxiv. 22, and in Judg. iv.
11 b, נַעֲב. קִין: או קֵּיתָא, או קַקָּיוֹן
Keri-וֹן, או קְרָיוֹן [Ket. Vat. Ker.; and so commonly
Alex.]; [1 Sam. xvii. 10, xxx. 29, קָרֵיַא (Ker.),
Vat. כָּרֵיַא, or כַּרַיַא; Alex. כַּרַיַא, or כָּרַיַא;
כַּרְיַא כְּרַיַא; Jer. כַּרְיַא כְּרַיַא; כְּרַיַא], a tribe or nation whose history is
strangely interwoven with that of the chosen people.
In the genealogical table of Gen. x. 13, the Kenites
are not mentioned. The first mention of them is in company
with the Kenizzites and Kadmonites, in the list of the
peoples that then occupied the Promised Land
(Gen. xv. 19). Their origin, therefore, like that
of the two tribes just named, and of the Avvim
(Avites), is hidden from us. But we may fairly infer
that they were a branch of the larger nation of
Midian — from the fact that Jethro, the elder
of Moses's wife, who in the records of Moses
(see ii. 15, 16, iv. 19, &c.) is represented as dwelling
in the land of Midian, and as prince or priest of that
nation, is in the narrative of Judges (i. 16, iv. 11 b)
as distinctly said to have been a Kenite. As
Midianites they were therefore descended imme-
diately from Abraham by his wife Keturah, and in
this relationship and their connection with Moses
we find the key to their continued alliance with
Israel. The important services rendered by the
shekh of the Kenites to Moses during a time of
great pressure and difficulty were rewarded by the
latter with a promise of firm friendship between the
two peoples — "what goodness Jehovah shall do
unto us, the same will we do to thee." And this
promise was gratefully remembered long after to
the advantage of the Kenites (1 Sam. iv. 6). The
connection then commenced lasted as firmly as a
connection could last between a settled people like
Israel and one whose tendencies were so markedly
nomadic as the Kenites. They seem to have ac-
companied the Hebrews during their wanderings.
At any rate they were with them at the time of
their entrance on the Promised Land. Their en-
campment — separate and distinct from the rest of
the people — was within Baham's view when he
heard his prophecy (Num. xxiv. 21, 22), and we
may infer that theagedList in the capture of
Jericho, the "city of palm-trees" (Judg. i. 10;
comp. 2 Chr. xviii. 15). But the wanderings of
Israel over, they forsok the neighborhood of the
towns, and betook themselves to freer air — to "the
wilderness of Judah, which is to the south of Arad "
(Judg. i. 16), where "they dwelt among the people"
of the district — the Amalekites who wandered
in that dry region, and among whom they were
living centuries later when Saul made his expedi-
tion there (1 Sam. xv. 6). Their alliance with
Israel at this later date is shown no less by Saul's
friendly warning than by David's feigned attack
(xxvii. 10, and see xxx. 29).

But one of the sheikhs of the tribe, Heber by
name, had wandered north instead of south, and at
the time of the great struggle between the north-
en and tribes and Judah, under Hozai, his tents were
pitched under the tree of Zaanain, near Kedesh
(Judg. iv. 11). Heber was in alliance with both
the contending parties, but in the hour of extrem-
ity the ties of Hebd-relationship and ancient
companionship proved strongest, and Nisera fell a
victim to the hammer and the blade of Jael.

The most remarkable development of this peo-
ple, exemplifying most completely their character-
des, their Bedouin hatred of the restraints of
civilization, their fierce determination, their attach-
ment to Israel, together with a peculiar semi-nom-
adic austerity not observable in their earlier pro-
ceedings — is to be found in the sect or family of the
Rechabites, founded by Rechab, or Jonadab his
son, who came prominently forward on more than
one occasion in the later history. [Jehosadab, Rechabites.]
The founder of the family appears to have been
a certain Hamanath (A. V., Hemath), and a sin-
gular testimony is furnished to the connection
which existed between this tribe of Midianite wan-
derers and the nation of Israel, by the fact that
their name and descent are actually included in the
genealogies of the great house of Judah (1 Chr.
ii. 59).

No further notices would seem to be extant of
this interesting people. The name of Bo-Kan
(abbreviated from Bene el-Kuin), is mentioned by
Ewald ('Gesch. i. 337, note), as borne in compara-
tively modern days by one of the tribes of the des-
cert; but little or no inference can be drawn from
such similarity in names.

GEN. XXIV.

KENTZITE [Kerëzëa]: Cencia], Gen.
iv. 19. [Kenzite.]

KIRCHEIFS, Ezck. xiii. 18, 21 כַּפְּלִיא
כַּפְּלִיא (cereolus) = coverings for the head,
from the French couvrechevel. The word appears
in Chaucer as kerchevel (Eastwood and Wright's

Jehonathan, when the Rechabite Kiriathaim was so far
"wasted" by the invading army of Asa, as to be
driven to take refuge within the walls of the city, a
step to which we may be sure nothing short of actual
extremity could have forced these Children of the
Desert. Whether "Asshir carried them away captive "
with the other inhabitants we are not told, but it is at
least possible.

It has been pointed out under Hohar that one of
the wards opposite Jericho, the same which, by ac-
cording to the local tradition, the Bene-Israel descended
to the Jordan, retained the name of Sh'eleb, the Musul-
mian version of Hohar.

A place named Kishr, possibly derived from the
same root as the Kenites, is mentioned in the lists of
the cities of "the south" of Judah. But there is
nothing to imply any connection between the two
[Kenites].
Keren-Happuch (כְּרֵנְ-הַפּוּךְ) [the point-brown]: Amalthea [Vat. Tet. Sin. U. Tet., Alex. Maltezis] Cyprus [Corinthis]. the youngest of the daughters of Job, born to him during the period of his reviving prosperity (Job xli. 14), and so called probably from her great beauty.

The Vulgate has correctly rendered her name "horn of antimony," the pigment used by eastern ladies to color their eyelashes; but the LXX., unless they had a different reading, adopted a current expression of their own age, without regard to strict accuracy, in representing Keriyyoth as "horn of Amalthea," or "horn of plenty."

Keriyyoth (כְּרֵי-יוֹת; i.e. Keriyyoth [cities]).

1. (חָיְל; Alex. πόλεις; Curioth.) A name which occurs among the lists of the towns in the southern district of Judah (Josh. xv. 25). According to the A. V. ("Keriioth, and Hezron"), it denotes a distinct place from the name which follows it; but this separation is not in accordance with the accentuation of the Rcc. Hebrew text, and is now generally abandoned (see Keil, Joaot, ad loc., and Hahnd, Pulciuus, pp. 703, 708, the versions of Kane, Calhoun, etc.), and the name taken as "Keriyyoth, which is Hazor," its name before its conquest was Hazor, for which was afterwards substituted Keriyyoth-Hezron — the "cities of H." Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. ii. 101), and Lient. Van de Velde (ii. 82) propose to identify it with Kureyetta ("the two cities"), a ruined site which stands about 10 miles S. from Hebron, and 3 from Mela (Monat).

Keriioth furnishes one, and that perhaps the oldest and most usual, of the explanations proposed for the title "Isaiceriot," and which are enumerated under Judas Isaioth, vol. ii. p. 1455. But if Keriioth is to be read in conjunction with Hezron, as stated above, another difficulty is thrown in the way of this explanation.

2. (קֵפַדָּה; Curioth.) A city of Moab, named in the denunciations of Jeremiah — and there only in company with Dibon, Beth-bilshahim, Bethmelek, and other places "far and near" (Jer. xviii. 24). None of the ancient interpreters appear to give any clue to the position of this place. By Mr. Porter, however, it is hesitatingly identified with Kureyagh, a ruined town of some extent lying between Busrak and Sulkind, in the southern part of the Hezron (Fire Years etc. ii. 191-93; Handbook, pp. 523, 524). The chief argument in favor of this is the proximity of Kerik to Busrak, which Mr. Porter accepts as identical with the Busrak of the same passage of Jeremiah. But there are some considerations which stand very much in the way of these identifications. Jeremiah is speaking (xviii. 21) expressly of the cities of the "Mishor" (A. V., "plain-country"), that is, the district of level downs east of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, which probably answered in whole or in part to the Belof of the modern Arabs. In this region were situated

a In the A. V. of 1011 the punctuation was still more marked — "and Keriioth: and Hezron, which is Hazor."

b This agrees with the version of Junius and Tremellius — "at Keriioth (Getzron or its Chatzeror), and with that of Luther. Castello, on the other hand, has " polarity, quae alia Hazor."

c This is a different place from the ruins and cave of Kureyath, near Tekoa (which see), about 2 hours southeast of Bethlehem. The names are somewhat

Heshbon, Dibon, Elealeh, Beth-meon, Kir-heres — the only places named in the passage in question, the positions of which are known with certainty. The most northern of these (Heshbon) is not further north than the upper end of the Dead Sea; the most southern (Kir) lay near its lower extremity. Nor is there anything in the parallel denunciation of Moab by Isaiah (ch. xxvi.) to indicate that the limits of Moab extended further to the north. But Busrak and Kureyagh are no less than 68 miles to the N. X. E. of Heshbon itself, beyond the limits even of the modern Belks (see Kiepert's map to Wetzstein's Hebran and the Travcbmen, 1869), and in a country of an entirely opposite character from the " flat downs, of smooth and even turf," which characterize that district — "a savage and forbidding aspect .... nothing but stones and jagged black rocks ... the whole country around Kerik covered with heaps of loose stones," etc. (Porter, ii. 183, 193). A more plausible identification would be Kureyagh, at the western foot of Jebel Atturas, and but a short distance from either Dibon, Beth-meon, or Heshbon.

But on the other hand it should not be overlooked that Jeremiah uses the expression "far and near" (ver. 21), and that if Busrak and Kureyagh are not Bozrah and Keriioth, those important places have apparently flourished without any notice from the sacred writers. This is one of the points which further investigation by competent persons, east of the Jordan, may probably set at rest.

Keriioth occurs in the A. V., also in ver. 41. Here however it bears the definite article מַקְוֹטֶה, תְּל שֶׁרֶה; Alex. Καρκάκαβα; [Vat. P. Καρκακάβα; Curioth;], and would appear to signify not any one definite place, but "the cities" of Moab — as may also be the case with the same word in Amos ii. 2. [Keriioth.]

Kerros (כְּרֹס; weaver's comb): Kades; Alex. Kepos in Ezr. ii. 44; מַקְוֹטֶה, תְּל שֶׁרֶה; Kaparit: [Vat. Kepa, P. Kepa, F.] Alex. Kepos in Neh. vii. 47; Ceres, one of the Xethinium, whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel.

Kettle (כְּרֹט; מַחְבֶּה; nakheva), a vessel for culinary or sacrificial purposes (1 Sam. ii. 14). The Hebrew word is also rendered "basket" in Jer. xxiv. 2, "caldron" in 2 Chr. xxxv. 13, and "pot" in Job xiii. 29. [CALDIRON.] H. W. P.

Ketura (כְּרֻעָא, וּכְרֻעָא; accesor. Ges.: Κετ ο ρα: Ketero; Cetero), the "wife" whom Abraham "had added and took" (A. V., "again took") besides, or after the death of, Sarah (Gen. xxv. 1; i Chr. i. 32). Genesis and others adopt the theory that Abraham took Ketura after Sarah's death; but probability seems against it (compare Gen. xvii, 17, xviii. 11; Rom. iv. 19; and Heb. xi. 12), and we incline to the belief that the passage commencing with xxv. 1, and comprising perhaps the whole chapter, or at least as far as ver. 10, is placed out of order, but that is accidental Kuetreita is so called from a celebrated monk Chariton, who a.p. 340-350 occupied the cave as a kura or monastery, which it continued to be for ages. The name is given also to the adjacent place, and to a fountain and a little village. See Tobler's Deblaker aus Jerusalem, p. 581 and Sepp's Judenland und das heil. Land, i. 529. H

< So Ewald, Prophe. 8; Die Städte Moab.>
of its chronological sequence in order not to break the main narrative; and that Abraham took Keturah during Sarah's lifetime. That she was, strictly speaking, his wife, is also very uncertain. The Hebrew word translated in this place in the A. V., and by many scholars, is Ishah, a of which the first meaning given by Gesenius is "a woman, of every age and condition, whether married or not: and although it is commonly used with the signification of "wife," as opposed to handmaid, in Gen. xxx. 4, it occurs with the signification of concubine, and she gave him Bilhah her handmaid to wife." In the record in 1 Chr. i. 32, Keturah is called a "concubine," and it is also said, in the two verses immediately following the genealogy of Keturah, that "Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, unto the east country" (Gen. xxv. 5, 6).

Except Hagur, Keturah is the only person mentioned to whom this passage can relate; and in confirmation of this supposition we find strong evidence of a wide spread of the tribes sprung from Keturah, bearing the names of her sons, as we have mentioned in other articles. These sons were "Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishshar, and Shurah" (ver. 2); besides the sons and grandsons of Jokshan, and the sons of Midian. They evidently crossed the desert to the Persian Gulf and occupied the whole intermediate country, where traces of their names are frequent, while Midian extended south into the peninsula of Arabia Proper. The former branch of the "sons of the concubines," however, was that of Ishmael. He has ever stood as the representative of the hand-woman's sons; and as such his name has become generally applied by the Arabs to all the Abrahamic settlers north of the Peninsula—besides the great Ishmaelite element of the nation.

In searching the works of Arab writers for any information respecting these tribes, we must be contented to find them named as Arabians, or even Ishmaelites, for under the latter appellation almost all the former are confounded by their descendants. Keturah herself is by them mentioned very rarely and vaguely, and evidently only in quoting from a rabbinical writer. (In the Kérimos the name is said to be that of the Turks, and that of a young girl (or slave) of Abraham; and it is added, her descendants are the Turks!)

M. Cauvin de Ducoral (Essai, i. 129) has endeavored to identify her with the name of a tribe of the Amalekites (the 1st Amalek) called Katoura, but his arguments are not of any weight. They rest on a weak etymology, and are contradicted by the statements of Arab authors as well as by the fact that the early tribes of Arabia (of which is Katoura) have not, with the single exception of Amalek, been identified with any historical races; while the exception of Amalek is that of an apparently aboriginal people whose name is recorded in the Bible; and there are reasons for supposing that these early tribes were aboriginal.

E. S. P.
by no means extinct in Palestine at the present day. "In the neighborhood of En-gedi," says Tristram, (Not. Hist. of the Bible, p. 196), "while encamped by the Dead Sea shore, we obtained several fine specimens, and very interesting it was to find this graceful creature by the very fountain to which it gave name, and in the spot where it roamed of old while David wandered to escape the persecutions of Saul (1 Sam. xxiv. 2)." [EN-GEDI.] Thomson also speaks of them as found in the ravines near this fountain (Land and Book, ii. 129).

Among the pastoral inhabitants of Palestine a kid forms the ordinary dish at a feast or entertainment. "The lamb," says Tristram, "are more generally kept till they reach maturity, for the sake of their wool, and a calf is too large and too valuable to be slain except on some very special occasions. Whenever in the wilder parts of Palestine the traveller halts at an Arab camp, or pays his visit to a village sheikh, he is pressed to stay until the kid can be killed and ready, and he has an opportunity of seeing in front of the tent the kid caught and prepared for the cooking" (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 90 f.). This usage explains the terms of the elder brother's complaint in the parable of the prodigal: "Thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends, but as soon as this thy son was come ... thou hast killed for him the fatted calf" (Luke xv. 20, 30).

The custom of "seething a kid in its mother's milk" (which was forbidden to the Hebrews, see Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 25, and Deut. xix. 21) is common among the Arabs of the present day. "They select," says Thomson, "a young kid, fat and tender, dress it carefully, and then stew it in milk, generally sour, mixed with onions and hot spices such as they relish. They call it Lbn limam — kid, 'in its mother's milk.'" The Jews however, refuse such food with abhorrence, not only as being abominable by Mosaic law, but unnatural and barbarous (Land and Book, i. 135).

The name is derived by Gesenius and others from הָעַרְבָּם (הָעַרְבָּם), "to be black," either, according to Robinson, from the turbidity of its stream (comp. Job vi. 19; though the words of Job imply that this was a condition of all brooks when frozen); or more appropriately, with Stanley, from the depth and obscurity of the ravine (Ex. xvi. P. 172), or possibly also — though this is proposed with hesitation — from the impurity which seems to have attached to it from a very early date.

We cannot, however, too often insist on the great uncertainty which attaches to the interpretations of these ancient names. Kidron, as a Hebrew word, we may be making a mistake almost as absurd as that of the coptic who altered it into τοῦ κηφόρον, believing that it arose from the presence of vipers.
by our Lord on his way to Gethsemane (John xviii. 1); a comp. Mark xiv. 26; Luke xxii. 39). Its connection with these two occurrences is also sufficient to leave no doubt that the Nachal Kidron is the deep ravine on the east of Jerusalem, now commonly known as the "Valley of Jehoshaphat."

But it would seem as if the name were formerly applied also to the ravines surrounding other portions of Jerusalem — the south or the west; since Solomon's prohibition to Shimei to "pass over the torrent Kidron" (1 K. ii. 37; Jos. Ant. viii. 1, § 5) is said to have been broken by the latter when he went in the direction of Gath to seek his fugitive slaves (41, 42). Now a person going to Gath would certainly not go by the way of the Mount of Olives, or approach the eastern side of the city at all. The route — whether Gath were at Beth-Awgin or at Tell es-Suifeh — would be by the Bethlehem-gate, and then nearly due west. Perhaps the prohibition may have been a more general one than is implied in ver. 37 (comp. the king's reiteration of it in ver. 42), the Kidron being in that case specially mentioned because it was on the road to Baburim, Shimei's home, and the scene of his crime. At any rate, beyond the passage in question, there is no evidence of the name Kidron having been applied to the southern or western ravines of the city.

The distinguishing peculiarity of the Kidron Valley — that is, the ravine as to which it is most frequently mentioned in the O. T. — is the impurity which appears to have been ascribed to it. Excepting the two casual notices already quoted, we first meet with it as the place in which King Asa demolished and burnt the obscene phallic idol (vol. ii. p. 1118) of his mother (1 K. xxv. 13; 2 Chr. xvi. 16). Next we find the wicked Athaliah hurried thither to execution (Jos. Ant. ix. 7, § 3; 2 K. xii. 16). Then it becomes the regular receptacle for the impurities and abominations of the idol-worship, when removed from the Temple and destroyed by the adherents of Jehovah (§ 2 Chr. xxix. 16, xxx. 14; 2 K. xiii. 4, 6, 12). In the course of these narratives, the statement of Josephus just quoted as to the death of Athaliah is supported by the fact that in the time of Josiah it was the common cemetery of the city (xi. 23; comp. xxv. 22; "graves of the common people."), perhaps the "valley of dead bodies" mentioned by Jeremiah (xxxi. 40) in close connection with the "fields" of Kidron; and the restoration of which to sanctity was to be one of the miracles of future times (ibid.).

How long the valley continued to be used for a burying-place it is very hard to ascertain. After the capture of Jerusalem in 609 B.C. the bodies of the slain were buried outside the Golden Gateway (Mishin, ii. 487; Todd, "Ungubunganii, p. 218); but what had been the practice in the interval the writer has not succeeded in tracing. To the date of the monuments at the foot of Oeloph we have at present no clue; but even if they are of pre-Christian times there is no proof that they are tombs.

From the date just mentioned, however, the burials appear to have been constant, and at present it is the favorite resting-place of Moslems and Jews. The former on the west, the latter on the east of the valley. The Moslems are mostly confined to the narrow level spot between the foot of the wall and the commenceinent of the precipitous slope; while the Jews have possession of the lower part of the slopes of Oeloph, where their scanty tombs are crowded so thick together as literally to cover the surface like a pavement.

The name Kidron is known in the O. T. with one single exception (2 K. xxiii. 4), attached to the name of Kidron, and apparently to that alone of the valleys or ravines of Jerusalem. Hammon is always the Ge. This enables us to infer with great probability that the Kidron is intended in 2 Chr. xxxiii. 4, by the break (Nachal) which ran through the midst of the land"; and that Hezekiah's preparations for the siege consisted in sealing the source of the Kidron — the upper springfield (not "watercourse," as A. V.) of Gilgon, where it burst out in the wady some distance north of the city, and leading it by a subterranean channel to the interior of the city. If this is so, there is no difficulty in accounting for the fact of the subsequent want of water in the ancient bed of the Kidron. In accordance with this also is the specification of Gilgon as "Gilgon-in-the-Nachal" — that is, in the Kidron Valley — though this was probably the lower of two outlets of the same name. [Gilgon.]

It is mentioned as "close to Jerusalem on the eastern side, and spoken of by John the Evangelist." But the favorite name of this valley at the time of Jerome, and for several centuries after, was "the Valley of Jehoshaphat," and the name Kidron, or, in accordance with the orthography of the Vulgate, Cidron, is not invariably found in the travellers (see Arcuti, "Earl. Trav. I; Sewell, 41; Benjamin of Tudela; Maundeville, "Earl. Trav. 176; Thietmar, 27; but not the Bordeaux Pilgrim, [Trans de Jersu-

The following description of the Valley of Kidron in its modern state — at once the earliest and the most accurate which we possess — is taken from 1863, in "R. D. B., 1859, xx. 111; 2, 1862, xxvii. 203;

"In approaching Jerusalem from the high mark of Nabi Samuel in the N. W., the traveller first descends and crosses the bed of the great Wady Beit Hunain already described. He then ascends again towards the S. E. by a small side wady and along a rocky slope for twenty-five minutes, when he reaches the Tomb of the Judges, lying in a small gap or depression of the ridge, still half an hour distant from the northern gate of the city. A few steps further he reaches the watershed be-

The term Nachal River, in different years, has been exactly, and has this fair to become simply an English word. It does not signify the stream, or the valley which contained the bed of the stream, and was its receptacle when swollen by winter-rain — but both. [Ryv.]"
and partly in the formation of sepalches. The region is full of excavated tombs; and these continue with more or less frequency on both sides of the valley, all the way down to Jerusalem. The valley runs for 15 minutes directly towards the city; a) it is here shallow and broad, and in some parts tilted, though very stony. The road follows almost the same line, and the valley now turns nearly east, almost at a right angle, and passes to the northward of the Tomb of the Kings and the Muslin Wely before mentioned. Here it is about 230 rods distant from the city; and the track between is tolerably level ground, planted with olive-trees. The Nablus road crosses it in this part, and ascends the hill on the north. The valley is here still shallow, and runs in the same direction for about 10 minutes. It then turns again to the south, and, following this general course, passes between the city and the Mount of Olives.

Before reaching the city, and also opposite its northern part, the valley spreads out into a basin of some breadth, which is tilted, and contains plantations of olive and other fruit-trees. In this part it is crossed obliquely by a road leading from the N. E. corner of Jerusalem across the northern part of the Mount of Olives to Amase. Its sides are still full of excavated tombs. As the valley descends, the steep side upon the right becomes more and more elevated above it; until, at the gate of St. Stephen, the height of this brow is about 100 feet. Here a path winds down from the gate on a course S. E. by E., and crosses the valley by a bridge; beyond which are the church with the Tomb of the Virgin, Gethsemane, and other plantations of fruit-trees, already described. The path and bridge are on a causeway, or rather terrace, built up across the valley, perpendicular on the southern side; the earth being filled in on the northern side up to the level of the bridge. The bridge itself consists of an arch, open on the southern side, and 17 feet high from the bed of the channel below; but the northern side is built up, with two subterranean drains entering it from above; one of which begins from the southern point of the Virgin's Tomb, and the other from the fields farther in the northwest. The breadth of the valley at this point will appear from the measurements which I took from St. Stephen's Gate to Gethsemane, along the path, namely —

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From St. Stephen's Gate to the brow of the descent, level</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bottom of the slope, the angle of the descent being 10½°</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bridge, level</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. N. corner of Gethsemane, slight rise</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. N. E. corner of</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last three numbers give the breadth of the proper bottom of the valley at this spot, namely, 435 feet or 145 yards. Further north it is somewhat broader.

Below the bridge the valley contracts gradually, and sinks more rapidly. The first continuous traces of a water-course or torrent-bed commence at the bridge, though they occur likewise at intervals higher up. The western hill becomes steeper and more elevated; while on the east the Mount of Olives rises much higher, but is not so steep. At the distance of 1000 feet from the bridge on a course S. 19° W. the bottom of the valley has become merely a deep gully, the narrow bed of a torrent, from which the hills rise directly on each side. Here another bridge b) is thrown across it on an arch; and just by on the left are the alleged tombs of Jehoshaphat, Absalom, and others; as also the Jewish cemetery. The valley now continues for a few minutes of the same character, and follows the same course (S. 100° W.) for 500 feet further; where it makes a sharp turn for a moment towards the right. This portion is the narrowest of all; it is here a mere ravine between high mountains. The S. E. corner of the area of the mosque overhangs this part, the corner of the wall standing upon the very brink of the declivity. From it to the bottom, on a course S. E. the angle of depression is 27°, and the distance 450 feet, giving an elevation of 128 feet at that point; to which may be added 20 feet or more for the rise of ground just north along the wall; making in all an elevation of about 150 feet. This, however, is the highest point above the valley; for further south the narrow ridge of Ophel slopes down as rapidly as the valley itself. In this part of the valley one would expect to find, if anywhere, traces of ruins thrown down from above, and the surface of the ground covered by the rubbish thus accumulated. Occasional blocks of stone are indeed seen, but neither the surface of the ground, nor the bed of the torrent, exhibits any special appearance of having been raised or interrupted by masses of ruins.

Below the short turn above mentioned, a line of 1025 feet on a course S. W. brings us to the Fountain of the Virgin, lying deep under the western hill. The valley has now opened a little; but its bottom is still occupied only by the bed of the torrent. From here a course S. 21° W. carried us along the village of Siloam (Κήφρος Σεβρίων) on the eastern side, and at 1170 feet we were opposite the mouth of the Tyropoeon and the Pool of Siloam, which lies 255 feet within it. The mouth of this valley is still 40 or 50 feet higher than the bed of the Kidron. The steep descent between the two has been already described as built up in terraces, which, as well as the strip of level ground below, are occupied with gardens belonging to the village of Siloam. These are irrigated by the waters of the Pool of Siloam, which at this time were lost in them. In these gardens the stones have been removed, and the soil is a fine mould. They are planted with fig and other fruit-trees, and furnish also vegetables for the city. Elsewhere the bottom of the valley is thickly strewn with small stones.

Further down, the valley opens more and is tilted. A line of 685 feet on the same course (S. 21° W.) brought us to a rocky point of the eastern hill, here called the Mount of Offense, over against the entrance of the Valley of Hinnom. Thence to the well of Job or Nehemiah is 275 feet due south. At the junction of the two valleys the bottom forms an oblong plat, extending from the gardens above mentioned nearly to the well of Job, and being 150 yards or more in breadth. The western and north-western parts of this plat are in like manner occupied by gardens; many of which are also on terraces and receive a portion of the waters of Siloam.

Below the well of Nehemiah the Valley of Jehoshaphat continues to run S. S. W. between the Mount of Offense and the Hill of Evil Counsel,  

---

a See a slight correction of this by Tobler, Umge- 

rungen, p. 22.  

b For a minute account of the two bridges, see 

Tobler, Umgehung, pp. 35-39.
KIDRON, THE BROOK

so called. At 130 feet is a small cavity or outlet by which the water of the well sometimes runs off. At about 1200 feet, or 400 yards, from the well is a pass under the western hill, where in the rainy season water flows out as from a fountain. At about 1500 feet or 500 yards below the well the valley lends off S. 75° E. for half a mile or more, and then turns again more to the south, and pursues its way to the Dead Sea. At the angle where it thus lends eastward a small wadi comes in from the west, from behind the Hill of Evil Counsel. The width of the main valley below the well, as far as to Hlobe, varies from 50 to 100 yards; it is full of olive and fig-trees, and is in most parts ploughed and sown with grain. Further down it takes the name among the Arabs of Wady er-Ribid, "Monks' Valley," from the convent of St. Saba situated on it; and still nearer to the Dead Sea it is also called Wady er-Nisr, "Fire Valley." 2

1 The channel of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the Hesek Kidron of the Scriptures, is nothing more than the dry bed of a winter torrent, bearing marks of being occasionally swept over by a large volume of water. No stream flows here now except when the heavy rains of winter, when the waters descend into it from the neighboring hills. Yet even in winter there is no constant flow; and our friends, who had resided several years in the city, had never seen a stream running through the valley. Nor is there any evidence that there was an ancient more water in it than at present. Like the wadis of the desert, the valley probably served of old, as now, only to drain off the waters of the rainy season.

1 A point is unnoticed in Dr. Robinson's description, sufficiently curious and well-attested to merit further careful investigation—the possibility that the Kidron flows below the present surface of the ground. Dr. Barclay ('City, etc., p. 392) mentions "a fountain that bursts forth during the winter in a valley entering the Kidron from the north, and flows several hundred yards before it sinks;" and again he testifies that at a point in the valley about two miles below the city the quantities of a stream deep below the ground may be distinctly heard, which stream, on excavation, he actually discovered under the Western hill, where in the two points the brook is flowing in a subterraneous channel, as is "not at all un frequent in Palestine" (p. 303). Nor is this a modern discovery, for it is spoken of by William of Tyre; by Brocardus (Hebr. cap. viii.), as audible near the "Tomb of the Virgin;" and also by Fabri (l. 370), Marinus Sanutus (3, 14, 9), and others.

That which Dr. Robinson complains that neither he nor his friends were fortunate enough to witness has since taken place. In the winter of 1853-54 so heavy were the rains that not only did the lower part of the Kidron, below the so-called well of Nechemiah or Jehud, run with a considerable stream for the whole of the month of March (Barclay, 515), but also the upper part, "in the middle section of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, flowed for a day or two" (Stewart, Tent of Klim, 316). The Well of Jehud is probably one of the outlets of the mysterious spring which flows below the city of Jerusalem, and its overflow is comparatively common; 4 but the flowing of a stream in the upper part of the valley would seem not to have taken place for many years before the occasion in question, although it occurred also in the following winter (Jewish Intelligence, May 1856, p. 137 note), and, as the writer is informed, has since become almost periodical. 5

* The language of Dr. Barclay (see above) hardly implies so much as the actual discovery of the subterranean stream spoken of. His words are that "about two miles southeast of the city" where a "notable stream of running water beneath the ground" was said to have been heard, "on removing the rocks to the depth of about ten or twelve feet, water was found, though in small quantity, in midsummer" (City of the Great King, pp. 302, 303).

* One point is unnoticed in Dr. Robinson's description, sufficiently curious and well-attested to merit further careful investigation—the possibility that the Kidron flows below the present surface of the ground. Dr. Barclay ('City, etc., p. 392) mentions "a fountain that bursts forth during the winter in a valley entering the Kidron from the north, and flows several hundred yards before it sinks;" and again he testifies that at a point in the valley about two miles below the city the quantities of a stream deep below the ground may be distinctly heard, which stream, on excavation, he actually discovered under the Western hill, where in the two points the brook is flowing in a subterraneous channel, as is "not at all un frequent in Palestine" (p. 303). Nor is this a modern discovery, for it is spoken of by William of Tyre; by Brocardus (Hebr. cap. viii.), as audible near the "Tomb of the Virgin;" and also by Fabri (l. 370), Marinus Sanutus (3, 14, 9), and others.

That which Dr. Robinson complains that neither he nor his friends were fortunate enough to witness has since taken place. In the winter of 1853-54 so heavy were the rains that not only did the lower part of the Kidron, below the so-called well of Nechemiah or Jehud, run with a considerable stream for the whole of the month of March (Barclay, 515), but also the upper part, "in the middle section of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, flowed for a day or two" (Stewart, Tent of Klim, 316). The Well of Jehud is probably one of the outlets of the mysterious

flows and discharges its waters down the Wady er-Nisr, the lower part of the Kidron, then they are certain that they will have abundance of water during the summer; if there is no overflow, their minds are filled with forebodings." (Stewart, 259.)

1 A list of some of the plants found in this valley is given by Medicus (261); and some samples of information about the valley itself at p. 140.

2 During the latter rains of February and March the well 'Ain Avgb is a subject of much speculation and interest to all dwellers in the city. If it overflows and discharges its waters down the Wady er-Nisr, the lower part of the Kidron, then they are certain that they will have abundance of water during the summer; if there is no overflow, their minds are filled with forebodings." (Stewart, 259.)
KINAH

KINDRED

KINAH (ጊጓሮ) [memoration, dirigę]: እስካፋ: Alex. KINN: Citiu, a city of Judah, one of those which lay or the extreme south boundary of the tribe, next to Edom (Josh. xx. 22). It is mentioned in the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome, but not so as to imply that they had any actual knowledge of it. With the sole exception of Schwartz (90), it appears to be unmentioned by any traveller, and the "town Ginnah situated near the wilderness of Zin" with which he would identify it, is not to be found in his own or any other map.

Professor Stanley (S. of P. p. 160) very ingeniously connects Kinah with the Kenites (ኢትሮ), who settled in this district (Jugd. i. 16). But it should not be overlooked that the list in Josh. xv. purports to record the towns as they were at the conquest, while the settlement of the Kenites probably (though not certainly) did not take place till after a.


7. የተሰብ, from የተወና, "redeem," Gen. p. 233; የተጋናጉው, "a kinsman," i. e. the relative to whom belonged the right of redemption or of vengeance ምቅ, አፋሎ በትጋናጉ በጨምር መጋት ይሆኝ;

8. ያጋ ጊዛጋ ጥር, ከ ይጨምር ከሚወኝ ይሆኝ;

9. ያጋ ጊዛጋ ጥር, የ ይጨምር ከሚወኝ ይሆኝ;

10. ያጋ ጊዛጋ ጥር, የ ይጨምር ከሚወኝ ይሆኝ;

8. ያጋ ጊዛጋ ጥር, የ ይጨምር ከሚወኝ ይሆኝ;

KINDRED. a I. Of the special names denoting relation by consanguinity, the principal will be found explained under their proper heads, FATHER, BROTHER, etc. It will be there seen that the words which denote near relation in the direct line are used also for the other superior or inferior degrees in that line, as grandfather, grandson, etc.

On the meaning of the expression Shè’r bašor (see below 1 and 2) much controversy has arisen. Sh’er, as shown below, is in Lev. xvii. 6, in marg. of A. V., "remainder." The rendering, however, of Shè’r bašor in text of A. V., "near of kin," may be taken as correct, but, as Michaelis shows, without determining the precise extent to which the expression itself is applicable (Mich. Lives of Moses, ii. 48, ed. Smith; Koshol on Levitica; see also Lev. xxiv. 49; Num. xxvii. 11).

II. The words which express collateral consanguinity are — (1) uncle; (2) aunt; (3) nephew; (4) niece (not in A. V.); (5) cousin.

III. The terms of affinity are — 1. (a) father-in-law, (b) mother-in-law; 2. (a) son-in-law, (b) daughter-in-law; 3. (a) brother-in-law, (b) sister-in-law.

The relations of kindred, expressed by few words, and imperfectly defined in the earliest ages, acquired in course of time greater significance and wider influence. The full list of relatives either by consanguinity, i. e. as arising from a common ancestor, or by affinity, i. e. as created by marriage, may be seen detailed in the Corpus Juris Civ. Digest, lib. xxxviii. tit. 10, de Grudha; see also Corp. Jur. Canum. Decr. ii. c. xxxv. 9, 5.

The domestic and economical questions arising out of kindred may be clasbed under the three heads of MARRIAGE, INHERITANCE, and BLOOD-REVENGE; and the reader is referred to the articles on those subjects for information thereon. It is clear that the tendency of the Mosaic Law was to increase the restrictions on marriage, by defining more precisely the relations created by it, as is shown by the cases of Abraham and Moses. [ISRAEL;
The immediate occasion of the substitution of a regal form of government for that of the judges seems to have been the siege of Jabesh-gilead by Nahash, king of the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 12), and the refusal to allow the inhabitants of that city to capitulate, except on humiliating and cruel conditions (1 Sam. xii. 4, 4-6). The conviction seems to have forced itself on the Israelites that they could not resist their formidable neighbor unless they placed themselves under the sway of a king, like surrounding nations. Concurrently with this conviction, disgust had been excited by the corrupt administration of justice under the sons of Saul, and a radical change was desired by them in this respect also (1 Sam. viii. 3-5). Accordingly the original idea of a Hebrew king was two-fold: first, that he should lead the people to battle in time of war; and, secondly, that he should execute judgment and justice to them in war and in peace (1 Sam. viii. 20). In both respects the desired end was attained. The righteous wrath and military capacity of Saul were immediately triumphant over the Ammonites: and though ultimately he was defeated and slain in battle with the Philistines, he put even them to flight on more than one occasion (1 Sam. xiv. 23, xvii. 52), and generally waged successful war against the surrounding nations (1 Sam. xiv. 47). His successor, David, entered on a series of brilliant conquests over the Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, Edomites, and Ammonites (see David, vol. i. p. 301); and the maps confined within the narrow bounds of Palestine, had an empire extending from the river Euphrates to Gaza, and from the entering in of Hamath to the river of Egypt (1 K. iv. 21). In the mean while complaints cease of the corruption of justice; and Solomon not only consolidated and maintained in peace the empire of his father, David, but left an enduring reputation for his wisdom as a judge. Under this expression, however, we must regard him, not merely as pronouncing decisions, primarily, or in the last resort, in civil and criminal cases, but likewise as holding public levees and transacting public business as the gate, when he would receive petitions, hear complaints, and give summary decisions on various points, which in a modern European kingdom would come under the cognizance of numerous distinct public departments.

To form a correct idea of a Hebrew king, we must abstract ourselves from the notions of modern Europe, and realize the position of Oriental sovereigns. It would be a mistake to regard the Hebrew government as a limited monarchy, in the English sense of the expression. It is stated in 1 Sam. x. 25, that Samuel "told the people the name of the kingdom," and wrote it in the book and laid it before the Lord; and it is barely possible that this may refer to some statement respecting the boundaries of the kingly power. But no such document has come down to us; and if it ever existed, and contained restrictions of any moment on the kingly power, it was probably disregarded in practice. The following passage of Sir John Malcolm respecting the Shabs of Persia may, with some slight modifications, be regarded as fairly applicable to the Hebrew monarchy under David and Solomon: 'The monarch of Persia has been pronounced to be one of the most absolute in the world. His word has ever been deemed a law; and he has probably never had any further restraint upon the free exercise of his vast authority than has arisen from his regard for religion, his respect for established usages, his desire of repu?tation, and his fear of exciting an opposition that might be dangerous to his power, or to his life' (Malcolm's Persis, vol. ii. 361; compare Elphinstone's India, or the Indian Mofulmante Empire, lock viii. e. 3). It must not, however, be supposed to have been either the understanding, or the practice, that the sovereign might seize at his discretion the private property of individuals. Ahaz did not venture to seize the vineyard of Nahoth till, through the testimony of false witnesses, Nahoth had been convicted of blasphemy; and possibly his vineyard may have been seized as a confiscation, without flagrantly outraging public sentiment in those who did not know the truth (1 K. xxi. 6). But no monarchy perhaps ever existed in which it would not be regarded as an outrage, that the monarch should from covetousness seize the private property of an innocent subject in no ways dangerous to the state. And generally, Sir John Malcolm proceeds as follows, in reference to "one of the most absolute" monarchs in the world, it will be understood that the Hebrew king, whose power might be described in the same way, is not, on account of certain restrictions which exist in the nature of things, to be regarded as a "limited monarch" in the European use of the words. "We may assume that the power of the king of Persia is by usage absolute over the property and lives of his conquered provinces, his rebellious subjects, his own family, his ministers, over public officers civil and military, and all the numerous towns of dominacies; and that

\[1\] The precise period depends on the length of the reign of Saul, for estimating which there are no certain data. In the O. T. the exact length is nowhere mentioned. In Acts, xiii. 21 forty years are specified; but this is in a speech, and statistical accuracy may have been foreign to the speaker's ideas on that occasion. And there are difficulties in admittin that he reigned so long as forty years. See Williamson and RAW, and the article Saul in this Dictionary. It is only in the reign of David that mention is first made of the "recorder" or "chronicler" of the king (2 Sam. viii.

\[2\] The word used in the text (בַּלּוּף) is not a "true" Mandarin in the LAX, meaning, in essence, "true," "act," or "ordinance" (see Ezek. iv. 17, Jer. xii. 17, 14. 13). But Josephus seems to have regarded the Sanhedrin, as a sort of a president, which, before the king, of the sanhedrin, which were to arise from the kingly power as a kind of protest record for succeeding ages (see Act. vi. 4, § 8).
be may punish any persons of these classes, without examination or formal procedure of any kind: in all other cases that are capital, the forms prescribed by law and custom are observed; the monarch only commands, when the evidence has been examined and the law declared, that the sentence shall be put in execution, or that the condemned subject be delivered up to his own, in accordance with such usages. David ordered Uriah to be treacherously exposed to death in the forefront of the hottest battle (2 Sam. xi. 15); he caused Rechab and Baanah to be slain instantly, when they brought him the head of Ish-bosheth (2 Sam. iv. 12); and he is represented as having on his death-bed recommended Solomon to put Joab and Shimei to death (1 K. ii. 5-9). In like manner, Solomon caused to be killed, without trial, not only his elder brother Adonijah, and Joab, whose execution might be regarded as the exceptional acts of a dismal state policy in the beginning of his reign, but likewise Shimei, after having been seated on the throne three years. And King Saul, in resentment at their compliance with David's escape, put to death 35 priests, and caused a massacre of the inhabitants of Nob, including women, children, and sucklings (1 Sam. xxi. 18, 19).

Besides being commander-in-chief of the army, supreme judge, and absolute master, as it were, of the lives of his subjects, the king exercised the power of imposing taxes on them, and of exacting from them personal service and labor. Both these points seem clear from the account given (1 Sam. viii. 11-17) of the evils which would arise from the kingly power: and are confirmed in various ways. Whatever mention may be made of consulting "old men," or "elders of Israel," we never read of their deciding such points as these. When Palt, the king of Assyria, imposed a tribute on the kingdom of Israel, "Menashe, the king," exacted the money of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 30 shekels of silver (2 K. xxv. 19). And when Jehoiakim, king of Judah, gave his tribute of silver and gold to Pharaoh, he taxed the land to give the money: he exacted the silver and gold of the people of every one according to his taxation (2 K. xxiii. 35). And the degree to which the exactation of personal labor might be carried on a special occasion is illustrated by King Solomon's requirements for building the Temple. He raised a levy of 30,000 men, and sent them to Lebanon by courses of ten thousand a month; and he had 70,000 that bare burdens, and 80,000 hewers in the mountains (1 K. v. 13-15). Judged by the oriental standard, there is nothing improbable in these numbers. In our own days, for the purpose of constructing the Mahnoodeh Canal in Egypt, Memelit, by orders given to the various sheikhs of the provinces of Sakarah, Ghizeh, Mensoura, Sharkieh, Menouf, Bahireh, and some others, caused 300,000 men, women, and children, to be assembled along the site of the intended canal. a This was 120,000 more than the levy of Solomon.

In addition to these earthly powers, the King of Israel had a more awful claim to respect and obedience. He was the viceroy of Jehovah (1 Sam. x. 1, xvi. 13), and as it were His son, if just and holy (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 25, 27, ii. 6, 7).

He had also a claim to a divine power, as it was said in his mouth that he had his head had been poured the holy anointing oil, composed of olive-oil, myrrh, cinnamon, sweet calamus, and cassia, which had hitherto been reserved exclusively for the priests of Jehovah, especially the high-priest, or had been solely used to anoint the Tabernacle of the Congregation, the Ark of the Testimony, and the vessels of the Tabernacle (Ex. xxv. 29-33; xl. 9; Lev. xxi. 10; 1 K. i. 39). He had become, in fact, emphatically "the Lord's Anointed." At the coronation of sovereigns in modern Europe, holy oil has been frequently used, as a symbol of divine right; but this has been mainly regarded as a mere form; and the use of it was undoubtedly introduced in imitation of the Hebrew custom. But, from the beginning to the end of the Hebrew monarchy, a living red signification continued to be attached to consecration by anointing oil. From well-known anecdotes related of David,—and perhaps, from words in his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 21)—it results that a certain sacredness invested the person of Saul, the first king, as the Lord's anointed; and that, on this account, it was deemed sacrilegious to kill him, even at his own request (1 Sam. xxiv. 6, 10, xxvi. 9, 16; 2 Sam. i. 14). And, after the destruction of the first Temple, in the Book of Lamentations over the calamities of the Hebrew people, it is by the name of "the Lord's Anointed" that Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, is bewailed (Lam. iv. 20). Again, more than 600 years after the capture of Zepheliah, the name of the Anointed, though never so used in the Old Testament,—yet suggested probably by Ps. ii. 2, Dan. ix. 26,—had become appropriated to the expected king, who was to restore the kingdom of David, and inaugurate a new era of prosperity and peace, as the Anointed of God, or the Messiah, and the Prositines, would again be incorporated with the Hebrew monarchy, which would extend from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean Sea and to the ends of the earth (Acts i. 6; John i. 41, iv. 25; Is. xi. 12-14; Ps. lxxii. 8). And thus the identical Hebrew word which signifies anointed, b through its Aramaic form adopted into Greek and Latin, is still preserved to us in the English word Messiah. (See Gesenius's Thesaurus, p. 825.) A ruler in whom so much authority, human and divine, was embodied, was naturally distinguished by outward honors and luxuries. He had a court of oriental magnificence. When the power of the kingdom was at its height, he sat on a throne of ivory, covered with pure gold, at the feet of which were two figures of lions. The throne was ap-

a See The Englishman in Egypt, by Mrs. Poole, vols. ii. p. 219. Owing to insufficiency of provisions, bad treatment, and neglect of proper arrangements, 30,000 of this number perished in seven months (p. 220). In compulsory levies of labor, it is probably difficult to prevent gross injustice; but the representation of 30,000 of the ten tribes, Adoniraim, called also Adoniram, who was over the levy of 30,000 men for Lebanon, was stoned to death (1 K. xii. 13; 1 K. v. 14; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24).

b It is supposed both by John (Archaeol. Bib. § 229) and Bauer (in his Hist. Altevthemat., § 30), that a king was only anointed when a new family came to the throne, or when the right to the crown was disputed. It is usually on such occasions only that the anointing is specified; as in 1 Sam. x. 1, 2 Sam. ii. 4, 1 K. i. 33, 2 K. i. 3, 2 K. xii. 12: but this is not invariably the case (see 1 K. v. 17), and there does not seem sufficient reason to doubt that each individual king was anointed. There can be little doubt, likewise, that the kings of Israel were anointed, though this is not specified by the writers of Kings and Chronicles, who would deem such anointing invalid.
proceeded by 6 steps, guarded by 12 figures of lions, two on each step. The king was dressed in royal robes (1 K. xxii. 10; 2 Chr. xvii. 9): his insignia were, a crown or diadem of pure gold, or perhaps radiant with precious gems (2 Sam. i. 10, xii. 30; 2 K. xii. 12; Ps. xxi. 3), and a royal sceptre (Ex. xix. 11; Is. xiv. 5; Ps. xiv. 6; Am. i. 5, 8). Those who approached him did him obeisance, bowing down and touching the ground with their foreheads (1 Sam. xxiv. 8; 2 Sam. xix. 18); and this was done even by a king's wife, the mother of Solomon (1 K. i. 16). Their officers and subjects called themselves his servants or slaves, though they do not seem habitually to have given way to such extravagant salutations as in the Chaldean and Persian courts (1 Sam. xvii. 32, 34, 36, xx. 8; 2 Sam. vi. 20; Dan. ii. 4). As in the East at present, a kiss was a sign of respect and homage (1 Sam. x. 1, perhaps Ps. ii. 12). He lived in a splendid palace, with porches and columns (1 K. vii. 2–7). All his drinking-vessels were of gold (1 K. x. 21). He had a large harem, which in the time of Solomon must have been the source of enormous expense, if we accept as statistically accurate the round number of 700 wives and 3,000 concubines, in all 1000, attributed to him in the Book of Kings (1 K. xi. 3). As is invariably the case in the great eastern nations, the church was present, his harem tended to be enlarged by exiles; translated "officers" in the A. V. for the most part (1 Sam. viii. 15; 2 K. xxiv. 12, 15; 1 K. xxii. 9; 2 K. viii. 6, ix. 32, 33, xx. 18, xxiii. 11; Jer. xxxviii. 7). The main practical restraints on the kings seem to have arisen from the prophets and the prophetic order, though in this respect, as in many others, a distinction must be made between different periods and different reigns. Indeed, under all circumstances, much would depend on the individual character of the king or the prophet. No transaction of importance, however, was entered on without consulting the will of Jehovah, either by Urim and Thummim or by the prophets; and it was generally the persuasion that the prophet that was in an especial sense the servant and messenger of Jehovah, to whom Jehovah had declared his will (Is. xiv. 29; Am. iii. 7; 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, ix. 6; see PROPHECY). The prophets not only rebuked the king with boldness for individual acts of wickedness, as after the murders of Uriah and of Naboth; but also, by interposing their denunciations or exhortations at critical periods of history, they swayed permanently the destinies of the state. When, after the revolt of the ten tribes, Rehoboam had under him at Jerusalem in army stated to consist of 180,000 men, Shechemiah, as interpreter of the divine will, caused the army to separate without attempting to put down the rebellion (1 K. xii. 21–24). When Judah and Jerusalem were in imminent peril from the invasion of Sennacherib, the prophetic utterance of Isaiah encouraged Hezekiah to a successful resistance (Is, xxxvii. 22–36). On the other hand, at the close of Jeremiah's life, the Chaldaeans, Jeremiah prophetically announced impending woes and calamities in a strain which tended to paralyze patriotic resistance to the power of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxviii. 4, 2). And Jeremiah evidently produced an impression on the king's mind contrary to the counsels of the princes, or what might be called the war-party in Jerusalem (Jer. xxxviii. 14–27). The law of succession to the throne is sometimes somewhat obscure, but it seems most probable that the king during his lifetime named his successor. This was certainly the case with David, who passed over his elder son Adonijah, the son of Haggith, in favor of Solomon, the son of Bath-shheba (1 K. i. 30, ii. 22); and with Rehoboam, of whom it is said that he loved Maachah the daughter of Abisai above all his wives and concubines, and that he made Abijah her son to be ruler among his brethren, to make him king (2 Chr. xi. 21, 22). The succession of the first-born has been inferred from a passage in 2 Chr. xxx. 4, in which Jehoshaphat is said to have given the kingdom to Jehoram "because he was the first-born." But this very passage tends to show that Jehoshaphat had the power of naming his successor; and it is worthy of note that Jer- horam, on his coming to the throne, put to death all his brothers, which he would scarcely, perhaps, have done if the succession of the first-born had been the law of the land. From the conciseness of the narratives in the books of Kings no inference either way can be drawn from the ordinary formula in which the death of the father and succession of his son is recorded (1 K. xv. 8). At the same time, if no partiality for a favorite wife or son intervened, there would always be a natural bias of affection in favor of the eldest son. There appears to have been some prominence given to the mother of the king, whether of the earlier reigns (2 K. xxii. 15; 1 K. ii. 19), and it is possible that the mother may have reigned during the minority of a son. Indeed some such custom best explains the possibility of the audacious usurpation of Athaliah on the death of her son Ahaziah: an usurpation which lasted six years after the destruction of all the seed-royal except the young Jehoash (2 K. xi. 1, 3).

The following is a list of some of the officers of the king: —

1. The Recorder or Chronicler, who was perhaps analogous to the Historiographer whom Sir John Malcolm mentions as an officer of the Persian court, whose duty it is to write the annals of the king's reign (History of Persia, c. 2). Certain it is that there is no regular series of minute dates in Hebrew history until we read of this recorder, or remem- brancer, as the word merseir is translated in a marginal note of the English version. He signifies one who keeps the memory of events alive, in accordance with a motive assigned by Herodotus for writing his history, namely, that the acts of men might not become extinct by time (Herod. i. 1; 2 Sam. viii. 16; 1 K. iv. 3; 2 K. xxii. 18; Is. xxxvi. 3, 22).

2. The Scribe or Secretary, whose duty would be to answer letters or petitions in the name of the king, to write despatches, and to draw up edicts (2 Sam. viii. 17, xx. 35; 2 K. xii. 10, xix. 2, xxii. 8).

3. The officer who was over the house (Is. xxii. 15, xxxiv. 3). His duties would be those of chief steward of the household, and would embrace all the internal economical arrangements of the palace, the superintendence of the king's servants, and the custody of his costly vessels of gold and silver. He seems to have worn a distinctive robe of office and girdle. It was against Shebna, who held this office, that Isaiah uttered his personal prophecy (xxii. 15–25), the only instance of the kind in his writings (see Ges. Com. on Isaiah, p. 694).

4. The king's friend (1 K. iv. 5), called likewise the king's companion. It is evident from the name that this officer must have stood in confidential relation to the king, but his duties are nowhere specified.
It only remains to add, that in Deuteronomy xvii. 14-20 there is a document containing some directions as to what any king who might be appointed by the people was to do upon his accession. The proper appreciation of this document would mainly depend on its date. It is the opinion of many modern writers—Genesius, de Wette, Winer, and others—that the book which contains the document was composed long after the time of Moses. See, however, Deuteronomy in the 1st vol. of this work; and compare Genesius, Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift, p. 32; de Wette, Einleitung in die Bibel, 7th and 18th edns., Winer, s. v. König; Wieland, Geschichte des Volkes Israels, iii. 381. E. T.

* KING'S GARDEN, 2 K. xxv. 4, etc. [GARDEN, vol. i. p. 570 a.]

* KING'S MOWINGS, Am. vii. 1. [Mowing.]

* KING'S POOL, Neh. ii. 14. [SILOAM.

* KINGDOM OF HEAVEN—always with the article. ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

1. This expression occurs thirty-three times in the first Gospel, but nowhere else in the Scriptures. In one passage (iii. 2) it is attributed by Matthew to John the Baptist, in another (xviii. 1) to the disciples of Christ, and in all the rest to Christ himself. An abbreviated form of it is found in such phrases as, "the gospel of the kingdom" (iv. 23), "the word of the kingdom" (xiii. 19), "the sou[s] of the kingdom" (vii. 12, xiii. 38), and "the kingdom prepared for you" (xxv. 34). In a single instance (2 Tim. iv. 18) Paul speaks of the Lord's "heavenly kingdom," —ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν,—an expression which is equivalent to "the kingdom of heaven," as this phrase was sometimes used by Christ. (See Matt. viii. 11, 12.) It will be observed that the Apostle not only describes the kingdom as "heavenly," but also as the Lord's, "his heavenly kingdom." In a few passages of the first Gospel (xiii. 41, xvi. 28, cf. xx. 21) it is likewise referred to as the Messiah's kingdom. With these may properly be connected the language of Christ in the Gospel of John (xviii. 36), the words of the Angel to Mary as preserved by Luke (i. 33), those of Christ as recorded by the same Evangelist (xii. 13, 15, xiii. 24, 30), and the teaching of the Apostles in their letters (1 Cor. xx. 24, 25; Eph. v. 5; Col. i. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Heb. i. 8; 2 Pet. i. 11). The kingdom of heaven is therefore frequently represented as the kingdom of Christ. But it is still more frequently called the kingdom of God. Matthew attributes this expression in several instances to Christ (vi. 10, 33, xii. 28, xiii. 43, xxi. 31, 44, xxi. 29), and when, in reporting the Saviour's teaching, his Gospel gives the words "kingdom of heaven," the other synoptical Gospels have, as a rule, the words "kingdom of God" (e. g. cf. Matt. v. 3, xi. 11, xiii. 31, 33, with Luke vi. 20, vii. 28, xiii. 18, 20). In all the other books of the New Testament the latter designation is regularly employed. While therefore the two expressions denote the same object, and may be regarded as substantially equivalent, the latter appears for some reason to have displaced the former in the language of the Apostles. Rev. (Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne ou Sécule Apostolique, i. 181) supposes that it had the advantage of being more comprehensive, not "seeming to restrict the notion to a future epoch, a particular locality, or a state of..."
things different from that in which humanity now exists," and was therefore preferred to the other by the Apostle.

The idea of a divine or heavenly kingdom was not proposed for the first time by John the Baptist and then adopted by Christ. It may be traced in many parts of the O. T., from the Pentateuch to the prophets of the exile. The Israelites as a people belonged especially to Jehovah, and were already in the law described as a nation of kings and priests unto Him (Ex. xix. 6, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9). Yet even in their best estate, under David their greatest king, they were but a shadow of the true people of God, and their sovereign but a shadow of his greater Son. And this they were clearly taught: for a Messiah was foretold by the prophets, who should spring from the family of David, should salve all his foes, and should reign forever in righteousness and peace (Ps. ii. ex.; Is. xi. cf. Ps. cxiii.: Jer. xxiii. 5 ff.; xxxi. 31 ff.; xxxii. 37 ff.; xxxiii. 7 ff.; Ez. xxiv. 23 ff.; xxxvi. 24 ff.). Moreover, in length, the prophecies of Daniel it was distinctly revealed that the "God of heaven" was to set up a kingdom (ii. 44), which was to be composed of his saints (vii. 27), was to be administered by One like a son of man (vii. 13, 14), and was to be universal and everlasting (vii. 27).

The very expression, "kingdom of God," occurs in the Apocrypha (Wis. of Sed. s. 10). Accordingly, when Christ appeared among the Jews, they were expecting this kingdom of "the God of heaven" which was to be set up by the agency of their long anticipated Messiah; and, however erroneous their views of its nature had become, they were prepared to understand in some measure the language of Jesus and his disciples concerning it. A few indeed of the more devout and spiritual, like Simeon and Anna, appear to have had a tolerably just conception of its nature.

5. This kingdom, in its ultimate and perfect form, is said to have been prepared for the saints from the foundation of the world. (Matt. xxv. 34.) It was therefore included in the wise purpose of God which antedates creation, and in this sense it is eternal. But the various representations of the N. T. have given rise to some differences of opinion among Biblical scholars as to the terminus a quo of its ultimate establishment. The writers of the O. T. speak of it distinctly as future and not present; and many passages of the N. T. refer to it in connection with the second coming of Christ. It is therefore maintained by some interpreters, that this kingdom has not yet been established, and will not be until the Lord returns in glory. Others have made the preaching of John the Baptist the date of its commencement, appealing to the words of Christ seen Matt. xi. 12, xiii. 11; Luke xvi. 16, in support of their position. But it has been objected to this, that one who was spoken of, by way of contrast, as less than the host of those in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xi. 11) could not have been an agent in setting up that kingdom, by introducing men into it, and that the kingdom itself must have its date fixed by the personal appearance and recognition of its king, that is, from the time of Christ's entrance on his public ministry. Others still, identifying the kingdom of God with the Christian church, have fixed upon the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit was poured out marvellously, as the date of its establishment. Perhaps the view which connects it most closely with the person of Christ, affirming that it began, properly speaking, with his public ministry, is entitled to the preference. For in the course of his preaching he spoke of it clearly as already come. At one time he said to the Pharisees, "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, the kingdom of God is come unto you." (Matt. xii. 28); and at another time he said to the same class of men, according to a natural interpretation of his words, "Behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you." (Luke xvi. 21). "The kingdom of God" (Eccles. Hist. de la Théod. Chr. i. 180) which Jesus wished to set up in his personal appearance on the world's theatre: his advent, and the advent of the kingdom, are one and the same thing, for he is the source and cause of it, and the cause may not exist without the effect.

He went so far even as to assign an exact date to the advent of the kingdom, and this date was no other than the moment when John Baptist, the last and greatest of the prophets, opened the door, so to speak, by announcing to the world of Him who would realize its cherished hopes. At that moment the movement towards the kingdom began, and men pressed on with ardor to enter into it."
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from the heart the will of God. Jews and Greek, bond and free, are alike welcomed to the duties, the honors, and the eternal blessedness of the Messiah's reign. And there are a few passages of the N. T. which seem to ascribe to holy angels a connection with it both in service and glory. (Matt. xvi. 27, xiii. 41, xviii. 10; Luke xv. 10; Heb. i. 14; Eph. i. 10, 20, 22, iii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 12, iii. 22.)

6. Yet this kingdom, though in its nature spiritual, was to have with earth a visible form in Christian churches, and the simple rites belonging to church life were to be observed by every loyal subject (Matt. xxviii. 18 ff.; John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38; Luke xxi. 17 ff.; 1 Cor. xii. 24 ff.). It cannot however be said that the N. T. makes the spiritual kingdom of Christ exactly coextensive with the visible church. There are many in the latter who do not belong to the former (1 John ii. 9), and some doubtless in the former do not take their place in the latter.


* KINGDOM OF ISRAEL. [ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.]

KINGS, FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF, originally only one book in the Hebrew Canon, and first edited in Hebrew as two by Bomberg, after the model of the LXX. and the Vulgate (De Wette and O. Theobald, Einleitung). They are called by the LXX, Origen, etc., Basileias tui ouropwr and regnum. The third and fourth of the Kingsbooks (the book of Samuel being the first and second), but by the Latins, with few exceptions, tertius et quartus Regnum liber. Jerome, though in the head- ing of his translation of the Scriptures he follows the Hebrew name, and calls them Liber Mahalchim Primus and Secundus, yet elsewhere usually follows the common usage of the church in his day. In his Prologus Galatus he places them as the fourth of the second order of the sacred books, i. e. of the Prophets: a) Quartus, Mahalchim, i. e. Regum, qui tertia et quartum regnum volumine continuat. Me- liusque nullo est Mahalchim, i. e. Regum, quam Manuelscloth, i. e. Regniowum, dicere. Non enim multum gentium descript regna: sed unius Israe- liti populi, qui tribus duodecim continetur. In his epistle to Paulinus he thus describes the contents of these two books: a) Mahalchim, i. e. ter- tius et quartus Regnum liber, a Salomone usque ad Jeconiam, et a Jeroboam filio Nabat usque ad Osee qui ductus est in Assyrias, regnum Juda et regnum describit Israel. Si historiam respiciat, verba simplicia sunt: si in literis senum latente inspexeris, Ecclesiæ paucitas, et hereticoorum contra ecclesiæ bellam, narratur. b The division into two books, being purely artificial and as it were mechanical, may be overlooked in speaking of them; and it must also be remembered that the division between the books of Kings and Samuel is equally artificial, and that in point of fact the histories and books commencing with and ending with 2 Kings present the appearance of one work, giving a continuous history of Israel from the times of Joshua to the death of Jehoiachin. It must suffice here to mention, in support of this assertion, the frequent allusion in the book of Judges to the times of the kings of Israel (xvii. 6, xviii. 1, xiv. 1, xxii. 25); the concurrent evidence of ch. ii. that the writer lived in an age when he could take a retrospect of the whole time during which the judges ruled (ver. 10-19), i. e. that he lived after the monarchy had been established; the occurrence in the book of Judges, for the first time, of the phrase "the Spirit of Jehovah" (iii. 10), which is repeated often in the book (vi. 34, xx. 23, xiv. 6, etc.), and is of frequent use in Samuel and Kings, (e. g. 1 Sam. x. 6, xvi. 13, xiv. 9; 2 Sam. xxii. 2; 1 K. xii. 24; 2 K. ii. 16, etc.); the allusion in i. 21 to the capture of Jerusalem, and the continuance of a Jehielite population (see 2 Sam. xxiv. 16): the reference in xx. 27 to the removal of the ark of the covenant from Siloah to Jerusalem, and the expression "in those days," pointing, as in xvi. 6, etc., to remote times; the distinct refer- ence in xviii. 30 to the Captivity of Israel by Shal- maneser; with the fact that the books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, form one unbroken narrative, similar in general character, which has no beginning except at Judg. i., while, it may be added, the book of Judges is not a continuation of Joshua, but opens with a repetition of the same events with which Joshua closes. In like manner the book of Ruth clearly forms part of those of Samuel, sup- plying as it does the essential point of David's genealogy and early family history, and is no less clearly connected with the book of Judges by its references to the history of Saul and the early kings, while the whole book relates. Other links connecting the books of Kings with the preceding may be found in the comparison, suggested by De Wette, of 1 K. ii. 26 with 1 Sam. iii. 35; ii. 11 with 2 Sam. v. 5; 1 K. ii. 3, 4, v. 17; 18, viii. 18, 19, 25, with 2 Sam. vii. 12-16; and 1 K. iv. 1-6 with 2 Sam. viii. 15-18. Also 2 K. xvii. 41 may be compared with Judg. ii. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 27 with Judg. xviii. 6; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 29, xii. 27, with Judg. xiii. 6; 1 Sam. ii. 21 with Judg. vi. 15, and xx. i. 8, 19; 2 Sam. vi. 17, and v. 7, 9; 1 Sam. xviii. 12 with Ruth iv. 17; Ruth i. 1 with Judg. xvii. 7, 8, 9, xiv. 1, 2 (Bethlehem-Judah); the use in Judg. xviii. 6, 8, of the phrase "the, man of God" (in the earlier books applied to Moses only, and that only in Deut. xxxii. 1 and Josh. iv. 6), may be com- pared with the very frequent use of it in the books of Samuel and Kings as the common designation of a prophet, whereas only Jeremiah besides (xxxiv. 4) so uses it before the Captivity. The phrase, "God

a De Wette's reasons for reckoning Kings as a separate work seem to the writer quite inconclusive. On the other hand, the book of Joshua seems to be an independent book. It avoids classes these books together as in the above (De W. i. 175), and calls them the great Book of the Kings."

b Eichhorn attributes Ruth to the author of the books of Samuel (Th. Parker's De Wette, ii. 329).

c In Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, it repeatedly occurs.
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Jo so to me, and more also," is common to Ruth, Samuel, and Kings; and "til they were ashamed," to Judges and Kings (Judg. iii. 23; 2 K. ii. 17, viii. 11). And generally the style of the narrative, orderly quiet and simple, but rising to great vigor and spirit when stirring deeds are described (as in Judg. vi. vii., xi., &c.; 1 Sam. iv. xvii., xxxi.-1 K. viii., xviii., xix., &c.), and the introduction of poetry or poetic style in the midst of the narrative (as in Judg. v. 1 Sam. ii. 2 Sam. i. 17, &c., 1 K. xxi. 17, &c.), constitute such strong features of resemblance as lead to the conclusion that these several books form but one work. Indeed the very names of the books sufficiently indicate that they were all imposed by the same authority for the convenience of division, and with reference to the subject treated of in each division, and not that they were original titles of independent works.

But to confine ourselves to the books of Kings.

We shall consider—

I. Their historical and chronological range.

II. Their peculiarities of diction, and other features in their literary aspect.

III. Their authorship, and the sources of their information.

IV. Their relation to the books of Chronicles.

V. Their place in the canon, and the references to them in the New Testament.

I. The books of Kings range from David's death and Solomon's accession to the throne of Israel, commonly reckoned as n. c. 1015, but according to Lepsius n. c. 933 (Ko1i14b. d. Egyjpt. p. 102); to the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the desolation of Jerusalem, and the burning of the Temple, according to the same reckoning n. c. 588 (n. c. 586, Lepsius, p. 107),—a period of 425 (or 405) years: with a supplemental notice of an event that occurred after an interval of 26 years, namely, the liberation of Jehoachin from his prison at Babylon, and a still further extension to Jehoiachin's death, the time of which is not known, but which was probably not long after his liberation. The history therefore comprises, the whole time of the Israelitish monarchy, exclusive of the reigns of Saul and David, whether existing as one kingdom as under Solomon and the eight last kings, or divided into the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah. It exhibits the Israelites in the two extremes of power and weakness; under Solomon extending their dominion over tributary kingdoms from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean and the border of Egypt (1 K. iv. 21); under the last kings reduced to a miserable remnant, subject alternately to Egypt and Assyria, till at length they were rooted up from their own land. As the cause of this decadence it points out the division of Solomon's monarchy into two parts, followed by the religious schism and idolatrous worship brought about from political motives by Jeroboam. How the consequent wars between the two kingdoms necessarily weakened both; how they led to calling in the stranger to their aid whenever their power was equally balanced, of which the result was the destruction first of one kingdom and then of the other; how a further evil of these foreign alliances was the adoption of the idolatrous superstitions of the heathen nations whose friendship and protection they sought, by which they forfeited the Divine protection—all this is with great clearness and simplicity set forth in these books, which treat equally of the two kingdoms while they lasted.

The doctrine of the Theocracy is also clearly brought out (see e. g. 1 K. iv. 7-11, xv. 24, 30, xvi. 1-7), and the temporal prosperity of the pious kings, as Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, stands in contrast with the calamitous reigns of Rehoboam, Ahaziah, Ahaz, Manasseh, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. At the same time the constancy of the kingdom of Judah, and the permanence of the dynasty of David, are contrasted with the frequent changes of dynasty, and the far shorter duration of the kingdom of Israel, though the latter was the more populous and powerful kingdom of the two (2 Sam. xxiv. 9). As regards the affairs of foreign nations, and the relation of Israel to them, the historical notices in these books, though in the earlier times scanty, are most valuable, and as has been lately fully shown (Rawlinson's Four Ointment Lectures, 1859), in striking accordance with the latest additions to our knowledge of contemporary profane history. Thus the patronage extended to Hadad the Edonite by Psinaesch king of Egypt (1 K. xi. 19, 20); the alliance of Solomon with his successor Pessuene, who reigned 35 years; the accession of Shishak, or Sennacherib, i., towards the close of Solomon's reign (1 K. xi. 40), and his invasion and conquest of the cities in the reign of Rehoboam, of which a monument still exists on the wall of Nebma (Ko1j14b. p. 114); the time of the Ethiopian kings So (Salab) and Tirhakah, of the 25th dynasty; the rise and speedy fall of the power of Syria; the rapid growth of the Assyrian monarchy which overshadowed it; Assyria's struggles with Egypt, and the sudden ascendency of the Babylonian empire under Nebuchadnezzar, to the destruction of Egypt and Assyria, as we find these events in the books of Kings, as exactly with what we now know of Egyptian, Syrian, Assyrian, and Babylonian history. The names of Omri, Jehu, Menahem, Hoshea, Hezekiah, etc., are believed to have been deciphered in the cuneiform inscriptions, which also contain pretty full accounts of the campaigns of Tighath-Pileser, Sargon, Senacherib, and Esarhaddon; Shalmaneser's name has not yet been discovered, though two inscriptions in the British Museum are thought to refer to his reign. These valuable additions to our knowledge of profane history, which we may hope will shortly be increased both in number and in certainty, together with the fragments of ancient historians, which are now becoming better understood, are of great assistance in explaining the brief allusions in these books, while they afford an irrefragable testimony to their historical truth.

Another most important aid to a right understanding of the history in these books, and to the filling up of its outline, is to be found in the prophets, and especially in Isaiah and Jeremiah. In the former the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, and of the contemporary Israelitish and foreign potentates, receive special illustration; in the latter, the history of Ahaz and Hezekiah, the dynasty of David, and Zedekiah, and those of their heathen contemporaries. An intimate acquaintance with these prophecies is of the utmost moment for elucidating the concise narrative of the books of Kings. The two together give us a fully full view of the events of the times at home and abroad.

It must, however, be admitted that the chronological details expressly given in the books of Kings form a remarkable contrast with their striking historical accuracy. These details are inexplicable and frequently entirely contradictory. The very
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first date of a decidedly chronological character which is given, that of the foundation of Solomon's Temple (1 K. vi. 1), is manifestly erroneous, as being irreconcilable with the evident fact of the antiquity of the times of the judges, or with St. Paul's calculation, Acts xiii. 20. It is in fact abandoned by almost all chroniclers, whatever school they belong to, whether ancient or modern, and is utterly ignored by Josephus. [CHRONOLOGY, vol. i. pp. 414-47.] Moreover, when the text is examined, it immediately appears that this date of 480 years is both unnecessary and quite out of place. The reference to the Exodus is gratuitous, and all the later notes of Blue, which refer merely to Solomon's accession. If it is left out, the text will be quite perfect without it, and will agree exactly with the resume in v. 37, 38, and also with the parallel passage in 2 Chr. iii. 2. The evidence therefore of its being an interpolation is wonderfully strong. But if so, it must have been inserted by a professed chronicler, whose object was to reduce the Scripture history to an exact system of chronology, which is manifestly therefore that we shall find traces of the same hand in other parts of the books. Now De Wette (F. I. II. p. 235), among the evidences which he puts forward as marking the books of Kings as in his opinion a separate work from those of Samuel, mentions, though erroneously, as 2 Sam. v. 4, 5 shows, the sudden introduction of "a chronological system" (die genaue Zeitrechnung). When therefore we find that the very first date introduced is erroneous, and that numerous other dates are also certainly wrong, because contradictory, it seems a not unfair conclusion that such dates are the work of an interpolator, trying to bring the history within his own chronological system: a conclusion somewhat confirmed by the alterations and omissions of these dates in the LXX. As regards, however, these chronological difficulties, it must be observed they are of two essentially different kinds. One kind is merely the want of the data necessary for chronological exactness. Such is the absence, apparently, of any uniform rule for dealing with the fragments of years at the beginning and end of the reigns. Such might also be a deficiency in the sum of the reign years of Israel as compared with the synchronistic years of Judah, caused by unnoticed interregna, if any such really occurred. And this class of difficulties may probably have belonged to these books in their original state, in which exact scientific chronology was not aimed at. But the other kind of difficulty is of a totally different character, and embraces dates which are very exact in their mode of expression, but are erroneous and contradictory. Some of these are pointed out below; and it is such which it seems reasonable to ascribe to the interpolation of later professed chroniclers. But it is necessary to give specimens of each of these kinds of difficulty, both with a view to approximating to a true chronology, and also to show the actual condition of the books under consideration.

(1.) When we sum up the years of all the reigns of the kings of Israel as given in the books of Kings, and then all the years of the reigns of the kings of Judah from the 1st of Rehoboam to the 6th of Hezekiah, we find that, instead of the two sums agreeing, there is an excess of 19 or 20 years in Judah—the reigns of the latter amounting to 261 years, while the former make up only 242. But we are able to get within half a year of this disagreement, because it so happens that the parallel histories of Israel and Judah touch in four or five points where the synchronisms are precisely marked. These points are (1) at the simultaneous ascensions of Jeroboam and Rehoboam; (2) at the simultaneous deaths of Jehoram and Ahaziah, or, which is the same thing, the simultaneous ascensions of Jehu and Athaliah; (3) at the 13th year of Amaziah, which was the 1st of Jeroboam II. (2 K. xiv. 17); (4) in the reign of Ahaz, which was contemporary with some part of Pekah's, namely, according to the text of 2 K. xvi. 3, the three first years of Ahaz with the three last of Pekah; and (5) at the 6th of Hezekiah, which was the 9th of Hoshea: the two last points, however, being less certain than the others, at least as to the precision of the synchronisms, depending as this does on the correctness of the numerals in the text.

Hence, instead of lumping the whole periods of 261 years and 242 years together, and comparing their difference, it is clearly expedient to compare the different sub-periods, which are defined by common termini. Beginning, therefore, with the sub-period which commences with the double accession of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, and closes with the double death of Ahaziah and Jehoram, and summing up the number of years assigned to the different reigns in each kingdom, we find that the six reigns in Judah make up 95 years, and the eight reigns in Israel make up 98 years. Here there is an excess of 3 years in the kingdom of Israel, which may, however, be readily accounted for by the frequent changes of dynasty there, and the probability of fragments of years being reckoned as whole years, thus causing the same year to be reckoned twice over. The 95 years of Judah, or even a less number, will hence appear to be the true number of whole years (see too Clinton, F. H. ii. 314, &c.).

Beginning again, at the double accession of Athaliah and Jehu, we have in Judah 7 + 4 + 11 first years of Amaziah = 61, to correspond with 28 + 17 + 16 = 61, ending with the last year of Jehosh in Israel. Starting again with the 15th of Amaziah = 1 Jeroboam II., we have 15 + 52 + 16 = 83 (to the 3d year of Ahaz), to correspond with 41 + 1 + 10 + 2 + 20 = 74 (to the close of Pekah's reign), where we at once detect a deficiency on the part of Israel of 9(174 = 12) years, if at least the 3d of Ahaz really corresponded with the 2th of Pekah. And lastly, starting with the year following that last named, we have 13 last years of Ahaz + 7 first of Hezekiah = 20, to correspond with the 9 years of Hoshea, where we find another deficiency in Israel of 11 years. The two first of the above periods may then be said to agree together, and to give 85 + 61 = 136 years from the accession of Rehoboam and Jeroboam to the 15th of Amaziah in Judah, and the death of Jehosh in Israel, and we observe that the discrepancy of 12 years first occurs in the third period, in which the breaking up of the kingdom of Israel began at the close of Jehu's dynasty. Putting aside the synchronistic arrangement of the years as we

a The MSS A B C have, however, a different reading, which is adopted by Lachmann [Tregelles] and Wordsworth.

b And it came to pass. In the fourth year
...and in 2 K. xv. 8, there would be no difficulty whatever in supposing that the reigns of the kings of Israel at this time were not continuous, and that for several years after the death of Zachariah, or Shallum, or both, the government may either have been in the hands of the king of Syria, or broken up amongst contending parties, till at length Menahem was able to establish himself on the throne by the help of Pals, king of Assyria, and transmit his tributary throne to his son Pekahiah.

But there is another mode of bringing this third period into harmony, which violates no historical probability, and is in fact strongly indicated by the fluctuations of the text. We are told in 2 K. x. 8, that Zachariah began to reign in the 38th of Uzziah, and (xv. 23) that his father Jeroboam began to reign in the 14th of Amaziah. Jeroboam must therefore have reigned 52 or 53 years, not 41: for the idea of an interregnum of 11 or 12 years between Jeroboam and his son Zachariah is absurd.

But the addition of these 12 years to Jeroboam's reign exactly equalizes the period in the two kingdoms, which would thus contain 86 years, and makes up 242 years from the accession of Rehoboam and Jeroboam to the 3d of Ahaz and 20th of Pekah, supposing always that these long-named years really synchroneous.

As regards the discrepancy of 11 years in the length of the period, nothing can in itself be more probable than that during some part of Pekah's life-time, or after his death, a period, not included in the regnal years of either Pekah or Hoshea, should have elapsed, when there was either a state of anarchy, or the government was administered by an Assyrian officer. There are also several passages in the contemporary prophets Isaiah and Hosea, which would fall in with this view, as Hos. x. 3, 7; Is. ix. 19-11. But it is impossible to assert peremptorily that such was the case. The decision must await some more accurate knowledge of the chronology of the times from heathen sources. The addition of these last 20 years makes up for the whole duration of the kingdom of Israel, 261 or 262 years, more or less. Now the interval, according to Lepsius' tables, from the accession of Sennachersib, or Shalman, to that of Sargon or Senacherib, is 17 years. Allowing Sennachersib to have reigned 7 years contemporaneously with Solomon, and Sargon, who reigned 12 years, to have reigned 9 before Shalmaner-as came up the same period against Sennacherib (235 + 7 + 9 = 261), the chronology of Egypt would exactly tally with that given here. It may, however, turn out that the time thus allowed for the duration of the Israelish monarchy is somewhat too long, and that the time indicated by the years of the Israelish kings, without any interregnum, is nearer the truth. If so, a ready way of reducing the sum of the reigns of the kings of Judah would be to assign 41 years to that of Uzziah, instead of 52 (as if the numbers of Uzziah and Jeroboam had been accidentally interchanged): an arrangement which interferes with no known historical truth, though it would disturb the double synchronism of the 3d of Ahaz with the 20th of Pekah, and make the 3d of Ahaz correspond with about the 9th or 10th of Pekah. Indeed it is somewhat remarkable that if we neglect this synchronism, and consider as one the period from the accession of Athaliah and Jehu to the 7th of Hezekiah and 9th of Hoshea, the sums of the reigns of the two kingdoms may not continue, and that we reckon 41 years for Uzziah, and 52 for Jeroboam, namely, 155 years, or 250 for the whole time of the Israelitish monarchy. Another advantage of this arrangement would be to reduce the age of Uzziah at the birth of his son and heir Jotham from the improbable age of 42 or 43 to 31 or 32. It may be added that the date in 2 K. xiv. 1, which assigns the length of Uzziah to the 27th of Jeroboam, seems to indicate that the author of it only reckoned 41 years for Uzziah's reign, since from the 27th of Jeroboam to the 1st of Pekah is just 41 years (see Lepsius's table, Königsb. p. 103 2). Also that 2 K. xii. 1, which makes the 12th of Ahaz = 1st of Hoshea, implies that the 1st of Ahaz = 9th of Pekah.

(2.) Turning next to the other class of difficulties mentioned above, the following instances will perhaps be thought to justify the opinion that the dates in these books which are intended to establish a precise chronology are the work of a much later hand or hands than the books themselves.

The date in 1 K. vi. 1 is one which is obviously intended for strictly chronological purposes. If correct, it would, taken in conjunction with the subsequent notes of time in the books of Kings, be intended to be correct also, to a year, the length of the time from the Exodus to the Babylonian Captivity, and establish a perfect connection between sacred and profane history. But so little is this the case, that this date is quite irreconcilable with Egyptian history, and is, as stated above, by almost universal consent rejected by chroniclers, even on purely Scriptural grounds. This date is followed by precise synchronistic definitions of the parallel reigns of Israel and Judah, the effect of which would be, and must have been designed to be, to supply the want of accuracy in stating the length of the reigns without reference to the old months. But these synchronistic definitions are in continual discord with the statement of the length of reigns. According to 1 K. xxii. 31 Alaziah succeeded Ahab in the 17th year of Jehoshaphat. This makes the length of Ahab's reign in xvi. 29, to the death of Jehoshaphat, according to 2 K. i. 17, Jehoram, the son of Alaziah, succeeded his brother (after his 2 years' reign) in the second year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, though, according to the length of the reigns, he must have succeeded in the 18th or 19th of Jehoshaphat (see 2 K. iii. 1), who reigned, in all, 25 years (1 K. xxiii. 3). As regards Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, the statements are so contradictory that Archbishop Usher actually makes three distinct beginnings to his regnal era: the first when he was made prince, to meet 2 K. i. 17; the second when he was associated with his father, 5 years later, to meet 2 K. viii. 18; the third when his sole reign commenced, to meet 1 K. xii. 24. In fact, as the primary purpose of these chronisms is to give an accurate measure of time, nothing can be more absurd than to suppose such variations in the time from which the commencement of the regnal year is dated. It may also be remarked that the whole notion of these joint of whom reigned 11 years, and the latter 41. But beyond the confusion of the names there is nothing to support such a notion.
reigns has not the smallest foundation in fact, and unluckily does not come into play in the only cases where there might be any historical probability of their having occurred, as in the case of Asa's illness and Uzziah's leprosy. From the length of Amaziah's reign, as given 2 K. xiv. 2, 17, 25, it is manifest that Jeroboam II. began to reign in the 15th year of Amaziah, and that Uzziah began to reign in the 16th of Jeroboam. But 2 K. xv. 1 places the commencement of Uzziah's reign in the 27th of Jeroboam, and the accession of Zachariah = the close of Jeroboam's reign, in the 38th of Uzziah — statements utterly contradictory and irreconcilable.

Other grave chronological difficulties seem to have their source in the same erroneous calculations on the part of the Jewish chronologist. For example, one of the cuneiform inscriptions tells us that Menahem paid tribute to Assyria in the 8th year of Tiglath-Pileser (Rav. Herod. i. 448), and the same inscription passes on directly to speak of the overthrow of Rezin, who we know was Pekah's ally. Now this is scarcely compatible with the supposition that the remainder of Menahem's reign, the 2 years of Pekahiah, and 18 or 19 years of Pekah's reign intervened, as must have been the case according to 2 K. xvi. 1, xx. 32. But if the invasion of Judaea was one of the early acts of Pekah's reign, and the destruction of Rezin followed soon after, then we should have a very intelligible course of events as follows. Menahem paid his last tribute to Assyria in the 8th of Tiglath-Pileser, his suzerain (2 K. xv. 19), which, as he reigned for some time under Pul, and only reigned 10 years in all, we may assume to have been his own last year. On the accession of his son Pekahiah, Pekah, one of his captains, rebelled against him, made an alliance with Rezin king of Syria to throw off the yoke of Assyria, in the course of a few months dethroned and killed Pekahiah, and reigned in his stead, and rapidly followed up his success by a joint expedition against Judah, the object of which was to set up a king who should strengthen his hands in his rebellion against Assyria. The king of Assyria, on learning this, and receiving Azah's message for help, immediately marches to Syria, invests Damascus, conquer s and kills Rezin, invades Israel, and carries away a huge body of captives (2 K. xvi. 20), and leaves Pekah to reign as tributary king over the sacked remnant, till a conspiracy deprived him of his life. Such a course of events would be consistent with the cuneiform inscription, and with everything in the Narrative scripture, except the synchronistic arrangement of the reigns. But of course it is impossible to affirm that the above was the true state of the case. Only at present the text and the cuneiform inscription do not agree, and few people will be satisfied with the explanation suggested by Mr. Rawlinson, that "the official who composed, or the workman who engraved, the Assyrian document, made a mistake in the name," and put Menahem when he should have put Pekah (Bibl. Lect. pp. 186, 409: Herod. i. 468-471).

Again, Scripture places only 8 years between the fall of Samaria and the first invasion of Judah by Sennacherib (2 K. xx. 27) = the 14th of Hezekiah). "The inscriptions (cuneiform; assigning the fall of Samaria to the first year of Sargon giving Sargon a reign of at least 15 years, and assigning the first attack on Hezekiah to Sennacherib's third year, put an interval of at least 18 years between the two events" (Rav. Herod. i. 479). This interval is further shown by reference to the canon of Ptolemy to have amounted in fact to 22 years. Again, Lepsius (Königl. p. 95-97) shows with remarkable force of argument that the 14th of Hezekiah could not by possibility fall earlier than n. c. 692, with reference to Tiribakh's accession; but that the additional date of the 3d of Sennacherib furnished by the cuneiform inscriptions, coupled with the fact given by Ierosus, that the year n. c. 693 was the year of Sennacherib's accession, fixes the year n. c. 691 as that of Sennacherib's invasion, and consequently as the 14th of Hezekiah. But from n. c. 691 to n. c. 586, when Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, is an interval of only 105 years; whereas the sum of the regnal years of Judah for the same interval amounts to 125 years. A from which calculations it necessarily follows, both that there is an error in those figures in the book of Kings which assign the relative positions of the destruction of Samaria and Sennacherib's invasion, and also in those which measure the distance between the invasion of Sennacherib and the destruction of Jerusalem. By whatever method, however, be noted that there is nothing to fix the fall of Samaria to the reign of Hezekiah but the statement of the synchronia; and 2 Chr. xxx. 6, 18, &c., seems rather to indicate that the kingdom of Israel had quite ceased in the 1st of Hezekiah.

Many other numbers have the same stamp of incorrectness. Jeroboam's age is given as 41 at his accession, 1 K. xiv. 21, and yet we read at 2 Chr. xiii. 7, that he was "young and tender-hearted" when he came to the throne. Moreover, if 41 when he became king, he must have been born before Solomon came to the throne, which seems improbable, especially in connection with his Amnonish mother. In the apocryphal passage moreover in the Cod. Vat. of the L.XX, which follows 1 K. xiii. 24, his age is said to have been 16 at his accession, which is much more probable. According to ver. 2, Uzziah's son and heir Jotham was not born till his father was 42 years old; and according to 2 K. xxii. 1, compared with ver. 19, Manasseh's son and heir Amon was not born till his father was in his 45th year. Still more improbable is the statement in 2 K. xviii. 2, compared with xvi. 2, which makes Hezekiah to have been born when his father was 11 years old; a statement which Bochart has endeavored to defend with his usual vast erudition, but with little success (Opera, i. 921). But not only does the incorrectness of the numbers testify against their genuineness, but in some passages the structure of the sentence seems to betray the fact of a later insertion of the chronological element. We have seen one instance in 1 K. vi. 1. In like manner at 1 K. xiv. 31, xv. 1, 2, we can see that at some time or other xv. 1 has been inserted between the two verses; for we may assume that ver. 9 has been inserted between 8 and 10; and xv. 24 must have once stood next to xii. 43, as xii.
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50 did to 2 K. vii. 17, at which time the corrupt ver. 16 had no existence. Yet more manifestly viii. 24, 26, were once consecutive verses, though they are now parted by 25, which is repeated, with a variation in the numeral, at ix. 29. So also xvi. 1 has been interposed between xv. 38 and xvi. 2. xxvii. 2 is consecutive with xvi. 20. But the plainest instance of all is 2 K. xi. 21, xii. 1 (xii. 1 ff., Heb.), where the words — "In the seventh year of John, Jehoshiah began to reign," could not possibly have formed part of the original sentence, which may be seen in its integrity 2 Chr. xxiv. 1. The disturbance caused in 2 K. xii. by the intrusion of this clause is somewhat disguised in the LXX. and the A. V. by the division of Heb. xii. 1 into two verses, and separate chapters, but is still palpable. A similar instance is pointed out by Movers in 2 Sam. v., where ver. 3 and 6 are parted by the introduction of ver. 4, 5 (p. 190). But the difficulty remains of deciding in which of the above cases the insertion was by the hand of the original compiler, and in which by a later chronologist.

Now when to all this we add that the pages of Josephus are full, in like manner, of a multitude of inconsistent chronological schemes, which prevent his being of any use, in spite of Habel's praises, in clearing up chronological difficulties, the proper inference seems to be, that no authoritative, correct, systematic chronology was originally contained in the books of Kings, and that the attempt to supply such afterwards led to the introduction of many erroneous dates, and probably to the corruption of some true ones which were originally there. Certainly the present text contains what are either conflicting calculations of antagonistic chronologists, or errors of careless copyists, which no learning or ingenuity has ever been able to reduce to the consistence of truth.

II. The peculiarities of diction in them, and other features in their literary history, may be briefly disposed of. The words noticed by De Wette, § 185, as indicating their modern date, are the following: 

for הָנָה for חָנָה, 1 K. xvi. 2. (But this form is also found in Judges, xii. 2. Jer. iv. 39, Ezek. xxxvi. 13, and not once in the later books.) לָשׁ for לָשָׁה, 1 K. xiv. 2. (But this form is also found in Judges, xii. 2. Jer. iv. 39, Ezek. xxxvi. 13, and not once in the later books.) לָשָׁה for לָשׁ, 2 K. i. 15. (But this form of לָשׁ is found in Lev. xv. 18, 21; Josh. xiv. 12; 2 Sam. xxiv. 21; 1 K. xix. 3. xii. 1 xiv. 10, xx. 11, xxvii. 2. Ez. xiv. 4, xxvii. 28.) לָשׁ for לָשָׁה, 1 K. i. 8. (But Jer. x. 8, xlix. 17, are identical in phrase and orthography.) לָשׁ for לָשָׁה, 2 K. xii. 13. (But everywhere else in Kings, e. g. 2 K. xii. 6, etc., לָשָׁה, which is also universal in Chronicles, an awkwardly later book; and here, as in לָשׁ for לָשׁ, 1 K. xii. 33, there is every appearance of the being a clerical error for the copulative ל; see Thesaurus, t. c.) לָשׁ for לָשָׁה, 1 K. xx. 14. (But this word occurs Lam. i. 1, and there is every appearance of its being a technical word in 1 K. xx. 14, and therefore as old as the reign of Ahaz.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 1 K. iv. 22. (But אָבַר is used by Ez. xiv. 14, and homer.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 1 K. xxi. 8. (On this see Kätner's Gramm. Heb. Gramm. Eng. tr. p. 6; Keil, Chron. p. 10; seems to have been then already obsolete.) 1 K. xii. 8. 11. (Occurs in Is. and Jer.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 2 K. xxv. 8. (But as the term evidently came with the Chaldees, as seen in Rab shahel, Rab-sara, Rab-mag, its application to the Chaldean general is no evidence of a time later than the person to whom the title is given.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 1 K. vii. 61, &c. (But there is not a shadow of proof that this expression belongs to later Hebr. It is found, among other places, in Is. xxxviii. 3; a passage against the authenticity of which there is also not a shadow of proof, except upon the presumption that prophetic intimations and supernatural interventions on the part of God are impossible.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 2 K. xviii. 7. (On what grounds this word is added it is impossible to guess, since it occurs in this sense in Josh., Is. Sam., and Jer.: vid. Gesen.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 2 K. xviii. 19. (Is. xxxvi. 4, Ezech. iv. 4.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 2 K. xviii. 26. (But why should not a Jer. in Hezekiah's reign, as well as in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, have called his mother—'the Javah language,' in opposition to the Aramaic? There was nothing in the Babylonish Captivity to give it the name, if it had not before: nor is there a single earlier instance — Is. xix. 18 might have furnished one — of any name given to the language spoken by all the Israelites, and which in later times was called Hebrew: Edom ski, Proleg. Ezech. ii. xxii. 38; John v. 2, &c.) אָבַר for אָבַר, 2 K. xxv. 6. (Frequent in Jer. iv. 12, xxxix. 5, &c.) Theod. Parker adds אָבַר (see too, Thesaurus, Edit. § 6), 1 K. x. 15, xx. 24; 2 K. xvii. 24, on the presumption probably of its being of Persian derivation; but the etymology and origin of the word are quite uncertain, and it is repeatedly used in Jer. ii., as well as Is. xxxvi. 9. With better reason might אָבַר have been added, 1 K. xii. 24. The expression אָבַר אָבַר, in 1 K. iv. 14 is also a difficult one to form an impartial opinion about. It is doubtful, as De Wette admits, whether the phrase necessarily implies its being used by one to the east of the Euphrates, because the use varies in Num. xxxii. 31, xxxii. 14; Josh. i. 14 ff., v. 1, ii. 17, xix. 7; 1 Chr. xxvi. 50; Deut. i. 1, 5, &c. It is also conceivable that the phrase might be used as a mere geographical designation by those who belonged to one of the provinces beyond the river subject to Babylon; and at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, Judas had been such a province for at least 23 years, and probably longer. We may safely affirm therefore, that on the whole the peculiarities of diction in these books do not indicate a time after the Captivity, or towards the close of it, but on the contrary point pretty distinctly to the age of Jeremiah. And it may be added, that the marked and systematic differences between the language of Chronicles and that of Kings, taken with the fact that all attempts to prove the Chronicles later than Ezra have utterly failed, lead to the same conclusion. (See many examples in Movers, p. 200 ff.) Other peculiar or rare expressions in these books are the proverbial ones: אָבַר for אָבַר, found only in them and in 1 Sam. xxv. 22, 34, "slept with his fathers," "him that dieth in the city, the dogs shall eat," etc.;
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13, Is. xxxix. 2. הָרָעֹ֖שׁ, part of Jerusalem so called, xxii. 14, Zeph. i. 10, Neh. xi. 9. תֹּ֖א דְּרֶתֶּרֶת, "signs of the Zodiac," xxiii. 5. סְּלֹּ֖שׁוֹ, "a suburb," xxiii. 11. יִֽשׁבָּ֖שׁ, "ploughmen," xxv. 12 (Cethib). אַ֣בּ, for יִֽשׁבָּ֖שׁ, "to change," xxv. 29. To which may be added the architectural terms in 1 K. vi., viii., and the names of foreign idols in 2 K. xvii. The general character of the language is, most distinctly, that of the time before the Babylonian Captivity. But it is worth consideration whether some traces of diastic varieties in Judah and Israel, and of an earlier admixture of Syriisms in the language of Israel, may not be discovered in those portions of these books which refer to the kingdom of Israel. As regards the text, it is far from being perfect. Besides the errors in numbers, some of which are probably to be traced to this source, such passages as 1 K. xxv. 6, v. 10, compared with v. 2; 2 K. xv. 30, xili. 16, xvii. 34, are manifest corruptions of transcribers. In some instances the parallel passage in Chronicles corrects the error, as 1 K. iv. 26 is corrected by 2 Chr. xxiv. 19-20 is corrected by 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3-7. The substitution of Azariah for Uzziah in 2 K. xxiv. 21, and throughout 2 K. xxv. 1-30, except ver. 13, followed by the use of the right name, Uzziah, in vv. 30, 32, 34, is a very curious circumstance. In Isaiah, in Zechariah (xv. 5), and in the Chronicles, except 1 Chr. lii. 12, it is uniformly Uzziah. Perhaps no other cause is to be sought than the close resemblance between יִֽשָּׂרֵאֶ֖ל and יִֽשָּׂרֵאֶל, and the fact that the latter name, Azariah, might suggest itself more readily to scribal error. There can be little doubt that Uzziah was the king's true name, Azariah that of the high-priest. (But see Thenius on 1 K. xiv. 21.)

In connection with these literary peculiarities may be mentioned also some remarkable variations in the version of the LXX. These consist of transpositions, omisions, and some considerable omissions, of all which Thenius gives some useful notices in his Introduction to the books of Kings.

The most important transpositions are the history of Shimeel's death, 1 K. ii. 36-46, which in the LXX. (Cod. Vaticanus) comes after iii. 1, and diversia scops from chapts. iv., v., and ix., accompanied by one or two remarks of the translators.

The sections 1 K. iv. 20-25, 2-6, 26, 21, 1, are strung together and precede 1 K. lii. 2-28, but are many of them repeated again in their proper places.

The sections 1 K. lii. 1, ix. 16, 17, are strung together, and placed between iv. 34 and v. 1.

The section 1 K. vii. 1-12 is placed after vii. 51. Section viii. 12-13 is repeated after 33.

Section ix. 15-22 is placed after x. 22.

Section xi. 43, xii. 1, 2, 3, is much transposed and confused in LXX. xi. 43, 44, xii. 1-3.

Section xiv. 1-21 is placed in the midst of the long addition to Chr. xii. mentioned below.
Section xxii. 42-50 is placed after xvi. 28. Chaps. xx. and xxi. are transposed.
Section xx. is placed after 2 K. i. 18.

The omission are few.
Section 1. vi. 11-14 is entirely omitted, and 37, 38, are only slightly altered to at the opening of ch. iii. The erroneous clause 1 K. xv. 6 is omitted; and so are the dates of Aaî's reign in xvi. 8 and 15; and there are a few verbal omissions of no consequence.

The chief interest lies in the additions, of which there are four, and these are the following. The supposed mention of a fountain as among Solomon's works in the Temple in the passage after 1 K. ii. 35; of a paved causeway on Lebanon, iii. 46; of Solomon pointing to the sun at the dedication of the Temple, before he uttered the prayer, "The Lord said he would dwell in the thick darkness," etc., xii. 12, 13 (after 53 LXX.), with a reference to the βιβλιόν τῆς ἀφίδος, a passage on which Thoain relies as proving that the Alexandrian had access to original documents now lost; the information that "Jeram his brother" perished with Tilibi, xii. 22; an additional date, "in the 24th year of Jeroboam," xv. 8; numerous verbal additions, as xi. 29, xvii. 1, &e.; and lastly the long passage concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat, inserted between xii. 24 and 25. There are also many glosses of the translator, explanatory, or necessary in consequence of transpositions, as e. g. 1 K. ii. 35, viii. 1, xi. 44, xvii. 20, xix. 2, &e. Of the above, from the recupitulatory character of the passage after 1 K. ii. 35, containing in brief the sum of the things detailed in ch. vii. 21-23, it seems far more probable that ΚΡΗΝΗ ΘΗΣ ΑΤΑΧΩΣ is only a corruption of ΚΡΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΙΑΛΑΜ, there mentioned. The obscure passage about Lebanon after ii. 46, seems no less certainly to represent what in the Hes. ix. x., 19, as appears by the triple concurrence of Tadmor, Lebanon, and ΣΗΡΑΙΜΩΝ, representing πορφύρας. The strange mention of the sun seems to be introduced by the translator to give significance to Solomon's mention of the sun's brightness in his son's glory. The works of Hiram which he had built for Gez, which he said He would dwell in the thick darkness; not therefore under the unveiled light of the sun; and the reference to "the book of song" can surely mean nothing else than to point out that the passage to which Solomon referred was Ps. xcviii. 2.
Of the other additions the mention of Tilibi's brother Jeram is the one which has most the semblance of an historical fact, or makes the existence of any other source of history probable. See too 1 K. xx. 19, 2 K. xv. 23. There remains only the long passage about Jeroboam. That this account is only an apocryphal version made up of the existing materials in the Hebrew Scriptures, after the manner of 1 Esdr., Bel and the Dragon, the apocryphal Esther, the Targums, etc., may be inferred on the following grounds. The framework of the story is given in the very words of the Hebrew narrative, and that very copiously, and the new matter seems to have been framed, and was the original one. The principal facts introduced, the marriage of Jeroboam to the sister of Shishak's wife, and his request to be permitted to return, is a manifest imitation of the story of Hadad. The misplacement of the story of Abijah's sickness, and the visit of Jeroboam's wife to Abijah the Siloite, makes the whole history out of keeping — the disguise of the queen, the rescue of Jeroboam's idolatry (which is accordingly left out from Abijah's prophecy, as is the mention at x. 2 of his having told Jeroboam he should be king), and the king's anxiety about the recovery of his son and heir. The embellishments of the story, Jeroboam's chariots, the amplification of Abijah's address to Aaî, the request asked of Pharaoh, the new garment not worked in silver, are precisely such as an embroiderer would add, as we may see by the apocryphal books above cited. Then the fusing down the three Hebrew names השעון, השעון and השעון, into one שמעון giving the same name to the mother of Jeroboam, and to the city where she dwelt, shows how comparatively modern the story is, and how completely of Greek growth. A yet phander indication is the confounding Shemaiah of 1 K. xii. 22, with Semaiah the Nehelamite of Jer. xxix. 24, 31, and putting Abijah's prophecy into his mouth. For beyond all question Erasmus, 1 K. xii. 22, is only an abbreviation of Αλασκροτιζήσῃ (Jer. xxxix. 24, LXX.). Then again the story is self-contradictory, if Jeroboam's child Abijam was not born till a year or so after Solomon's death, how could "any good thing toward the Lord God of Israel" have been found in him before Jeroboam became king? The one thing in the story that is more like truth than the Hebrew narrative is the age given to Rehoboam, 11 years, which may have been preserved in the MS. which the writer of this romance had before him. The calling Jeroboam's mother "paphyrion" instead of γυναῖκα was probably accidental.

On the whole then it appears that the great variations in the LXX. contribute little or nothing to the elucidation of the history contained in these books, nor much even to the text. The Hebrew text and arrangement is not in the least shaken in its main points, nor is there the slightest cloud cast on the accuracy of the history, or the truthfulness of the prophecies contained in it. But the variations illustrate a characteristic tenacity of the Jewish mind to make interesting portions of the Scriptures the groundwork of separate religious tales, which they altered or added to according to their fancy, without any regard to history or chronology, and in which they exercised a peculiar kind of ingenuity in working up the Scripture materials, or in inventing circumstances calculated as they thought to make the main history more probable. The story of Zerubbabel's answer in 1 Esdr. about truth, to prepare the way for his mission by Parus; of the discovery of the imposture of Bel's priests by Daniel, in Bel and the Dragon; of Mordecai's dream in the Apoc. Esther; and the paragraph in the Talmud inserted to connect 1 K. xvi. 34, with xvii. 1 (Smith's Σύγκρισις, vol. ii. p. 421), are instances of this. And the reign of Solomon, of which the remarkable rise of Jeroboam were not unlikely to exercise this propensity of the Hellenistic Jews. It is to the existence of such works that the variations in the LXX. account of Solomon and Jeroboam must most probably be attributed.

Another feature in the literary condition of our books must just be noticed, namely that the compiler, may be seen in Chronica in Literature, i. 226. The Talmud contains many more.
In arranging his materials, and adopting the very words of the documents used by him, has not always been careful to avoid the appearance of contradiction. Thus the mention of the staves of the ark remaining in their place "unto this day," 1 K. viii. 3, does not accord with the account of the destruction of the Temple 2 K. xxv. 3. The mention of Eliah as the only prophet of the Lord left, 1 K. xxii. xix. 10, has an appearance of disagreement with xx. 13, 28, 35, &c., though xviii. 4, xix. 18, supply, it is true, a ready answer. In 1 K. xxi. 15, only Naboth is mentioned, while in 2 K. ix. 26, his sons are added. The prediction in 1 K. xix. 15-17 has no perfect fulfilment in the following chapters. 1 K. xxii. 38 does not seem to be a fulfilment of xxi. 19. The declaration in 1 K. ix. 22 does not seem in harmony with xiv. 28. There are also some singular repetitions, as 1 K. xiv. 21 compared with 31; 2 K. ix. 24 with vii. 25; xiv. 15, 16 with xii. 12, 13. But it is enough just to have pointed these out, as no real difficulty can be found in them.

III. As regards the authorship of these books, but little difficulty presents itself. The Jewish tradition which ascribes them to Jeremiah, is borne out by the strongest internal evidence, as well as by an agreement to that of the LXX. The evidence chapter, especially as compared with the last chapter of the Chronicles, bears distinct traces of having been written by one who did not go into captivity, but remained in Judea, after the destruction of the Temple. This suits Jeremiah. The events singled out for mention in the concise narrative, are precisely those of which he had personal knowledge, and in which he took an active interest. The famine in 2 K. xx. 3 was one which had nearly cost Jeremiah his life (Jer. xxxvii. 9). The capture of the city, the flight and capture of Zedekiah, the judgment and punishment of Zedekiah and his sons at Riblah, are related in 2 K. xxxvi. 1-7, in almost the identical words which we read in Jer. xxxix. 1-7. So are the breaking down and burning of the Temple, the king's palace, and the houses of the great men, the desolation of Babylon of the fugitives and the surviving inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea. The intimate knowledge of what Nebuzardan did, both in respect to those selected for captive punishment, and those carried away captive, and those poor whom he left in the land, displayed by the writer of 2 K. xxv. 11, 12, 18-21, is fully explained by Jer. xxxix. 10-11, xl. 1-5, where we read that Jeremiah was actually one of the captives who followed Nebuzaradan as far as Ramah, and was very kindly treated by him. The careful enumeration of the pillars and of the sacred vessels of the Temple which were plundered by the Chaldeans, tallies exactly with the prediction of Jeremiah concerning them, xxvii. 19-22. The paragraph concerning the appointment of Gedaliah as governor of the remnant, and his murder by Ishmael, and the flight of the Jews into Egypt, is merely an abridged account of what Jeremiah tells us more fully, xl.-xxxii. 7, and are events in which he was personally deeply concerned. The writer in Kings has nothing more to tell us concerning the Jews or Chaldees in the land of Judah, which exactly agrees with the hypothesis that he is Jeremiah, who we know was carried down to Egypt with the fugitives. In fact, the date of the writing and the position of the writer seem as clearly marked by the termination of the narrative at v. 26, as in the case of the Acts of the Apostles. It may be added, though the argument is of less weight, that the annexation of this chapter to the writings of Jeremiah so as to form Jer. lii. (with the additional clause contained 25-30), is an evidence of a very ancient, if not a con temporaneous, editor of it. Again, the special mention of Seniah the high-priest, and Zephaniah, the second priest, as slain by Nebuzaradan (v. 18), together with three other priests, is very significant when taken in connection with Jer. xxxi. 1, xxxii. 23-24, passages which show that Zephaniah belonged to the faction which opposed the prophet, a faction which was healed by priests and also by the apostles (Acts xxvii. 7, 8, 11, 16). Going back to the xxvith chapter, we find in ver. 14 an enumeration of the captives taken with Jehoiachin identical with that in Jer. xxiv. 1; in ver. 13, a reference to the vessels of the Temple precisely similar to that in Jer. xxvii. 18-20, xxviii. 3, 6, and in vv. 3, 4, a reference to the idolatries and bloodshed of Manasseh very similar to those in Jer. lii. 34, xxx. 4-8, &c., a reference which also connects ch. xxiv. with xxi. 6, 19-16. In ver. 20 the hostile nations, and the reference to the prophets of God, point directly to Jer. xxv. 9, 20, 21, and the reference to Pharaoh Necho in ver. 7 points to ver. 19, and to xxxi. 1-12. Brief as the narrative is, it brings out all the chief points in the political events of the time which we know were much in Jeremiah's

---

a For a discussion of this difficulty see Naboth. Jer. The simplest explanation is that Naboth was stoned at Samaria, since we find the elders of Jeareel at Samaria, 2 K. x. 1. Thus both the spot where Naboth's blood flowed, and his vineyard at Jeareel, were the scene of righteous retribution.

b De Wette cites from Livy, Cincinnati, and Movers, 1 K. ix. 8, 9, comp. with Jer. xxxii. 8; 2 K. vili. 13, 14, comp. with Jer. vii. 13, 24; 2 K. xii. 12. comp. with Jer. xxii. 3; and the identity of Jer. iii. 2 with 2 K. xxiv. 18 ff., xxv., as the strongest passage in favor of Jeremiah's authorship, which, however, he repudiates, on the ground that 2 K. xxv. 27-30 could not have been written by him. A weaker ground can scarcely be imagined. Jer. xv. 1 may also be cited as connecting the compilation of the books of Samuel with Jeremiah. Compare further 1 K. vii. 51 with Jer. xi. 4.

c The last four verses, relative to Jehoiachin, are equally a supplement whether added by the author or by some later hand. There is nothing impossible in the supposition of Jeremiah having survived till the 51st of Jehoiachin's captivity, though he would have been between 80 and 90. There is something touching in the idea of this gleam of joy having reached the prophet in his old age, and of his having added these few words to his long-finished history of his nation.

d These priests, of very high rank, called ψευδοπροφηταὶ, or "keepers of the door," i. e. of the three principal entrances to the Temple, are not to be confounded with the porters, who were Levites. We are expressly told in 2 K. xii. 10 (A. V.) that these "keepers" were priests. 2 K. xxii. 4. xiii. 4, with xii. 10 and xxi. 19, they are put out of the rank of these officers as next in dignity to the second priest, a sagam. [Houg-Priest, vol. ii. p. 1009.] Josephus calls them τοὺς διακόνους τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἱερεῖας. The expression ψευδοπροφηταὶ, is however also applied to the Levites in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, 1 Chr. ix. 19. [Koö]
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mind; and yet which is exceedingly remarkable, Jeremiah is never once named (as he is in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 12, 21), although the manner of the writer is frequently to connect the sufferings of Judah with their sins and their neglect of the Word of God, 2 K. xviii. 13 ff., xxiv. 2, 3, &c. And this leading together, connecting, and placing in a prominent portion of the history which belongs to Jeremiah's times, and the writings of Jeremiah himself. De Wette speaks of the superficial character of the history of Jeremiah's times as hostile to the theory of Jeremiah's authorship. Now, considering the nature of these annals, and their coincidences, this criticism seems very unfounded as regards the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. It must, however, be acknowledged that as regards Jehoiakim's reign, and especially the latter part of it, and the way in which he came by his death, the narrative is much more meagre than one would have expected from a contemporary writer, living on the spot. But exactly the same pæan of information is found in those otherwise copious notices of contemporary events with which Jeremiah's prophecies are interspersed. Let any one open, e. g. Townsend's "Arrangement," or Genest's "Parallel Histories," and he will see at a glance how remarkably little light Jeremiah's narrative or prophecies throw upon the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign. The cause of this silence may be difficult to assign, but whatever it was, whether absence from Jerusalem, possibly on the mission described, Jer. xiii., or imprisonment, or any other impediment, it operated equally on Jeremiah and on the writer of 2 K. xxiv. When it is borne in mind that the writer of 2 K. was a contemporary writer, and, if not Jeremiah, must have had independent means of information, this coincidence will have great weight.

Going back to the reign of Josiah, in the xxii. and xxiii. chapters, the connection of the destruction of Jerusalem with Manasseh's transgressions, and the comparison of it to the destruction of Samauria, xv. 25, 27, lead us back to xxi. 10-14, and that passage leads us to Jer. vii. 15, xv. 4, xix. 3, 4, &c. The particular account of Josiah's passover, and his other good works, the reference in vv. 24, 25 to the law of Moses, and the finding of the Book by Hilkiah the priest, with the fuller account of that discovery in ch. xxiii., exactly suit Jeremiah, who began his prophetic office in the 15th of Josiah; whose xii. chap. refers repeatedly to the book thus found; and who showed his attachment to Josiah by writing a lamentation on his death (2 Chr. xxvi. 25), and whose writings show how much he made use of the copy of the Deuteronomy so found. [JEREMIAH, HILKIAH.] With Josiah's reign (although we may even in earlier times hit upon occasional resemblances, such for instance as the silence concerning Manasseh's repentance in both), necessarily cease all strongly marked characters of Jeremiah's authorship. For though the general unity and continuity of plan (which, as already observed, pervades not only the books of Kings, but those of Samuel, Ruth, and Judges likewise, lead us to assign the whole history in a certain sense to one author, and enable us to carry to the account of the whole book the proofs derived from the closing chapters, yet it must be borne in mind that the authorship of those parts of the history of which Jeremiah was not an eye-witness, that is, of all before the reign of Josiah, would have consisted merely in selecting, arranging, inserting the connecting passages, and adding necessary, slightly modernizing (see Thurston, "Editors" 4 14), those histories which had been drawn up by contemporary prophets through the whole period of time. See c. g. 1 K. xiii. 32. For, as regards the sources of information, it may truly be said that we have the narrative of contemporary writers throughout. It has already been observed [Chronicles] that there was a regular series of state-annals both for the kingdom of Judah and for that of Israel, which embraced the whole time comprehended in the books of Kings, or at least to the end of the reign of Jehoiakim, 2 K. xxiv. 5. These annals are constantly cited by name as "the Book of the Acts of Solomon," 1 K. xi. 41; and, after Solomon, "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, or Israel," c. g. 1 K. xiv. 21, xv. 7, xvi. 5, 14, 20; 2 K. x. 34, xxiv. 5, &c., and it is manifest that the author of Kings had them both before him, while he drew up his history, in which the reigns of the two kingdoms are harmonized, and these annals constantly appealed to. But in addition to these national annals, there were also extant, at the time that the books of Kings were compiled, separate works of the several prophets who had lived in Judah and Israel, and which probably bore the same relation to the annals, which the historical parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah bear to those portions of the annals preserved in the books of Kings, i. e. were, in some instances at least, fuller and more copious accounts of the current events, by the same hands which drew up the more concise narrative of the annals, though in others perhaps mere duplicates. Thus the acts of Uzziah, written by Isaiah, were very likely identical with the history of his reign in the national chronicles; and part of the history of Hezekiah we know was identical in the chronicle and in the prophet. The chapter in Jeremiah relating to the destruction of the Temple (hi.) is identical with that in 2 K. xxiv., xxv. In later times we have supposed that a chapter in the prophecies of Daniel was used for the national chronicles, and appears as Ezr. ch. 1, [Ezra, Book of.] Compare also 2 K. xvi. 5, with Is. xii. 1; 2 K. xii. 8, with Is. xii. 20. As an instance of verbal agreement, coupled with greater fulness in the prophetic account, see 2 K. xx. compared with Is. xxxiii., in which latter alone is Hezekiah's writing given.

These other works, then, as far as the memory of them has been preserved to us, were as follows (see Keil's Apology Vers.): For the time of David, the book of Nathan the seer, the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of God the seer (2 Sam. xx.-xxiv. with 1 K. 1, being probably extracted from Nathan's book), which seem to have been collected—at least that portion of them relating to David—into one work called "the Acts of David the King" 1 Chr. xxix. 29. For the time of Solomon, "the Book of the Acts of Solomon,"

"The prophet does not tell us that he returned to Jerusalem after his exile to the Captivity. This may have been spent among the Captivity at Babylon. [JEREMIAH, p. 152.] He may have returned just after Jehoiachin's death; and the king and the queen," in ver. 18, may mean Jehoiachin and his mother. Comp. 2 K. xxiv. 12, 15, which would be the fulfillment of Jer. xviii. 18, 19.
1. Acts seeing of in Chronicles time reign xvii., Nehu been of servilely, Oded, likely passage, LXX., "For Ahijah the book of the Chr."
2. The Chronicler says, as "the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," which in the parallel passage, 1. K. xv. 24, is called "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah." So again, 2. Chr. xxvii. 7, comp. with 2. K. xv. 36; 2. Chr. xxviii. 26, comp. with 2. K. xvi. 19; 2. Chr. xxxii. 32, comp. with 2. Chr. xxix. 20; 2. Chr. xxxii. 28; 2. Chr. xxxvi. 8, with 2. K. xxv. 5. Moreover the book so quoted refers exclusively to the affairs of Judah; and even in the one passage where reference is made to it as "the Book of the Kings of Israel," 2. Chr. xx. 34, it is for the reign of Jehoshaphat that it is cited. Obviously, therefore, it is the same work which is elsewhere described as the Chr. of Israel and Judah, and of Judah and Israel? Nor is this an unreasonable title to give to these chronicles. Saul, David, Solomon, and in some sense Hezekiah, 2. Chr. xxx. 1, 5, 6, and all his successors were kings of Israel as well as of Judah, and therefore it is very conceivable that in Ezra's time the chronicles of Judah should have acquired the name of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Even with regard to a portion of Israel in the days of Rehoboam, the Chronicler remarks, apparently as a matter of gratulation, that "Rehoboam reigned over them," 2. Chr. x. 17: he notices Abijah's authority in portions of the Israelitish territory, 2. Chr. xiii. 18, 19, xv. 8, 9; he not unfrequently speaks of Israel, when the kingdom of Judah is the matter in hand, as 2. Chr. xii. 1, xiv. 4, xxii. 2, &c., and even calls Jehoshaphat "King of Israel," 2. Chr. xx. 2, and distinguishes "Israel and Judah," from "Ephraim and Manasseh." XXX. 1: he notices Hezekiah's authority from Dan to Beer-shaba, 2. Chr. xxx. 5, and Josiah's destruction of idols throughout all the land of Israel, xxxiv. 6-9, and his passerover for all Israel. xxxv. 17, 18, and seems to parade the title "King of Israel" in connection with David and Solomon, xxxv. 3, 4, and the elevation of the Levites to "all Israel," ver. 3; and therefore it is only in accordance with the feeling displayed in such passages that the name, "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" should be given to the chronicles of the Jewish kingdom. The use of this term in speaking of the "Kings of Israel and Judah who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression," 1 Chr. ix. 1, would be conclusive, if the construction of the sentence were certain. But though it is absurd to separate the words "and Judah" from Israel, as Bertheau does (Kurzf. Exeg. Handsch.), follow ing the Masoretic punctuation, seeing that the "Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" is cited in at least six other places in Chr., still it is possible that Israel and Judah might be the antecedent to the pronoun understood before הָלוֹנִי.

It seems, however, much more likely that the antecedent to הָלוֹנִי is הָלוֹנִי מַעֲלֶה. On the whole, therefore, there is no evidence of the existence in the time of the Chronicler of a history, 

§ 8. It is cited in 2. Chr. xxvii. 23 as "the story" — the Midrash הָלוֹנִי of the book of the Kings Comp 2 K. xii. 19.
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since lost, of the two kingdoms, nor are the books of Kings the work so quoted by the Chronicler, except for the facts of the acts of Kings, when he has already given all that is contained in our books of Kings. He refers therefore to the chronicles of Judah. From the above authentic sources then was compiled the history in the books under consideration. Judging from the facts that we have in 2 K. xvi., xix., xx., the history of Hezekiah in the very words of Isaiah, xxxvi.-xxxix.; that, as stated above, we have several passages from Jeremian in duplicate in 2 K., and the whole of Jer. iii. in 2 K. xxiv. 18, &c., xxv.: that so large a portion of the books of Kings is repeated in the books of Chronicles, though the writer of Chronicles had the original chronicles also before him, as well as from the whole internal character of the narrative, and even some of the blemishes referred to under the 2d head; we may conclude with certainty that we have in the books of Kings, not only in the main the history faithfully preserved to us from the ancient chronicles, but most frequently whole passages transferred verbatim into them. Occasionally, no doubt, we have the compiler's own comments or reflections thrown in, at 2 K. xxi. 10-16, xvii. 10-13, xiii. 23, xvii. 7-41 &c. We connect the insertion of the prophecy in 1 K. xiii. with the fact that the compiler himself was an eye-witness of the fulfillment of it, and can even see how the words ascribed to the old prophet are of the age of the compiler. We can perhaps see his hand in the frequent repetition on the review of each reign of the remark, "the high places were not taken away, the people still sacrificed and burnt incense on the high places," 1 K. xii. 43; 2 K. ii. 3, xiv. 4, 45; cf. 1 K. iii. 3, and in the repeated observation that such and such things, as the staves by which the ark was borne, the revolt of Edom, etc., continue unto this day," though it may be perhaps doubted in some cases whether these words were not in the old chronicler (2 Chr. v. 9).

See 1 K. viii. 8, ix. 13, 21. x. 12, xii. 19; 2 K. ii. 22, xvii. 22, x. 27, xiii. 23, xiv. 7, xvi. 23, xvi. 43, 44, xlii. 25. It is, however, remarkable that in no instance does the use of this phrase lead us to suppose that it was perused after the destruction of the Temple; in several of the above instances the phrase necessarily supposes that the Temple and the kingdom of Judah were still standing. If the phrase then is the compiler's, it proves him to have written before the Babylonish Captivity; if it was a part of the chronicler he was quoting, it shows how exactly he transferred its contents to his own pages.

IV. As regards the relation of the books of Kings to those of Chronicles, it is manifest, and is universally admitted, that the former is by far the older work. The language, which is quite free from the Persianisms of the Chronicles and their late orthography, and is not at all more Aramaic than the language of Jeremiah, as has been shown above (I.), clearly points out its relative superiority in regard to that characteristic object of Israel as well as Judah, is another indication of its composition before the kingdom of Israel was forgotten, and before the Jewish annals to Samaria, which is apparent in such passages as 2 Chr. xx. 37, xxv., and in those chapters of Ezra (i.-iv.), which belong to Chronicles, was brought to maturity. While the books of Chronicles were therefore written especially for the Jews after their return from Babylon, the book of Kings was written for the whole of Israel, before their common national existence was hopelessly quenched.

Another comparison of considerable interest between the two histories may be drawn in respect to the main design, that design having a marked relation both to the individual station of the supposed writers, and to the peculiar circumstances of their country at the times of their writings.

Jeremiah was himself a prophet. He lived while the prophetic office was in full vigor, in his own person, in Ezekiel, and Daniel, and many others, both true and false. In his eyes, as in truth, the main cause of the fearful calamities of his countrymen was their rejection and contempt of the Word of God in his mouth and that of the other prophets; and the one hope of deliverance lay in their hearing the words to the prophets who still continued to speak to them in the name of the Lord. Accordingly, we find in the books of Kings great prominence given to the prophetic office. Not only are some fourteen chapters devoted more or less to the history of Elijah and Elisha, the former of whom is but once named, and the latter not once in the Chronicles; but besides the many passages in which the names and sayings of prophets are referred to (alike in both histories, the following may be cited as instances in which the compiler of Kings has noticed of the prophets which are peculiar to himself. The history of the prophet who went from Judah to Bethel in the reign of Jeroboam, and of the old prophet and his sons who dwelt at Bethel, 1 K. xiii.; the story of Ahijah the prophet and Jeroboam's wife in 1 K. xiv.; the prophecy of Jehu the son of Hanani concerning the house of Ahab, 1 K. xvi.; the reference to the fulfillment of the Word of God in the termination of Jehu's dynasty, in 2 K. xx. 12; the reflections in 2 K. xvii. 7-23; and above all, as relating entirely to Judah, the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery in 2 K. xx. as contrasted with that in 2 Chr. xxxix., may be cited as instances of that prominence given to the prophetic office and to the book of Kings, which is also especially noticed by De Wette, § 183, and Parker, transl. p. 233.

This view is further confirmed if we take into account the lengthened history of Samuel the prophet, in 1 Sam. (while he is but barely named two or three times in the Chronicles), a circumstance, by the way, strongly connecting the books of Samuel with those of Kings.

Ezra, on the contrary, was only a priest. In his days the prophetic office had wholly fallen into abeyance. That evidence of the Jews being the people of God, which consisted in the presence of prophets among them, was no more. But to the men of his generation, the distinctive mark of the continuance of God's favor to their race was the building of the Temple at Jerusalem, the restoration of the temple service and the Levitical worship, and the wonderful and providential renewal of the Mosaic institutions. The chief instrument, too, for preserving the Jewish remnant from absorption into the mass of heathenism, and for maintaining their national life till the coming of Messiah, was the maintenance of the Temple, its ministers, and its services. Hence we see at once that the chief care of a good and enlightened Jew of the age of Ezra,
and all the more if he were himself a priest, would naturally be to enhance the value of the Levitical ritual, and the dignity of the Levitical caste. And in compiling a history of the past glories of his race, he would as naturally select such passages as especially bore upon the sanctity of the priestly office, and showed the deep concern taken by their ancestors in all that related to the honor of God's House, and the support of his ministering servants. Hence the Levitical character of the books of Chronicles, and the presence of several detailed narratives not found in the books of Kings, and the more frequent reference to the Mosaic institutions, may most naturally and simply be accounted for, without resorting to the absurd hypothesis that the ceremonial law was an invention subsequent to the Captivity. 2 Chr. xxix., xxx., xxxi. compared with 2 K. xiii. is perhaps as good a specimen as can be selected of the distinctive spirit of the Chronicles. See also 2 Chr. xxvi. 10-21, comp. with 2 K. xv. 5; 2 Chr. xi. 13-17, xiii. 9-20, xv. 1-15, xiii. 2-8, comp. with 2 K. xi. 5-9, and xv. 18, 19, comp. with ver. 18, and many other passages.

Moreover, upon the principle that the sacred writers were influenced by natural feelings in their selection of their materials, it seems most appropriate that while the prophetic writings in Kings is very fully with the kingdom of Israel, in which the prophets were much more illustrous than in Judah, the Levitical writer, on the contrary, should concentrate all his thoughts round Jerusalem where alone the Levitical caste had all its power and functions, and should dwell upon all the instances preserved in existing monuments of the deeds and even the minutest ministrations of the priests and Levites, as well as of their faithfulness and sufferings in the cause of truth. This professional bias is so true to nature, that it is surprising that any one should be found to raise an objection from it. Its subserviency in this instance to the Divine purposes and the instruction of the Church, is an interesting example of the providential government of God. It may be further mentioned as tending to account simply and naturally for the difference in some of the narratives in the books of Kings and Chronicles respectively; that whereas the compiler of Kings usually quotes the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, the writer of Chronicles very frequently refers to those books of the contemporary prophets which we presume to have contained more copious accounts of the same reigns. This appears remarkably in the parallel passages in 1 K. xi. 41; 2 Chr. ix. 29, where the writer of Kings refers for "the rest of Solomon's acts," to the "book of the acts of Solomon," while the writer of Chronicles refers to "the book of Nathan the prophet" and "the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite," and "the visions of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat;" and in 1 K. xiv. 29, and 2 Chr. xii. 15, where the writer of Kings sums up his history of Rehoboam with the words, "Now the rest of the acts of Rehoboam are written in the Book of the Kings of Judah," whereas the chronicler substitutes "in the Book of Shemariah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer concerning genealogies," and in 1 K. xxi. 45, where "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" stands instead of "the Book of Jehu the son of Hanani," in 2 Chr. xx. 34. Besides which, the very formula so frequently used, "the rest of the acts of so and so, and all that he did," etc., necessarily supposes that there were in the chronicles of each reign, and in the other works cited, many things recorded which the compiler did not transcribe, and which of course it was open to any other compiler to insert in his narrative if he pleased. If then the chronicler, writing with a different motive and different predications, and in a different age, had access to the same original documents from which the author of Kings drew his materials, it is only what was to be expected, that he should omit or abridge some things given in detail in the books of Kings, and should insert, or give in detail, some things which the author of Kings had omitted, or given very briefly. The following passages which are placed side by side are examples of these opposite methods of treating the same subject on the part of the two writers:

### Fall in Kings

1 K. i. ii. give in detail the circumstances of Solomon's accession, the conspiracy of Adonijah, Joab, Abiathar, etc., and substitution of Zadok in the priest's office, in the same room of Abiathar, the submission of Adonijah and all his party, Joab's death, etc.

### Short in Chronicles

1 Chr. xxix. 22-24.

"And they made Solomon the son of David king the second time, and anointed him unto the Lord to be the chief governor, and Zadok to be priest. Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father, and prospered, and all Israel obeyed him. And all the princes and the mighty men, and all the sons likewise of king David, submitted themselves unto Solomon the king."

1 K. iii. 5-14.

Ver. 6. "And Solomon said, Thou hast shewed unto thy servant David my father great mercy, according as he walked before Thee in truth, and in righteousness, and in uprightness of his heart with Thee; and Thou hast kept for him this great kindness, that Thou hast given him a son to sit on his throne, as it is this day."

7, 8, 9, 10. "And the speech pleased the Lord, that Solomon had asked this thing."

11. "And God said unto him, etc."

12. "... and hast made me to reign in his stead."

2 Chr. i. 7-12.

Ver. 8. "And Solomon said unto God, Thou hast shewed great mercy unto David my father, and hast made me to reign in his stead."

11. "And God said to Solomon, etc."

12. "... any after thee have the like."

13. "Then Solomon came from his journey to the high place that was at Gibeon to Jerusalem, from before the tabernacle of the congregation, etc."
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Full in Kings. Solomon's judgment.


iv. 1. "So king Solomon was king over all Israel."

2-10. Containing a list of Solomon's officers.


xii. 2. "Who was yet in Egypt." The omission of the word "yet" in Chronicles of course accounted for by his flight from Egypt not having been narrated by the chronicler.


1 K. xvi. 18. "Then Asa took all the silver and the gold that were left in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house, and delivered them into the hand of his servants; and king Asa sent them to Benhadad the son of Tabrimon, the son of Hezaviah, king of Damascus, that dwelt at Damascus, saying, There is a league, etc."

2 K. xvi. 10-16. A detailed account of Ahaz's visit to Damascus, and setting up an altar in the temple at Jerusalem after the pattern of one at Damascus. Urijah's subterfuge, etc.

xx. 1-19. Hezekiah's sickness, prayer, and recovery, with Isaiah's prophecy, and the sign of the shadow on the dud; the visit of the Babylonish ambassadors; Hezekiah's pride, Isaiah's rebuke, and Hezekiah's submission and reign over Israel." Omitted in Chronicles.

2 Chr. xii. 1. "And it came to pass when Rehoboam had established the kingdom, and had strengthened himself, he forsook the law of the Lord, and all Israel with him."

2 Chr. xvi. 2. "Then Asa brought out silver and gold out of the treasures of the house of the Lord, and of the king's house, and sent to Benhadad king of Syria, that dwelt at Damascus, saying, There is a league, etc."

2 Chr. xxvii. 1-22. "And in the time of his distress did he trespass yet more against the Lord; this is that king Ahaz. For he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus which were in Damascus, he sent, because the gods of Syria help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me."

xxvii. 24-28. "In those days Hezekiah was sick to the death, and prayed unto the Lord, and he spoke unto him, and gave him a sign. But Hezekiah rendered not again according to the benefit done unto him; the message. Throughout the history of Hezekiah the narrative in 2 K. and Isaiah is much fuller than in Chronicles.


2 K. xxviii. 4-25. Detailed account of the destruction of Baal-worship and other idolatrous rites and places in Judah and Israel, by Josiah, "that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book that Hilkiah the high priest found in the house of the Lord."

In like manner a comparison of the history of the reigns of Jotham, (Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, and Zechariah, will show, that, except in the matter of Hezekiah's capture in the 4th year of his reign, and deportation or (towards) Babylon, in which the author of Chronicles follows Daniel and Ezekiel (Dan. i. 1, 2; Ez. xix. 9), the narrative in Chronicles is chiefly an abridgment of that in Kings. Compare 2 K. xxiii. 30-37, with 2 Chr. xxxvii. 1-5; 2 K. xiv. 1-7, with 2 Chr. xxxvii. 6-9; 2 K. xiv. 10-17, with 2 Chr. xxxvii. 10. From 2 Chr. xxxvii. 13, however, to the end of the chapter, is rather a comment upon the history in 2 K. xvi. 1-21, than an abridgment of it.

Under this head should be noticed also what may be called systematic abridgments; as when the statements in Kings concerning high-place worship in the several reigns (2 K. ii. 25. 3, xiv. 3, xiv. 3. 4, 4. 5, 35) are either wholly omitted, or more cursorily glanced at, as at 2 Chr. xxv. 2, xxvi. 12; or when the name of the queen-mother is omitted, as in the case of the seven last kings from Manasseh downwards, whose mothers are given by the author of Kings, but struck out by the author of Chronicles. 

Ammaziah, son of Jehoash, K. and Chr.

Uzziah. Jehoash, K. and Chr.

Jotham. Jerusha, K. and Chr.

Ahaz. Hezekiah, Abi, K. and Chr.

Manasseh Hezekiah, K.

Amon Nethaniah, K.

Josiah Hezekiah, K.

Jehoahaz Hananiah, K.

Jehoash Zedekiah, K.

Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar, K.

Zedekiah Hamutal, K.

The annexe of kings' mothers shows which are named in Kings and Chronicles, which in Kings alone.:

- Solomon son of Bathsheba, K. and Chr. (I. i. 5).

Abijam " Naamah, K. and Chr.

Asa " Michaiah or Michaiah, K. and Chr.

Ahab " Micaiah, dr. of Abii'am, K. and Chr.

Jehoshaphat " Azubah, K. and Chr.

Jehoram " Athaliah, K. and Chr.

Jotham " Zibiah, K. and Chr.

Josiah " Hananiah, K.

Ammaziah son of Jehoash, K. and Chr.

Uzziah. Jehoash, K. and Chr.

Jotham Jerusha, K. and Chr.

Ahaz. Hezekiah, Abi, K. and Chr.

Manasseh Hezekiah, K.

Amon Nethaniah, K.

Josiah Hezekiah, K.

Jehoahaz Hananiah, K.

Jehoash Zedekiah, K.

Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar, K.

Zedekiah Hamutal, K.

There is some
thing systematic also in the omitted or abbreviated accounts of the idolatries in the reigns of Solomon, Rehoboam, and Ahaz. It may not always be easy to assign the exact motives which influence a writer, who is abbreviating, in his selection of passages to be shortened or left out: but an obvious motive in the case of these idolatries, as well as the high-places, may be found in the circumstance that the idolatrous tendencies of the Jews had wholly ceased during the Captivity, and that the details and repetition of the same remarks relating to them were therefore less suited to the requirements of the age. To see a design on the part of the Chronicler to deceive and mislead, is to draw a conclusion not from the facts before us, but from one’s own prejudices. It is not criticism, but invention.

On the other hand, the subjoined passages present some instances in which the books of Kings give the short account, and the books of Chronicles the full one.

**Short in Kings.**

1 K. viii.

Ver. 10. "And it came to pass when the priests were come out of the holy place,

that the cloud filled the house of the Lord,

11. "So that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.

12. "Then said Solomon," etc.

**Full in Chronicles.**

2 Chr. v.

Ver. 11. "And it came to pass when the priests were out of the holy place: (for all the priests that were present were sanctified, and did not then wait by course:"

12. "Also the Levites which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jeduthun, with their sons and their brethren, being arrayed in white linen, having cymbals and psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them 120 priests, sounding with trumpets:"

13. "It came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanksgiving to the Lord; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever; then that the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord;"

14. "So that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God. Then said Solomon," etc.

---

a A curious incidental confirmation of the fact of this copious use of musical instruments in Solomon's time may be found in 1 K. x. 11, 12, where we read that Solomon made of the great plenty of alms- "which came from Ophir" 2 harps and psalteries for singers." Several able critics (as Ewald) have inferred from the frequent mention of the Levitical musical services, that the author of Chronicles was one of the singers of the tribe of Levi himself.

b This is obviously repeated here, because at this moment the priests sought to have entered into the house, but could not because of the glory.
Short in Kings. Fall in Chronicles.

KINGS, Afa's Jerusalem.

7. "And the rest of the acts of Abijam, and all that he did, are not written in the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah," etc.

8. "And Abijam slept with his fathers," etc.

1 K. xv.

12. (Ama) "took away the sodomites out of the land, and removed all the idols that his fathers had made."

Entirely omitted.

16-23 His war with Baasha.

23. "Nevertheless in the time of his old age he was diseased in his feet." 1 Kings 12:21.


1 K. xxii. 41-50.

"Jehoshaphat was 35 years old when he began to reign," etc. These verses are all the account of Jehoshaphat's reign, except what is contained in the history of Israel.

All omitted in Kings.

1 K. xxii. (from history of Israel) = 2 Chr. xviii.

All omitted in Kings.

2 Chr. xix.

Jehoshaphat's reproach by Jehu the son of Hanani. His renewal zeal against idolatry. His appointment of judges, and his charge to them. Priests and Levites appointed as judges at Jerusalem under Ama.

All omitted in Kings.

2 Chr. xx. 1-50.


2 K. ix. 27.

"And when Ahaziah the king of Judah saw this, he fled by the way of the garden-house. And Jehu followed after him, and said, Sit thee down also in the chariot. And they did so at the going up to Gur, which is by Ibleam. And he fled to Megiddo, and died there. And his servants carried him in a chariot to Jerusalem, and buried him in his sepulchre with his fathers in the city of David."

With reference to the above two accounts of the death of Ahaziah, which have been thought irreconcilable (Kwald, iii. 529; Parker's De Wette, 470; Theuren, etc.), it may be here remarked, that the order of the events is sufficiently intelligible if we take the account in Chronicles, where the kingdom of Judah is the main subject, as explanatory of the brief notice in Kings, where it is only incidentally mentioned in the history of Israel. The order is clearly as follows: Ahaziah was with Jehoram at Jeruel when Jehu attacked and killed him. Ahaziah escaped and fled by the Beth-gam road to Samaria, where the partisans of the house of Ahab were strongest, and where his own brethren were, and there concealed himself. But when the sons of Ahab were all put to death in Samaria, and the house of Ahab had hopelessly lost the kingdom, he determined to make his submission to Jehu, and send his brethren to salute the children of Jehu (2 K. x. 13), in token of his acknowledgment of him as king of Israel. Jehu, instead of accepting this submission, had them all put to death, and instanced on to Samaria to take Ahaziah also, who had probably learnt some of from the attendants

"Not, as Theuren and others, the children of Je
horam, and of Jezebel the queen-mother
as he already knew, was at Samaria. Ahaziah again took to flight northwards, towards Megiddo, perhaps in hope of reaching the dominions of the king of the Sidonians, his kinsman, or more probably to reach the coast, where the direct road from Tyre to Egypt would bring him to Judah. [Cesarea.] He was hotly pursued by Jehu and his followers, and overtaken near Hileani, and mortally wounded, but managed to get as far as Megiddo, where it should seem Jehu followed in pursuit of him, and where he was brought to him as his prisoner. There he died of his wounds. In consideration of his descent from Jehoshaphat, "who sought Jehovah with all his heart," Jehu, who was at this time very forward in displaying his zeal for Jehovah, handed over the corpse to his followers, with permission to carry it to Jerusalem, which they did, and buried him in the city of David. The whole difficulty arises from the account in Kings being abridged, and so bringing together two incidents which were not consecutive in the original account. But if 2 K. ix. 27 had been even divided into two verses, the first ending at "house," and the next beginning "and Jehu followed after him," the difficulty would almost disappear. Jehu's pursuit of Ahaziah would only be interrupted by a day or two, and there would be nothing the least unusual in the omission to notice this interval of time in the concise abridged narrative. We should then understand that the word also in the original narrative referred not to Jehoram, but to the brethren of Ahaziah; who had just before been smitten, and the death of Ahaziah would fall under 2 K. x. 17. If Beth-gan (A. V. "garden-house") was as usual, now Jezreel, it lay directly on the road from Jezreel to Samaria, and is also the place at which the road to Megiddo and the coast, where Cesarea afterwards stood, turns off from the road between Jezreel and Samaria. In this case the mention of Beth-gan in Kings as the direction of Ahaziah's flight is a confirmation of the statement in Chronicles that he concealed himself in Samaria. This is also substantially explained by the account of the Medonites in 2 K. xiv. 7-9 (p. 322, note 1, but not very successfully (םירעב) instead of הַסַּמְלָה.).

The other principal additions in the books of Chronicles to the facts stated in Kings are the following. In 2 Chr. xxiv. 17-24 there is an account of Joash's relapse into idolatry after the death of Jehoiada, of Zechariah's prophetic rebuke of him, and of the stoning of Zechariah by the king's command in the very court of the Temple; and the Syrian invasion, and the consequent calamities of the close of Joash's reign are stated to have been the consequence of this iniquity. The book of Kings gives the history of the Syrian invasion at the close of Joash's reign, but omits all mention of Zechariah's death. In the account of the Syrian invasion also some details are given of a battle in which Jehoshaphat was victorious, which are not mentioned in Kings, and repeated reference is made to the sin of the king and people as having drawn down this judgment upon them. But though the apostasy of Jehoash is not mentioned in the book of Kings, yet it is clearly implied in the expression (2 K. xii. 2), "Jehoash did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah all his days, wherein Jehovah instructed him." The silence of Kings is perhaps to be accounted for by the author following here the Chronicle of the Kings, in which Zechariah's death was not given. And the truth of the narrative in the book of Chronicles is confirmed by the distinct reference to the death of Zechariah, Luke xi. 49-51.

2 Chr. xxv. 3-16 contains a statement of a genealogical character, and in connection with it an account of the hiring of 100,000 mercenaries out of Israel, and their disposal by Amaziah in the bidding of a man of God. This is followed by an account (in greater detail than that in Kings) of Amaziah's victory over the Edomites, the plunder of certain cities in Judah by the rejected mercenaries of Israel, the idolatry of Amaziah with the idols of Edom, and his relapse by a prophet.

2 Chr. xxvi. 5-20 contains particulars of the reign of Uzziah, his wars with the Philistines, his towers and walls which he built in Jerusalem and Judah, and other statistics concerning his kingdom, somewhat of a genealogical character: and lastly, of his invasion of the priestly office, the resistance of Azariah the priest, and the leprosy of the king. All this nothing is mentioned in Kings except the fact of Uzziah's leprosy, and the latter part of his reign; a fact which confirms the history in Chronicles. The silence of the book of Kings may most probably be explained here on the mere principle of abridgment.

2 Chr. xxvii. 2-6 contains some particulars of the reign of Jotham, especially of the building done by him, and the tribute paid by the Ammonites, which are not contained in Kings.

2 Chr. xxviii. 17-19 gives details of invasions by Edomites and Philistines, and of cities of Judah taken by them in the reign of Ahaz, which are not recorded in Kings. 2 K. xvi. 5 speaks only of the hostile attacks of Rezin and Pekah. But 2 Chr. xxxix. xxx. contains by far the longest and most important addition to the narrative in the book of Kings. It is a detailed and circumstantial account of the purification of the Temple by Hezekiah's orders in the last year of his reign, with the names of all the principal Levites who took part in it, and the solemn sacrifices and musical services with which the Temple was reopened, and the worship of God reinstated, after the desuetude and idolatries of Ahaz's reign. It then gives a full account of the celebration of a great Passover at Jerusalem in the second month, kept by all the tribes, telling us that "since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there was not the like in Jerusalem;" and goes on to describe the destruction of idols both in Judah and Israel; the revival of the courses of priests and Levites, with the order for their proper maintenance, and the due supply of the daily, weekly, and monthly sacrifices; the preparation of chambers in the Temple for the reception of the titles and dedicated things, with the names of the various Levites appointed to different charges connected with them. Of this there is no mention in Kings: only the high religious character and zeal, and the attachment to the law of Moses, ascribed to him in 2 K. xviii. 4-6, is in exact accordance with these details.

2 Chr. xxxii. 2-8 supplies some interesting facts


b From 1 Chr. ix. 1, it appears that "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" contained a copious collection of genealogies.
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connected with the defense of Jerusalem, and its supplies of water, in Hezekiah's reign, which are not mentioned in 2 K. xxiii.

2 Chr. xxxiii. 11–19 contains the history of Manasseh's captivity, deportation to Babylon, repentance and restoration to his throne, and an account of his buildings in Jerusalem after his return. The omission of this remarkable passage of history in the book of Kings is perhaps one of the most difficult to account for. But since the circumstances are, in the main, in harmony with the narrative in Kings, and with what we know of the profane history of the times (as Keil has shown, p. 427), and since we have seen numerous other omissions of important events in the books of Kings, to disbelieve or reject it on that account, or to make it a ground of discarding the book of Chronicles, is entirely contrary to the spirit of sound criticism. Indeed all the sober German critics accept it as truth, and place Manasseh's captivity under Esarhaddon (Bertheau, in loc.). But Bertheau suggests that some support to the account may perhaps be found in 2 K. xxi. 17 ff. Moviers, while he defends the truth of Manasseh's exile to Babylon, attempts to raise up the story of his repentance, and reduces it to the level of a moral romance, such as the books of Tobit and Judith. But such a mode of explaining away plain historical statements of a trustworthy historian, who cites contemporaneous documents as his authority (let alone the peculiar character of the Biblical histories as "given by inspiration of God"), cannot reasonably be accepted. There is no doubtless some reason why the repentance of Manasseh for his dreadful and heinous wickedness was not recorded in the book of Kings, and why it was recorded in Chronicles: just as there is some reason why the repentance of the thief on the cross is only recorded by one evangelist, and why the raising of Lazarus is passed over in silence in the three first Gospels. It may be a moral reason: it may have been that Manasseh's guilt being permanent in its fatal effects upon his country, he was to be handed down to posterity in the national record as the Sinful King, though, having obtained mercy as a penitent man, his repentance and pardon were to have a record in the more private chronicle of the church of Israel. But, whatever the cause of this silence in the book of Kings may be, there is nothing to justify the rejection as non-historical of any part of this narrative in the book of Chronicles.

Passing over several other minor additions, such as 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12–14, xxxv. 25, xxxvi. 6, 7, 13, 17, it may suffice to notice the last place the circumstantial account of Josiah's Passover in 2 Chr. xxxv. 1–19, as compared with 2 K. xviii. 21–25. This addition has the same strong critical character that appears in some of the other additions, and contains the names of many Levites, and especially, as in so many other passages of Chronicles, the names of singers; but is in every respect, except as to the time, a confirmatory of the brief account in Kings. It refers, curiously enough, to a great Passover held in the days of Samuel (thus defining the looser expressions in 2 K. xiii. 24, "the days of the judges"), of which the memorial, like that of Josiah's terrible campaign in Edom (1 K. xi. 15, 16), has not been preserved in the books of Samuel, and enables us to reconcile one of those little verbal apparent discrepancies which are jumped at by hostile and unspeculative criticism. For the detailed account of the two Passovers at the return of Hezekiah and Josiah enables us to see, that, while Hezekiah's was most remarkable for the extensive fasting and joy with which it was celebrated, Josiah's was more to be praised for the exact order in which everything was done, and the fuller union of all the tribes in the celebration of it (2 Chr. xxx. 26, xxxv. 18, 2 K. xxi. 22). As regards discrepancies which have been imagined to exist between the narratives in Kings and Chronicles, besides those already noticed, and besides those which are too trifling to require notice, the account of the repair of the Temple by King Josiah, and that of the invasion of Judah by Hazael in the same reign may be noticed. For the latter, see Jos. xvii. As regards the former, the only real difficulty is the placing of the chest for the collection of contributions. The writer of 2 K. xxii. 19 seems to place it in the inner court, close to the brazen altar, and says that the priests who kept the door put therein all the money that was brought into the house of Jehovah. The writer of 2 Chr. xxiv. 8, places it apparently in the outer court, at the entrance into the inner court, and makes the princes and people cast the money into it themselves. Bertheau thinks there were two chests. Lightfoot, that it was first placed by the altar, and afterwards removed outside at the gate (ix. 374, 375), but whether, either of these be the true explanation, or whether rather the same spot be not intended by the two descriptions, the point is too unimportant to require further consideration in this place.

From the above comparison of parallel narratives in the two books, which, if given at all, it was necessary to give somewhat fully, in order to give them fairly, it appears that the results are precisely what would naturally arise from the circumstances of the case. The writer of Chronicles, having the books of Kings before him, and to a great extent making those books the basis of his own, but also having his own personal views, predilections, and motives, was writing for a different age and society, under very different circumstances; and, moreover, having before him the original authorities from which the books of Kings were compiled, as well as some others, naturally rearranged the older narrative as suited his purpose, and his tastes; gave in full passages which the other had abridged, inserted what had been wholly omitted, omitted some things which the other had inserted, including everything relating to the kingdom of Israel, and showed the color of his own mind, not only in the nature of the passages which he selected from the ancient documents, but in the reflections which he frequently adds upon the events which he relates, and possibly also in the turn given to some of the speeches which he records. But to say, as has been the rest of the acts, etc., comes in in both books. See 1 K. xiv. 23, 24, and 2 Chr. xxi. 11, 12 of this 1 K. xiv. 21, 22, compared with 2 Chr. xii. 16, xiii. 1, 2, is another striking proof. So is the repetition of rare words found in K. by the Chronicler. Comp 2 K. xiv. 11, with 2 Chr. xxvi. 21, 2 K. xx. 5 with Chr. xxvi. 21, 1 K. iv. 21 with 2 Chr. iv. 22.
sia or insinuated, that a different view of supernatural agency and Divine interposition, or of the Mosaic institutions and the Levitical worship, is given in the two books, or that a less historical character belongs to one than to the other, is to say what has not the least foundation in fact. Supernatural agency, as the school of the Temple of Solomon, 1 K. viii. 10, 11; the appearance of the Lord to Solomon, iii. 5, 11, ix. 2 ff.; the withering of Jeroboam's band, xiii. 3-6; the fire from heaven which consumed Elijah's sacrifice, xviii. 38; and numerous other incidents in the lives of Elijah and Elisha; the summiting of Samnachthi's army, 2 K. xix. 35; the going back of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz, xx. 11; and in the very frequent prophecies uttered and fulfilled, is really more often advanced in these books than in the Chronicles.

The selection therefore of one or two instances of miraculous agency which happen to be mentioned in Chronicles and not in Kings, as indications of the superstitious credulous disposition of the Jews after the Captivity, can have no effect but to mislead. The same may be said of a selection of passages in Chronicles in which the mention of Jewish idolatry is given. There are, however, reasons, because the truth is that the Chronicler does expose the idolatry of Judah as severely as the author of Kings, and traces the destruction of Judah to such idolatry quite as clearly and forcibly (2 Chr. xxxvi. 14 ff.). The author of Kings again is quite explicit in his references to the law of Moses, and has many allusions to the Levitical ritual, though he does not dwell so copiously upon the details. See e. g. 1 K. ii. 3, iii. 14, viii. 2, 4, 9, 53, 56, ix. 9, 20, x. 12, xi. 2, xii. 31, 32; 2 K. xi. 5-7, 12, xii. 5, 11, 13, 16, xiv. 6, xvi. 13, 15, xvii. 7-12, 13-15, 31-33, xviii. 4, 6, xxi. 4, 5, 8 ff., xxii. 21, 

* The selection of one or two instances of miraculous agency which happen to be mentioned in Chronicles and not in Kings, as indications of the superstitious credulous disposition of the Jews after the Captivity, can have no effect but to mislead. The same may be said of a selection of passages in Chronicles in which the mention of Jewish idolatry is given. There are, however, reasons, because the truth is that the Chronicler does expose the idolatry of Judah as severely as the author of Kings, and traces the destruction of Judah to such idolatry quite as clearly and forcibly (2 Chr. xxxvi. 14 ff.). The author of Kings again is quite explicit in his references to the law of Moses, and has many allusions to the Levitical ritual, though he does not dwell so copiously upon the details. See e. g. 1 K. ii. 3, iii. 14, viii. 2, 4, 9, 53, 56, ix. 9, 20, x. 12, xi. 2, xii. 31, 32; 2 K. xi. 5-7, 12, xii. 5, 11, 13, 16, xiv. 6, xvi. 13, 15, xvii. 7-12, 13-15, 31-33, xviii. 4, 6, xxi. 4, 5, 8 ff., xxii. 21, 

§ The miracle of the loaves and fishes (Luke ix. 18, 19 K. iv. 12; John vii. 9, 2 K. iv. 43), and the catching of the fish (Philip, Acts vii. 39, 40, as compared with 1 K. xviii. 12. 2 K. ii. 16, are also, in a different way N. T. references to the books of Kings.
Indeed he disappointed: but if we are content to read accurate and truthful history, ready to fit into its proper place whenever the exact chronology of the times shall have been settled from other sources, then we shall assuredly find they will abundantly repay the most laborious study which we can bestow upon them.

But it is for their deep religious teaching, and for the insight which they give us into God's providential and moral government of the world, that they are above all valuable. The books which describe the wisdom and the glory of Solomon, and yet record his fall; which make us acquainted with the painful ministry of Elijah, and his translation into heaven; and which tell us how the most magnificent temple ever built for God's glory, and of which He vouchsafed to take possession by a visible symbol of his presence, was consigned to the flames and desolation, for the sins of those who worshipped in it, read us such lessons concerning both God and man, as are the best evidence of their divine origin, and make them the richest treasure to every Christian man.


A. C. H.

* Other commentaries and helps. — Among the older writers may be mentioned Theodoret, Quaest. in libros iii. et iv. Regum; (Opp. vol. i. cxii. Schultze et Nisselt, 1789); Seb. Schneider, Alt-Test. in libros Prophet. (1805); Calvin, Comment. libri resp., etc. vol. ii. (1724); Jo. Clericus (Le Clerc), Vetus Test. libri historici, etc. (1735); H. Patrick, Comm. on the Hist. Books of the O. T., 5th ed., vol. ii. (1738); and the commentators in the Critici Sacri, tom. ii. pp. 633-678 (1700).

The principal later writers are Maurer, Comm. Crit. i. 198-231 (1835); Thenius, Die Bücher der Könige erklärt (Lief. ix. der Königsc. exeg. Hans.; 1850); K. P. Keil, Bücher der Könige (1818), Eng. trans. Edin. 1857; and also Comm. ub. die Bücher der Könige (Theil ii. 1882.iii. of the Bibl. Comm. ub. das A. Test. by Keil and Holtzsch.; Vaihinger, König, Bücher der, in Herzog's Real-Encyk. viii. 2-8 (1857); Wordsworth, Books of Kings, etc., in his Holy Bible, with Notes and Introductions, vol. iii. (1856); and Dr. کی (735); and Dr. کی (1853). For a long list of writers on single difficult passages in Kings, see Danz's Universi-Wörterb., p. 355 f. De Wette's German translation of these books (in his Heilige Schrifte, 4th Aufl., 1838) and the French translation of H. A. Perrot-Gentil, publ. by the Société Biblique Protétestante (Paris, 1866), embody the results of the best modern scholarship. The latter is times and it is the first publication of considerable value, accompanied with notes, are those of Patthe, Libri bibl. Vetus Test. (1871); J. D. Michaelis, Deutsche Werke d. A. Test. Theil 1. (1875); and S. Clemen, La Bible, trad. var. tom. viii. (Paris, 1896).

For historical sketches derived to a great extent from these books, see John's Hebrew Commons, vol. iii. pp. 82-134 (Andover, 1828); Milman's History of the Jews, i. 319-451 (Amer. ed.: 1851); Holley, Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures, ii. 44-146 (Boston, 1852); Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church, vol. ii. Lect. xxv.-xl.; Bertheau, Zur Geschichte der Bruchst. pp. 304-357; Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, Bd. iii., 3. Aufl. (1866); and (other articles König in Herzog's Real-Encyk. viii. 8-16. Of a kindred character is the valuable chapter on "Könige" in Saxemburg's Das Moschtische Recht, i. 72-83. Newman's Hist. of the Hebrew Monarchy (24 ed. Lond. 1853) is written from a purely naturalistic stand-point. For the connection of the Hebrews with Nineveh and Babylon during this period of the Hebrew monarchy, we have M. von Niebuhr's Gesch. Asar's und Ebdel's, pp. 54, 85 f., 164, 214, &c.; Oppert and Menant's Les États de Sargon (Paris, 1863); Oppert's Inscriptions des Sargonides (Versailles, 1863); Rawlinson's Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern Worlds, especially vol. ii. and iii. (Lond. 1864, 1865); and Layard's Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, especially ch. xxv. (Lond. 1853). G. Rawlinson touches on this last topic in his Bampton Lectures (already referred to) on the Bible, on the sources of these books, the work of Wolff and others referred to under the art. CHRONOLOGY, vol. i. p. 451, and Richter, Sargon u. Sargon Edwin der, in der. Zeit. Stud. u. Krit. 1868, pp. 683-698.

Of the Introductions to the O. T., those in particular of Haverick (ii. 148-226) and (Lectures, 1866) and (Lectures, 1806) furnish a good outline of the questions relating to the authorship, sources, and historical character of the Books of Kings. See also Davidson's Introd. to the Old Test. ii. 1-16 (1862), and (Andover, 1856), and (1824, 1866). It will be borne in mind that the interest of these chronicles centres largely in the personal character and history of those who are mentioned in them. The reader therefore will find important aid for the study of these books in the articles on the names in the Dictionary (Solomon, Jeroboam, John, Elijah, Elisha, Abiah, Jehoram, Heziah, Manasseh, Isaiah, and others), which represent this period of Hebrew history. The copious articles on JUDAH, KINGDOM OF, and ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF, may be consulted for the same purpose.

* KINRED is the reading of the original edition of the A. V. (A. ed. 1611) in all the passages in which "kindred" now stands in later editions. This substitution is due to the copyists which illustrate the "large amount of tarit and unacknowledged revision" which the English Scriptures have gradually undergone. See Trench, "Authorized Version," p. 63 (2d ed.).

* KINRIDS in the A. V. ed. 1611 has also (as above) given place in later editions to "kinreds," in the sense of families or tribes.

The original terms are in the OT. הַשֵּׁם (1 Chr. xvi. 28; Ps. xxxii. 27, &c.), and in the T. נַעֲרֵי (Acts iii. 25) and פָּנָאי (Rev. i. 7, vii. 9, &c.).

KIR (קֵר, קִר, קיר) [wall, walled place]: [Am. i. 5] "Kaphar [ix. 7, בָּשַׁר; Ia., LXX. omit. 2 K. xvi. 9, Rom. Vat. omit. 2 K. xvi. 9, Vulg. "Corne," is mentioned by Amos (ix. 7) as the land from which the Syrians (Aramanans) were once "brought
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Ps. xlvii. 2; Is. i. 29, &c. &c.), and 2 in the book of Ezra, either in speaking of Samaria (iv. 10), or in the letter of the Samaritans (iv. 12-21), implying that it had become a provincialism. In this it is unlike Ir, which is the ordinary term for a city in narrative or chronicle, while it enters into the composition of early names in a far smaller proportion of cases. For illustration—though for that only—Kirjath may perhaps be compared to the word "burg," or "bury," in our own language.

Closely related to Kirjath is Kereth (קֵרְתֵּש), apparently a Phoenician form, which occurs occasionally (Job xxix. 7; Prov. viii. 3). This is familiar to us in the Latin garb of Cardagno, and in the Partian and Armenian names Cirto, Piriano-Certia (Bochart, Chaldaica, ii. cap. x.; Genesis, Thes. 1236-37).

As a proper name it appears in the Bible under the forms of Kirioth, Kartah, Kartan; besides those immediately following.

G.

Kirjatha'im (כִּרְתָּהִים), but in the Cethib of Ez. xxv. 9, כֵּרְתָּהִים [two cites]: Ḡarwás, in Vat. [rather, Rom.] of Jer. xlviii. 1; [Vat. here] and elsewhere with Alex. Ḡarwás: [FA. in Jer., xliv. 23, Ḡarwás: Corineth], one of the towns of Moab which were the "glory of the country;" named amongst the denominations of Jeremian (xlviii. 1, 23) and Ezekiel (xxv. 9). It is the same place as Kirjatha'im, in which form the name elsewhere occurs in the A. V. Taken as a Hebrew word this would mean "double city;" but the original reading of the text of Ez. xxv. 9, Kirjathaim, taken with that of the Vat. LXX. at Num. xxxii. 37, prompts the suspicion that that may be nearer its original form, and that the men — the Hebrew dual — is a later accommodation, in obedience to the ever-existing tendency in the names of places to adopt an intelligible shape. In the original edition (A. D. 1611) of the A. V. the name Kirjath, with its compounds, is given as Kirjath, the yod being there, as elsewhere in that edition, represented by i. Kirjathaim is one of the few of these names which in the subsequent editions have escaped the alteration of i to y.

G.

Kirithhariaius (Қaρίθθαίαίου), Vat. Καρίθθαράιαος; Alex. Καρίθθαράιαος: Ceritippus; 1 Esdr. v. 19. [Kirjath-searim, and K. Aim.]

Kirjoth (כִּרְתּות), with the definite article, i. e. hab-Kerjoth [the cities]: אֵי צִבְיָה כִּרְתּות: Caribot, a place in Moab the palace of which were denounced by Amos with destruction by fire (Am. ii. 2); unless indeed it be safer to treat the word as meaning simply "the cities" — which is probably the case also in Jer. xlviii. 41, where the word is in the original exactly similar to the above, though given in the A. V. "Kirich." [Kerioth].

G.

Kirjath (כִּרְתָּה), [city]: ָּיָרְפִּים; [Vat. ָּיָרְפִּים]: Alex. πόλις ָּיָרְפִּים: Corinth, the last of the cities enumerated as belonging to the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xvii. 29), one of the group which contains both Gibson and Jerusalem. It is named with Gibeah, but without any copulative — "Gibeah, Kirjath," a circumstance which, in the absence of any further mention of the place, has given rise to several explanations. (1.) That of
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Eusebius in the Onomasticon (Καρπαθία), that it was under the protection of Gibeath (ὃ χρηστάν σταυρίζων Γαβάδα). This, however, seems to be a mere supposition. (2.) That of Schwarz and others, that the two names form the title of one place, "Gibeath-Kirjatha" (the hill-town). Against this is the fact that the towns in this group are summoned up as 14; but the objection has not much force, and there are several considerations in favor of the view. [See Eusebius, p. 214 n.]

But whether there is any connection between these two names or not, there seems a strong probability that Kirjath is identical with the better known place Kirjath-Jearim, and that the latter part of the name has been omitted by copyists at some very early period.

Such an omission would be very likely to arise from the fact that the word for "cities," which in Hebrew follows Kirjath, is almost identical with Jearim; and that it has arisen we have the testimony of the LXX. in both MSS. (the Alex. most complete), as well as of some Hebrew MSS. still existing (Davidson, Hebr. Text, ad loc.). In addition, it may be asked why Kirjath should be in the "construct state" if no word follows it to be in construction with? In that case it would be Kiriah. True, Kirjath-jearim is enumerated as a city of Judah (Jos. xxv. 9, 10, 11); but so are several towns which were Simeon's and Dan's, and it is not to be supposed that these places never changed hands.

G. KIRJATHAIM (בִּקְרְיָת-יָיִם) [two cities], the name of two cities of ancient Palestine.

1. (Καρπαθία: [Vat. Καρπαθία] (in Num.), Καρπαθία: [Alex. Καρπαθία] Kirjathaim.) On the east of the Jordan, one of the places which were taken possession of and rebuilt by the Reubenites, and had fresh names conferred on them (Num. xxxii. 57, and see 38). Here it is mentioned between Ebelah, Nebo, and Beth-meon, the first and last of which are known with some tolerable degree of certainty. But on its next occurrence (Josh. xiii. 19) the same order of mention is not maintained, and it appears in company with Michmash and Shimna, of which at present nothing is known. It is possibly the same place as that which gave its name to the ancient Shaveh-Kirjathaim, though this is mere conjecture. It existed in the time of Jeremiah (xlvii. 1, 23) and Ezekiel xxxv. 14—in these three passages the A.V. gives the name Kirjathaim. Both these prophets include it in their denunciations against Moab, in whose hands it then was, prominent among the cities which were "the glory of the country" (Ezr. xxv. 9).

By Eusebius it appears to have been well known. a

a The text now stands בִּקְרְיָת-יָיִם; in the above view it originally stood בִּקְרְיָת יָיִם

b It is as well to observe, though we may not be able yet to draw any inference from the fact, that on both occasions of its being attributed to Judah, it is called by another name. — "Kirjath-baal, which is Kirjath-jearim.

c This reading of the LXX suggests that the dual termination "ain" may have been a later accommodation of the name to Hebrew forms, as was possibly the case with Jerusalim (vol. ii. p. 1272). It is supported there are several considerations in favor of the view. [See Eusebius, p. 14, and the Vat. Roman.] Ixx. of Jer. xviii. I. [Kirjathaim.]

d There is some uncertainty about Burekhardt's name at this part. In order to see Mad-bah, which is shown on the maps as nearly S. of Hebron, he left the great road at the latter place, and went through Betul, es-Nemeh, and other places which are shown as on the road eastward, in an entirely different direction from Madba, and then after 8 hours, without noting any change of direction, he arrives at Madba, which appears from the maps to be only about 11 hour from Ittin.

e The following is the full synonym of this Targum for Kirjathaim: "And the city of two streets paved with marble, the same is Berosha." [Str. 11, 1437.] This is almost identical with the rendering given in the same Targum on Num. xxii. 39, for Kirjath-Huzoth. Can Berosha contain an allusion to the modern Jerash? 1654

KIRJATH-ARBA (בִּקרְיָת-אֵרָבָא) and once, Neh. xi. 25, 227 N [see in the art.]: παλαι Ἀρβῶν, π. Ἀρβῶν: Alex. [Ἀρβῶν, Ἀρβῆκα, Ἀρβὸν] Αρβὸν and Ἀρβᾶ: Καρπαθανάκος [Vat. Καρπαθανάκος]; Καρπαθαβάκοσφερ, but Mai Καρπαθαβάκοφερ;
Alex. Karada'abh (in Neb. Karada'ap-
Bh; Vat. FA; Karada'ap, Alex. Karada'abho!)
Contra Arba, an anagram of the name of the city which after the conquest is generally known as Hbron (Josh. xiv. 13; Judg. i. 10). Possibly, however, not Kirjath-arba, but MAMRE, was its earliest appellation (Gen. xxv. 27), though the latter name may have been that of the sacred grove near the town, which would occasionally transfer its title to the whole spot. {MAMRE.}

The identity of Kirjath-Arba with Hebron is constantly asserted (Gen. xxii. 2, xxxv. 27; Josh. xiv. 15, xv. 13, 54, xx. 7, xxi. 11), the only mention of it without that qualification being, as is somewhat remarkable, after the return from the Captivity (Neh. xi. 25), a date so late that we might naturally have supposed the aboriginal name would have become extinct. But it lasted far longer than that, for when Sir John Maundeville visited the place (cir. 1322) he found that "the Saracens call the place a place that the Jews call it Arboth" (Early Trav. p. 161). Thus too in Jerome's time would Debrir seem to have been still called by its original title, Kirjath-Sepher. So impossible does it appear to extinguish the name originally bestowed on a place?

The signification of Kirjath-Arba is, to say the least, unsatisfactory. In favor of its being derived from some ancient hero is the statement that "Arba was the great man among the Anakim" (Josh. xiv. 15) — the "father of Anak" (xxi. 11). Against it are the peculiarity of the expression in the first of these two passages, where the term Adam (הַדָּם הַנַּחַל) — usually employed for the species, the human race — is used instead of Ish, which commonly denotes an individual. (b.) The consideration that the term "father" is a metaphor frequently employed in the Bible — as in other oriental writings — for an originator or author, whether of a town or a quality, quite as often as of a human being. (c.) The LXX. certainly so understood both the passages in Joshua, since they have in each μητροπόλις, "mother-city." (c.) The constant tendency to personification so familiar to students of the topographical philology of other countries than Palestine, and which in the present case must have had some centuries in which to exercise its influence. In the lists of 1 Chron. Hebron itself is personified (li. 42) as the son of Maresiah, a neighboring town, and the father of Tappnah and other places in the same locality; and the same thing occurs with Beth-zur (ver. 45), Ziph (42), Madmannah and Gibeah (49); etc. etc. (d.) On more than one occasion (Gen. xxxv. 27; Josh. xiv. 13; Neh. xi. 25) the name Arba has the definite article prefixed to it. This is very rarely, if ever, the case with the name of a man (see Rod. Pol. p. 724). (e.) With the exception of the

---

In Gen. xxxv. 27, the A. V. has "the city of Ar-bah;" in Josh. xiv. 13, and xxi. 11, "the city of Arba" but "Ar'bah," ed. 1011, in xxi. 11. A curious parallel to this terminology is found in our own country, where many a village is still known to its rustic inhabitants by the identical name by which it is inscribed in Domesday Book, while they are actually unaware of the later name by which the place has been currently known in maps and documents, and in the general language of all but their own class for centuries. If this is the case with Kirjath-Arba and Hebron, the occurrence of the former in Heb-
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KIRJATH-JEARIM, P; πόλις Καριαθαρίμ (city of forests), and once πόλις Καριαθῆρια; Alex, the same, excepting in some cases the termination σια; [Vat. σια, πολις] there are other variations not here noticed; J. Joseph, Kariathaim: Carithathara, a city which played a not unimportant part in the history of the Chosen People. We first encounter it as one of the four cities of the Gileadites (Josh. iv. 15); it next occurs as one of the landmarks of the northern boundary of Judah (xx. 9), and as the point at which the western and southern boundaries of Benjamin coincided (xviii. 14, 15); and in the last two passages we find it

KIRJATH-JEARIM — in 1 Chr. xiii. 6, the Vulgate has Collis Carithatharim, and in the Hebrew name it is Kiriath-Jearim, not Kirjath-Jearim; and in the preceding verse, 5, it is Kiriath-Jearim. In 2 Sam. xvi. 1, it is Kirjath-Jearim. The name Kirjath-Jearim is not stated to have been allotted to the Levites, but it is difficult to suppose that Abinadab and Eleazar were not Levites. This question, here another, perhaps earlier, name — that of the great Canaanite deity Baal, namely Baalah and KIRJATH-BAAL. It is included among the towns of Judah (xv. 60), and there is some reason for believing that under the shortened form of Kirjath it is also named among those of Benjamin, as might almost be expected from the position it occupied on the confines of each. Some considerations bearing on this will be found under KIRJATH and GIDEON. It is included in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr. i. 50, 52) as founded by, or descended from, Simeon, the son of Caleb-Hur, and as having in its turn sent out the colonies of the Jebusites, Philistines, Ammonites, and Moabites, and as having in its turn sent out the colonies of the Jebusites, Philistines, Ammonites, and Moabites, as has already been stated under Kirjath-Jearim. Behind Kirjath-Jearim, the land of Danites pitched their camp before their expedition to Mount Ephraim and Gilgal, leaving their name attached to it (Judg. xviii. 12). In this high place — the hill (see above) — under the charge of Eleazar, son of Ahimelech, the ark remained for twenty years (vii. 2), during which period the spot became the resort of pilgrims from all parts, anxious to offer sacrifices and perform vows to Jehovah (Joseph. Ant. vi. 2, § 1). At the close of that time Kirjath-Jearim lost its sacred treasure, on its removal by David to the house of Obed-edom the Gittite (1 Chr. xiii. 5, 6; 2 Chr. i. 3; 2 Sam. vi. 2, 4). It is very remarkable and suggestive that in the account of this transaction the ancient and present name of Baal is preserved. In full and complete form this name, 2, vi. 2, probably the original statement — the name Baal is used without any explanation, and to the exclusion of that of Kirjath-jearim. In the allusion to this transaction in Is. xxxii. 6, the name is otherwise indicated as the "wood" — yer, the root of Kirjath-jearim. We are further told that its people, with those of Chephirah and Beeroth, 743 in number, returned from captivity (Neh. vii. 20; and see Ezra ii. 25, where the name is Kir'am, and 1 Esdr. v. 19, Kirathareas). We also hear of a prophet Uriah-ben-Shemaiah, a native of the place, who enforced the warnings of Jeremiah, and was cruelly murdered by Jehoiakin (Jer. xxxvii. 20, 4), but of the place we know nothing beyond what has been already said. A tradition which intercedes for Uriah, in his connection with the Ark, is found in 1 Ki. ii. 12, 13, and 2 Sam. xiv. 23, xxv. 8, 9, Dan. § 17), though without stating his authority, that it was the native place of Zechariah, see and the force of the word rendered "sanctified" (vii. 1), will be noticed under Levites. On the other hand it is remarkable that Beth-hemesh, from which the Ark was sent away, was a city of the priests.
a very uneven country, with no appearance of any road ever having existed (Rob. iii. 157). Neither is it at all in proximity to Bethlehem (Ephratah), which would seem to be implied in Is. cxxxi. 6; though this latter passage is very obscure. Williams (Holy City) endeavors to identify Kirjath-jearim with Deir el-Homs, east of Ain Sheva. But this, though sufficiently near the latter place, does not answer to the other conditions. We may therefore, for the present, consider Kuriet el-Emab as the representative of Kirjath-jearim.

The modern name, differing from the ancient only in its latter portion, signifies the "city of grapes;" the ancient name, if interpreted as Hebrew, the "city of forests." Such interpretations of these very antique names must be received with great caution on account of the tendency which exists universally to alter the names of places and persons so that they shall contain a meaning in the language of the country. In the present case we have the play on the name in Ps. cxxxii. 6, already noticed, the authority of Jerome (Comm. in Is. xxix. 1), who renders it villa silvarum, and the testimony of a recent traveller (Tolker, Dritte Wunderung, 178, 187), who in the immediate neighborhood, on the ridge probably answering to Mount Jearim, states that "for real genuine (cohete) woods, so thick and so solitary, he had seen nothing like them since he left Germany."

It remains yet to be seen if any separate or definite eminence answering to the hill or high-place on which the ark was deposited is recognizable at Kuriet el-Emab.

* An old Gothic church at Kuriet el-Emab built by the Crusaders is an object of mournful interest to the traveller. It is one of the most perfect Christian ruins of this description in Palestine. The exterior walls are well preserved, and the aisles, pillars, and some old frescoes still remain. The Moslems often make mosques of such churches, but this one they have turned into a stable or cow-pen.

H.

KIRJATH-SANNAH (תִּירְגַּת-סָנְנָה) [city of instruction or writing, FIrst; of palm-branch.]

a The mention of קַרְיָתָא (Aur.l. קַרְיָתָא) in the LXX. of Josh. iii. 10, possibly proceeds from a corruption of the Hebrew Kirjath-A-Tau, "the city

Ges.]: פַּדָּא הָֽעַֽרְפּוּדְתָא: Carithsenna), a name which occurs once only (Josh. xv. 49), as another, and probably an earlier, appellation for Debir, an important place in the mountains of Judah, not far from Hebron, and which also bore the name of Kirjath-Sepher. Whence the name is derived we have no clue, and its meaning has given rise to a variety of conjectures (see Keil, Joshur, on x. 49; Ewald, Gesch. i. 324, note). That of Gesenius (Thes. 902) is, that sannah is a contraction of sannnah = a palm-branch, and thus that Kirjath-sannah is the "city of palms." But this, though adopted by Stanley (S. of P. 161, 524), is open to the objection that palms were not trees of the mountain district, where Kirjath-sannah was situated, but of the valleys (S. of P. 145).

It will be observed that the LXX. interpret both this name and Kirjath-Sepher alike.

* The etymology of the name at present seems almost hopelessly obscure, and any explanation founded on that basis must be uncertain. It has been suggested that תִּירְגַּת may mean the palm-branch or leaf as used for writing purposes, as is the case so extensively in Asia at the present day.

Adam," as has been pointed out under Adam, vol. i. p. 27 a.
If this were so, Kirjath-sannah and Kirjath-Sepher would differ only as referring the one to the books written or preserved in the place and the other to the material out of which they were made. If the palm trees themselves did not grow there (though several are found now even at Jerusalem), the leaves could have been procured elsewhere and brought thither. If the later name Debir (which see) signifies "sacred recess," "sacred sanctuary" (Jerome, ocellum), it then simply points back by a less definite designation to the ancient character of the town (shadowed forth in the other names) as the seat of some religious cultus among the old Canaanites. II.

**KIRJATH-SEPHER (קִירְיַת-שֵׁפֶר) [city of the book or writing]:** In Judg. i. 11, קִירְיַת-שֵׁפֶר [Val. כֶּרֶם-שֵׁפֶר] πόλις γραμματέως in ver. 12, and in Josh. the first word is omitted (Curtius-Sepher), the early name of the city Debir, which further had the name — doubtless also an early one — of Kirjath-Sannah. Kirjath-Sepher occurs only in the account of the capture of the place by Othniel, who gained thereby the hand of his wife Achsah, Caleb's daughter (Josh. xv. 15, 16; and in the exact repetition of the narrative, Judg. i. 11, 12). In this narrative, a document of unmistakably early character (Ewald, Gesch. ii. 373, 374), it is stated that "the name of Debir before was Kirjath-Sepher." Ewald conjectures that the new name was given by the conquerors on account of its retired position on the back — the south or southwestern slopes — of the mountains, possibly at or about the modern el-Baer, a few miles W. of el-Dhahirah (Gesch. ii. 373, note). But whatever the interpretation of the Hebrew name of the place may be, that of the Canaanite name must certainly be more obscure. It is generally assumed to mean "city of book" (from the Hebrew word Sepher = book), and it has been made the foundation for theories of the amount of literary culture possessed by the Canaanites (Keil, Josen, x. 39; Ewald, i. 324). But such theories are to say the least, premature during the extreme uncertainty as to the meaning of these very ancient names?

The old name would appear to have been still in existence in Jeromen's time, if we may understand his allusion in the epigraph of Paula (§ 11), where he translates it vinculum litterarum. [Comp. Kirjath-Sepher.]

**KIR OF MOAB:** נַחָל מָאָב [cave or fortification of Moab]; תֵּלְחֵי תְּרוֹמִית יְהוּדָה [Vat. Sin. -Bens]: murmurs, Moab), one of the two chief strongholds of Moab, the other being Ar or Mount Sion. The name occurs only in Is. xx. 1, though the place is probably referred to under the names of Kir-Heba, Kir-Hareseth, etc. The clue to its identification is given up by the Targum on Is. and Jeremiah, which for the above names has נַחָל הַמִּצְרָיִם, נַחָל שָׁמְרוֹן. It is almost identical with the name Kirwil, by which the site of an important city in a high and very strong position at the S. E. of the Dead Sea is known at this day. The claim of evidence for the identification of Kirwil with Kir-Moab is very satisfactory. Under the name of קירמָאָב it is mentioned in the Acts of the Council of Jerusalem, A. D. 536 (Ibn-Dor, p. 533), by the geographers Toleny and Stephanus of Byzantium (Ibn-Dor, pp. 493, 765). In A. D. 1211, under King Fulk, a castle was built there which became an important station for the Crusaders. Here, in A. D. 1183, they sustained a fruitless attack from Saladin and his brother (Bosioini, Vita. San. 2. 5), the place being as impregnable as it had been in the days of Eliakim (2 K. iii. 23). It was then the chief city of Arcobia Secundus or Petronius; it is specified as in the Bibles, and is distinguished from Kaksah, the ancient Ar-Moab, and from the Mens regula (Schultens, Index Georg. Caracalle: see also the remarks of Gesenius, Josua, 517, and his notes to the German transl. of Burckhardt). The Crusaders in error believed it to be Petra, and that name is frequently attached to it in the writings of William of Tyre and Jacob de Vitry (see quotations in Rob. Bibl. Res. ii. 167). This error is perpetuated in the Greek Church service compiled by the bishop of Petra, whose office, as representative of the Patriarch, it is to produce the holy fire at Easter in the "Church of the Sepulchre" at Jerusalem (Stanley, S. & P. 467), is in reality bishop of Kerak (Seteetn, Reisen, ii. 538; Burchst. 387).

The modern Kerak is known to us through the descriptions of Burckhardt (378-380), Irby (ch. viii.), Setetn (Reisen, i. 412, 413), and De Saney (Le Mor Morte, i. 355, etc.); and these fully bear out the interpretation given above to the name — the "fortress," as contradistinguished from the "metropolis" (Ar) of the country, i.e. Rabbath-Moab, the modern Rub. It lies about 6 miles S. of the last-named place, and some ten miles from the Dead Sea, upon the plateau of highlands which forms this part of the country, not far from the western edge of the plateau. Its situation is truly remarkable. It is built upon the top of a steep hill, surrounded on all sides by a deep and narrow valley, which again is completely inclosed by mountains rising higher than the town, and overbuckling it on all sides. It must have been from these surrounding heights that the Israelite singers hurled their volleys of stones after the capture of the place had proved impossible (2 K. ii. 25). The town was completely compassed by a wall of great width, and when perfect, there were but two entrances, one to the south and the other to the north, cut or tunnelled through the ridge of the natural rock below the wall for a length of 100 to 120 feet. The wall is defended by several large towers, and the western extremity of the town is occupied by an enormous mass of buildings — on the south the castle or keep, on the north the walled town of Rabbath-Moab, which, when perfect, there were but two entrances, one to the south and the other to the north, cut or tunnelled through the ridge of the natural rock below the wall for a length of 100 to 120 feet.
KISH

hardly be less than 3000 feet above the sea (Porter, 
Hdbk. 60). From the heights immediately outside it, near a ruined mosque, a view is obtained of the  
Dead Sea, and in clear weather of Bethlehem and Jerusalem (Seetzen, Relken, i. 419; Schwarz, 217).  

G.

KISH (ךו?) [perh. bone, Ges.]: Kis; [Vat. Alex. 
Kei], and so Lachhm. Tisch. Treg. in Acts: Cis, 
Vulg. and A.V., Acts xiii. 21]. 1. A man of the 
tribe of Benjamin and the family of Matri, accord-
ing to 1 Sam. x. 21, though descended from Becher, 
according to 1 Chr. vii. 8, compared with 1 Sam. 
x. 1. [BECHEI]. He was son of Ner, brother to 
Almer, and father to King Saul. Gibesh or Gibon 
seems to have been the seat of the family from 
the time of Jehiel, otherwise called Abiel (1 Sam. 
xiv. 51), Kish’s grandfather (1 Chr. ix. 35).

2. Son of Jehiel, and uncle to the preceding 
(1 Chr. viii. 30), ix. 30).

3. [Karas]: Vat. Alex. Keswcy: A Benja-
mite, great grandfather of Mordecai, who was taken 
captive at the time that Joneniah was carried to 
Babylon (Fatha ii. 5).

4. A Merarite, of the house of Mahli, of the 
tribe of Levi. His sons married the daughters of 
his brother Eleazar (1 Chr. xiii. 21, 22, xxiv. 28, 
29), apparently about the time of David, since 
Jethuhun was the singer was the son of Kish (1 Chr. 
vi. 44, A. V.), compared with 2 Chr. xxix. 12. In 
the last cited place, “Kish, the son of Abdi;” in the 
reign of Hezekiah, must denote the Levitical house or 
division, under its chief, rather than an individual.  

The genealogy in 1 Chr. vi. shows that, though 
Kish is called “the son of Mahli” (1 Chr. xii. 21), 
eth eight generations intervened between him and Mahli. In the corrupt text of 1 Chr. 
xxvi. the name is written Kushabiah at ver. 17, 
and for Jethubah is written Ethan. [JETHUHUN.]

It is not improbable that the name Kish may have 
passed into the tribe of Levi from that of Benjamin, 
owing to the residence of the latter in the imme-
diate neighborhood of Jerusalem, which might lead 
to intermarriages (1 Chr. viii. 28, 32).

A. C. H.

KISHON (ךו) [see above]: Kishon, 
[Vat. Keswcy: Alex. Keswcy: Cesion], one of the town 
on the boundary of the tribe of Issachar (Jos. xix. 
20), which with its suburbs was allotted to the 
Gershonite Levites (xxi. 28); though in this place 
the name — identical in the original — is incor-
rectly given in the A. V. KISHON. If the judg-
ment of Gesenius may be accepted, there is no con-
nexion between the name Kishon and that of the 
river Kishon, since as Hebrew words they are 
derivable from distinct roots.  

But it would seem very questionable how far so archaic a name as that of 
the Kishon, mentioned, as it is, in one of the earliest records we possess (Judg. v.), can be treated as 
Hebrew. No trace of the situation of Kishon however exists, nor can it be inferred so as to enable 
us to ascertain whether any connection was likely to have existed between the town and the river.

KISHON, THE RIVER [torrent, K., i. e. bending itself, 
serpentine, Ges.]: ךו, קיוושו, Kishon, and 
Kishon: [Vat. Alex. Keswcy: Cesion], uniformly, and 
Kishon, of the town (Cesion), a torrent or winter stream of central 
Palestine, the scene of two of the grandest achievements of Israelite history — the defeat of Sisera, and 
the destruction of the prophets of Baal by Elijah.

Unless it be alluded to in Jos. xii. 11 as "the 
torrent facing Jokneam" — and if Kainah be Jok-
necam, the description is very accurate — the Kishon 
is not mentioned in describing the possessions of 
the tribes. Indeed its name occurs only in connec-
tion with the two great events just referred to 
(Judg. iv. 7, 13, v. 21; Ps. lxxxii. 9 — here in-
curately "Kison;" and 1 K. xviii. 40).

The Nahor Mukattah, the modern representative of 
the Kishon, is the drain by which the waters of 
the plain of Esdraelon, and of the mountains which 
inclose that plain, namely, Carmel and the Samaria 
range on the south, the mountains of Galilee on 

2. As an epithet of the Kishon 
itself: LXX., χειρόβους ἀργαῦμα; Aquila, καινουργίαν, 
perhaps intending to imply a searching wind or 
sinuous course accompanying the rising of the waters; Symmachus, αἰγίων or αἰγουρ, perhaps alluding to the swift spring-
ning of the torrent (άγεν is used for high waves by 
Artemidorus). The Targum, adhering to the signifi-
cation "ancient," expands the sentence — "the torrent 
in which, were shown signs and wonders to Israel 
of old," and this miraculous torrent a later Jewish tra-
tition (present in the Commentarius in Canticam 
Deborah, ascribed to Jerome) would identify with 
the Red Sea, the scene of the greatest marvels in Israel’s 
history. The rendering of the A. V. is supported by 
Mendelssohn, Gesenius, Ewald, and other modern 
sciences. But it is not possible that the term may 
refer to an ancient tribe of Kedumum — wanderers from 
the eastern deserts — who had in remote antiquity 
settled on the Kishon or one of its tributary wadis.
the north, and Gibson, "Little Hermon" (so called), and Tabor on the east, and their way to the Mediterranean. Its course is in a direction nearly due N. W. along the lower part of the plain nearest the foot of the Samarian hills, and close beneath the very cliffs of that range. (Thomson, Land and Book, 2d ed. p. 430), breaking through the hills which separate the plain of Esdraelon from the maritime plain of Acre, by a very narrow pass, beneath the eminence of Herod's Church or Turt, which is believed still to retain a trace of the name of Harosheth of the Gentiles (Thomson, p. 437). It has two principal feeders: the first from Debariah (Dabatha), on Mount Tabor, the S. E. angle of the plain; and secondly, from Jabok (Gibsam and Jacob (Eugan- nium) on the S. E. The very large perennial spring of the last-named place may be said to be the origin of the remote part of the Kishon (Thomson, p. 435). It is also fed by the copious spring of Leijun, the stream from which is probably the "waters of Megiddo" (Van de Velde, 333; Porter, Handbook, p. 383). During the winter and spring, and after such rain as may have fallen on the upper part of the Kishon, the upper half has a very strong torrent; so strong, that in the battle of Mount Tabor, April 16, 1799, some of the circumstances of the defeat of Sisera were reproduced, many of the fugitive Turks being drowned in the wady from Debariah, which then inundated a part of the plain (Barekhald, p. 329). At the same seasons the ground about Leijun (Megiddo) where the principal encounter with Sisera would seem to have taken place, becomes a morass, impassable for even single travellers, and truly destruc- tive for a large horde like his army (Prokoseh, in Rob ii. 364; Thomson, p. 436).

But like most of the so-called "rivers" of Palestine, the perennial stream forms but a small part of the Kishon. During the greater part of the year its upper portion is dry, and the stream confined to a few miles next the sea. The sources of this perennial portion proceed from the roots of Carmel — the "vast fountains called 'So Abedjic, about three miles east of Uzafa" (Thomson, p. 435) and those, apparently still more copious, described by Shaw (Rob, ii. 365), b as bursting forth from beneath the eastern brow of Carmel, and discharging of themselves "a river half as big as the Isis." It enters the sea at the lower part of the bay of Akko, and forms about two miles east of Caspian a deep tortuous bed between banks of loam some 15 feet high, and 15 to 20 yards apart." (Porter, Handbook, pp. 383, 384). Between the mouth and the town the shore is lined by an extensive grove of date-palms, one of the finest in Palestine (Van de Velde, p. 289).

The part of the Kishon at which the prophets of Baal were slaughtered by Elijah was probably close before the spot on Carmel where the sacrifice had taken place. This spot is now fixed with all but certainty, as at the extreme east end of the moun-

tain, to which the name is still attached of el-Moharak, "the burning." [CARMEL.] No-where does the Kishon run so close to the mountain as just beneath this spot (Van de Velde, i. 324). It is about 1000 feet above the river, and a pre-
cipitation raves leads directly down, by which the victims were perhaps hurried from the sacred pre-
cinets of the altar of Jehovah to their doom in the torrent bed below, at the foot of the mound, which from this circumstance may be called Tell Kisd, the hill of the priests. Whither the Kishon con-
tained any water at this time we are not told; that required for Eliah's sacrifice was in all probability obtained from the spring on the mountain side below the plateau of el-Moharak. [CARMEL, vol. i. p. 360 a.]

Of the identity of the Kishon with the present Nahar Maktabeh there can be no question. The existence of the sites of Tanneh and Megiddo along its course, and the complete agreement of the circumstances just named with the require-
ments of the story of Elijah, are sufficient to satisfy us that the two are the same. But it is very remarkable what an absence there is of any continuous or traditional evidence on the point. By Josephus the Kishon is never named, neither does the name occur in the early Itineraries of Antoninus Augustus, or the Bordeaux Pilgrims. Eusebius and Jerome dismiss it in a few words, and note only its origin in Tabor (Osma, "Cison") of such part of it as can be seen thence (Ep. ad Eustochium, § 14), passing by entirely its con-
nection with Carmel. Benjamin of Tudela visited Akka and Carmel. He mentions the river by name as "Naxhal Kishon;" but only in the most cursory manner. Brocardus (cir. 1500) describes the western portion of the stream with a little more fullness, but enlarges most on its upper or eastern part, which, with the victory of Tarab, he places on the east of Tabor and Kishon, as dis-
charging the water of those mountains into the Sea of Galilee (Desc. Terr. S. Cap. 6, 7). This has been shown by Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. ii. 364) to allude to the Wady el-Birich, which runs down to the Jordan a few miles above Scythopolis. For the descriptions of modern travellers, see Maundrell (Early Trav. 450); Robinson (ii. 362 Ac., ii. 116, 117); Van de Velde (221, &c.); Stanley (306, 393, 355), and Thomson (Land and Book, chap. xxxii.).

KISDON (קיסון) [see above]: Kishon. Kishon, or Kisson, an inaccurate mode of represent-
ing the name elsewhere correctly given in the A. V. in Kiston (Ps. lviii. 9 only). An additional in-
consistency is the expression "the brook of Kisson" — the word of" being redundant both here and in Judg. iv. 18, and v. 21. KIS.
The written decrees of a sovereign are kissed in token of respect; even the ground is sometimes kissed by Orientals in the fullness of their submission (Gen. xii. 40; 1 Sam. xxiv. 8; Ps. lxxix. 9. Is. xlix. 23; Mic. vii. 17; Matt. xxviii. 9; Wilkison, Anc. Egy. ii. 293; Layard, Nin. i. 374; Harmer, Obs. i. 336).

Friends saluting each other join the right hand. Then each kisses his own hand, and puts it to his lips and forehead, or breast; after a long absence they embrace each other, kissing first on the right side of the face or neck, and then on the left, or on both sides of the beard (Lane, ii. 9, 10; Irby and Mangles, p. 116; Chardin, Voy. iii. 421; Arriuex, L. c.; Burchardt, Notes, i. 369; Russell, Aleppo, i. 240).

Kissing is spoken of in Scripture as a mark of respect or adoration to idols (1 K. xix. 18: Hos. vii. 2; comp. Civ. Err. iv. 43; Tadunit, speaking of an eastern custom, Hist. iii. 24, and the Mohammedan custom of kissing the Kaaba at Mecca; Burchardt, Trav. i. 290, 298, 329; Crichton, Arabus, ii. 218).

W. P. C.

KITE (775, ayagh: ikirwos, γαφ: vultus vulgaris). The Hebrew word thus rendered occurs in three passages, Lev. xi. 14, Deut. xiv. 13, and Job xxviii. 7: in the two former it is translated "kite" in the A. V., in the latter "vulture." It is enumerated among the twenty names of birds mentioned in Deut. xiv. 13 (belonging for the most part to the order Fugitores), which were considered unclean by the ancient Law, and forbidden for food, which may be used as food by the Israelites. The allusion in Job alone affords a clue to its identification. The deep mines in the recesses of the mounts from which the labor of man extracts the treasures of the earth are there described as "a track which the bird of prey hath not known, nor hath the eye of the ayagh looked upon it." Among all birds of prey, which are proverbially clear-sighted, the ayagh is thus distinguished as possessed of peculiar keenness of vision, and by this attribute alone is it marked. Translators have been singularly at variance with regard to this bird. In the LXX. of Lev. and Deut. ayagh is rendered "kite," while in Job it is "vulture," which the A. V. has followed. The Vulg. gives "vulture" in all three passages, unless, as Drusius suggests (on Lev. xi. 14), the order of the words in Lev. and Deut. is changed; but even in this case there remains the rendering "vulture" in Job, and the reason advanced by Drusius for the transposition is not conclusive. The Targ. Onkelos vaguely renders it "bird of prey," Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan, "black vulture;" Targ. Jerus. by a word which Buxtorf translates "a pie," in which he is supported by the authority of Kimchi, but which Bochart considers to be identical in meaning with the preceding, and which is employed in Targ. Onkelos as the equivalent of the word rendered "heron" in A. V. of Lev. xi. 19. It is impossible to say what the rendering of the Peshito Syriac in Lev. and Deut. may be, in consequence of an evident confusion in the text; in

(Milenus vulgaris); but "gledë" is applied by the common people in Ireland to the common buzzard (Buteo vulgaris), the "kite" not being indigenous to that country. So, too, the translators of the A. V. considered the terms "kite" and "gledë" as distinct for they render γαφ: "gledë," and 775: "kite."
Job 39:20 is translated by *daishi* as "a kite" or "vulture" as some have it, which is the representative of "vulture" in the A. V. of Is. xxiv. 15. The Arabic versions of Saadia and Abulwahab give "the night-owl;" and Alen Ezra, deriving it from a root מז signifyng "an island," explains it as "the island bird," without however identifying it with any individual of the feathered tribes. Robertson (*Cleris Pentateuchi*) derives *ayyih* from the Heb. עין, an obsolete root, which he connects with an Arabic word, the primary meaning of which, according to Schultens, is "to turn." If this derivation be the true one, it is not improbable that "kite" is the correct rendering. The habit which birds of this genus have of "sailing in circles, with the rudder-like tail by its inclination governing the curve," as Yarrell says, accords with the Arabic derivation.

Bochart, regarding the etymology of the word, connected it with the Arabic عين, a kind of hawk so called from its cry عين, described by Damir as a small bird with a short tail, used in hunting, and remarkable for its great courage, the swiftness of its flight, and the keenness of its vision, which is made the subject of praise in an Arabic stanza quoted by Damir. From these considerations Bochart identifies it with the merlin, or *Falco australis* of Linnaeus, which is the same as the Greek α listing and Latin avis. It must be confessed, however, that the grounds for identifying the *ayyih* with any individual species are too slight to enable us to regard with confidence any conclusions which may be based upon them; and from the expression which follows in Lev. and Deut., "after its kind," it is evident that the term is generic. The Talmud
go so far as to assert that the four Hebrew words rendered in A. V. "vulture," "glede," and "kite," denote one and the same bird (Levisohn, *Zoology*).

*KNIFE*

Seven different kinds employed by the natives to the same purpose.

Two persons are mentioned in the O. T. whose names are derived from this bird. [AAAH.] First (Howe. s. v.) compares the parallel instances of *Shahin,* a kind of falcon, used as a proper name by the Persians and Turks, and the Latin Milvius. To these we may add *Falco* and *Falcatus* among the Romans, and the names of *Hawke, Falcon,* *Falconer, Kite,* etc., etc., in our own language (see Lower's *Historical Essays on English Surnames*).

W. A. W.

*The common black kite, which is seen wheeling in circles over the cities of Egypt, with the small vulture (*Vultur percopterus*) is called by the natives مَلْح. This species is found also in Syria, though like all the raptorial birds, less numerous than in Egypt. From its proximity to the cities it would appear to prefer what it can pick up of offal and dead birds to the more precarious hunting of its living prey. The pigeons of Egypt, which are exceedingly numerous in the neighborhood of the towns, seem to fly about in perfect indifference to the presence of this powerful raptor, and I never saw a kite make a descent on a flock of pigeons, though they might be at all times. They are exceedingly wary and difficult to approach, or shoot on the wing.*

G. E. P.

*KITHLISH* (maids, i. e. Ciblish. *Maryas:* Alex. *Kobhoss:* [Comp. Abd. *Kobhoss:*] Ciblish, one of the towns of Judah, in the *Develd,* or lowland (Josh. xv. 40), named in the same group with Egdon, Gederoth, and Makkedah. It is not named by Eusebius or Jerome, nor does it appear to have been either sought or found by any latter traveller.

G.

*KITRON* (*Kitron* [perh. *coste, fortress,* Diets.]: *Khopau*; Alex., with unusual departure from the Heb. text, *Khpbau*; [Comp. *Khphao:*] Cetrion, a town which, though not mentioned in the specification of the possessions of Zebulun in Josh. xix., is catalogued in Judg. i. 30 as one of the towns from which Zebulun did not expel the Canaanites. It is here named next to Nahalgal, a position occupied in Josh. xix. 15, by Kaddath. Kitron may be a corruption of this, or it may be an independent place omitted for some reason from the other list. In the Talmud (*Meggil*), as quoted by Schwarz, 173 it is identified with *Zippori,* i. e. Sepphoris, now Safuriah.

G.

*KITTIM* (*Kittim,* Gen. x. 4; *Ktto:* [Alex. 3] Kpitou; [Comp. *Kepi:*] Kthim, Abd. *Kptim,* 1 Chr. i. 7: [Cithim.] Cethim.) Twice written in the A. V. for *CHITTIM.*

*KNEADING-TOUGHS.* [BREAD.]

*KNIFE:* 1. The knives of the Egyptians, and of other nations in early times, were probably only of hard stone, and the use of the flint or stone knife was sometimes retained for sacred purposes after the introduction of iron and steel (Plin. H. N. 68. 92; *pharmos*; *gladius*.)
KNIFE

xxxv. 12, § 165). Herodotus (ii. 36) mentions knives both of iron and of stone\textsuperscript{a} in different stages of the same process of engraving. The same may perhaps be said to some extent of the Hebrews.\textsuperscript{b}

2. In their meals the Jews, like other Orientals, made little use of knives, but they were required both for slaughtering animals either for food or sacrifice, as well as cutting up the carcase (Lev. vii. 33, 34, viii. 15, 20, 25; ix. 13; Num. xviii. 18; I Sam. ii. 24; Ez. xxiv. 4; Ex. i. 9; Matt. xxvi. 29; Russell, \textit{Aegypt.}, i. 172; Wilkinson, i. 109; Mischein. \textit{Tanait}, iv. 3).

3. Smaller knives were in use for paring fruit (\textit{Joseph. Ant.} xvii. 7; \textit{B. J.} ii. 33, § 7) and for sharpening pens\textsuperscript{c} (Jer. xxxvi. 23).

1. 2. Egyptian Flint Knives in Museum at Berlin.
3. Egyptian Knife used in Hieroglyphics.

4. The razor\textsuperscript{d} was often used for Nazaritic purposes, for which a special chamber was reserved in the Temple (Num. vi. 5, 9, 19; Ez. v. 1; Is. vii. 20; Jer. xxxvi. 23; Acts xviii. 18, xxii. 24; Mischein. \textit{Mishl}, ii. 5).

5. The pruning-hooks of Is. xviii. 5\textsuperscript{e} were probably curved knives.

6. The lancets\textsuperscript{f} of the priests of Baal were double-pointed knives (1 K. xviii. 28). [\textit{Lancet}.]

Asiatics usually carry about with them a knife or dagger, often with a highly ornamented handle, which may be used when required for eating purposes (Judg. iii. 21; Layard, \textit{Num.} ii. 342, 299; Wilkinson, i. 352, 360; Chardin, \textit{Voy.} iv. 18: Niebuhr, \textit{Iog.} i. 349, pl. 71). H. W. P.

* Instead of "sharp knives" in Josh. v. 2 (A. V.) the margin reads "knives of flint," which is more exact for \textit{μαθέα}, \textit{πέρπασα}, lit. knives of rocks or stones. The account of Joshua's burial (Josh. xiv. 30) contains in the Septuagint this remarkable addition. "Then they placed with him in the tomb in which they buried him there the flint knives (\textit{τας μαθέας} \textit{τας πέρπασας}) with which he circumcised the children of Israel in Gilgal, when he led them forth out of Egypt, as the Lord commanded them; and there they are unto this day." It thus appears that the Alexandrian translator (even supposing that he has not followed here a distinct tradition respecting the great Hebrew leader) was at all events familiar with the fact that it was not uncommon to bury such relics with distinguished persons when they died. It is well known that in the Sinaitic peninsula stone or flint knives have often been discovered on opening ancient places of sepulture. The Abyssinian tribes at the present day use flint knives in performing circumcision (Knobel, \textit{Exodus}, p. 40). See \textit{Stones}, 3. H.

KNOP, that is \textit{Knor} (A. S. \textit{cnap}). A word employed in the A. V. to translate two terms, of the real meaning of which all that we can say with certainty is that they refer to some architectural or ornamental object, and that they have nothing in common.

1. \textit{Cephtar} (רץ). This occurs in the description of the candlestick of the sacred tent in Ex. xxv. 31-36, and xxxvii. 17-22, the two passages being identical. The knops are here distinguished from the shaft, branches, bowls, and flowers of the candlestick; but the knob and the flower go together, and seem intended to imitate the produce of an almond-tree. In another part of the work they appear to form a boss, from which the branches are to spring out from the main stem. In Am. ix. 1

\textit{a} \textit{Ailôn Ailônios}.

\textit{b} \textit{V̄r̄} (Ex. iv. 25) is in LXX \textit{φιλος}, in which Syr.

\textit{c} \textit{ זכֶבַּת קֶבָּב}, \textit{"the knife of a scribe."}

\textit{d} \textit{כֶּכֶבַּב, Ges.} p. 1069.

\textit{e} \textit{גֶּכֶבַּב}, Ges. p. 421: \textit{הנהר}: \textit{fatea}.

\textit{f} \textit{כֶּכֶבַּב: סָטָמַצַת: lanuotli}
the same word is rendered, with doubtful accuracy, "lintel." The same rendering is used in Zeph. ii. 14, where the reference is to some part of the palaces of Nineveh, to be exposed when the wooden upper story—the "cedar work"—was destroyed. The Hebrew word seems to contain the sense of "covering" and "crowning" (Gesenius, Thes. 790). Josephus’s description (Ant. iii. 6, § 7) names both balls (σφαίρας) and pomegranates (ροδοκινός), either of which may be the σεφθις. The Targum agrees with the former, the LXX. (σφαίριτις) with the latter. [LINTEL.]

2. The second term, Pe'katim (פֵּקַטִים), is found only in 1 K. vi. 18 and v. 24. It refers in the former to carvings executed in the cedar wainscot of the interior of the Temple, and, as in the preceding word, is associated with flowers. In the latter case it denotes an ornament cast round the great reservoir or "sea" of Solomon’s Temple below the brim: there was a double row of them, ten to a cubit, or about 2 inches from centre to centre.

The word no doubt signifies some globular thing resembling a small gourd, or an egg, though as to the character of the ornament we are quite in the dark. The following woofcut of a portion of a

---

**KOHATH**

KNOP

---

of Nineveh, a word, "l^tn," in 2 K. iv. 29.

b Compare the similar word פַּקֵטִים, Pakkāth, "gourds," in 2 K. iv. 29.

c This is the rendering of the Targum.

---

**KO'A (כֹּהָד; כְּיָוד) [Alex. Asor; Comp. Ko'ē; Ab. Ko'ōth: principles] is a word which occurs only in Ez. xxvii. 23: "The Babylonians and all the Chaldaeans, Pekod, and Shoa, and Koâ and all the Assyrians with them." It is uncertain if the word is a proper name or no. It may perhaps designate a place otherwise unknown, which we must suppose to have been a city or district of Babylonia. Or it may be a common noun, signifying "prince" or "nobleman," as the Vulgate takes it, and some of the Jewish interpreters.

G. R.

**KO'HATH c (כֹּהָד), and Num. xvi. 1, 1c, כֹּהֶד, assembly: Koâd and [Alex. once] Koâ: Kohath, second of the three sons of Levi (Gershon, Kohath, Merari), from whom the three principal divisions of the Levites derived their origin and their name (Gen. xvi. 11: Exod. vii. 10, 18; Num. iii. 17; vii. 26)."
KOATH

2 Chr. xxxiv. 12, 18). Kothath was the father of Anram, and he of Moses and Aaron. From him, therefore, were descended all the priests; and hence those of the Kohathites who were not priests were of the highest rank of the Levites, though not the sons of Levi's first-born. Korah, the son of Izhar, was a Kohathite, and hence, perhaps, his impatience of the superiority of his relatives, Moses and Aaron. In the journeys of the Tabernacle the sons of Kohath had charge of the most holy portion of the vessels, to carry them by staves, as the vail, the ark, the tables of show-bread, the 7, 10-21, etc. (Num. iv.); but they were not to touch them or look upon them "lest they die." These were all previously covered by the priests, the sons of Aaron. In the reign of Hezekiah the Kohathites are mentioned first (2 Chr. xxix. 12), as they are also 1 Chr. xxv. 5-7, 11, when Urieil their chief assisted, with 120 of his brethren, in bringing up the ark to Jerusalem in the time of David. It is also remarkable that in this last list of those whom David calls "chief of the fathers of the Levites," and couples with "Zadok and Abia-thar the priests," of six who are mentioned by name four are descendants of Kohath; namely, besides Urieil, Shemaiath the son of Elzaphan, with 20 men, the head of his family, the son of Aaron, with 80 of his brethren; and Amminadab, the son of Uziel, with 112 of his brethren. For it appears from Ex. vi. 18-22, compared with 1 Chr. xxiii. 12, xxvi. 23-32, that there were four families of sons of Kohath—Aramaites, Izharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites; and of the above names Elzaphan and Amminadab were both Uzzielites (Ex. vi. 22), and Elieel a Hebronite. The verses already cited from 1 Chr. xxiv.; Num. iii. 19, 27; 1 Chr. xxviii. 12, also disclose the wealth and importance of the Kohathites, and the important offices filled by them as keepers of the dedicated treasures, as judges, officers, and rulers, both secular and sacred. In 2 Chr. xx. 19, they appear as singers, with the Korahites.

The number of the sons of Kohath between the ages 29 and 50, at the census in the wilderness was 2,750, and the whole number of Kohathites who were born from a month old was 9,000 (Num. iii. 23, iv. 36). Their number is not given at the second numbering (Num. xxvi. 57), but the whole number of Levites had increased by 1,300, namely, from 22,000 to 23,300 (Num. iii. 39, xxvi. 62). The place of those sons of Kohath in marching and encamping was south of the Tabernacle (Num. iii. 23), which was also the situation of the Reubenites. Samuel was a Kohathite, and so of course were his descendants, Heman the singer and the third division of the singers which was under him. [HEMAN; ASAPH; JEDUTTHA]. The inheritance of those sons of Kohath who were not priests lay in the half tribe of Manasseh, in Ephrain (1 Chr. vi. 61-70), and in Dan (Josh. xxi. 5, 20-29). Of the personal history of Kohath we know nothing, except that he came down to Egypt with Levi and Josue (Gen. xi. 11), that his sister was Jochebed (Ex. vi. 20), and that he lived to the age of 133 years (Ex. vi. 18). He lived about 80 or 90 years in Egypt during Joseph's lifetime, and about 30 more after his death. He may have been some 20 years younger than Joseph his uncle. The table on the preceding page shows the principal descents from Korath's family; a fuller table may be seen in Bunting's Genealogies, Tab. X. No. 1. [LEVITES.]

A. C. H.

* KO'ATHITES (acional, 7 times, and * KO'RAH (axyal, 4 times, and * KO'LA'IAH, baldness a; Kopel; Core). 1. Third son of Esau by Aholibamah (Gen. xxxv. 5, 14; 1 Chr. i. 55). He was born in Canaan before Esau migrated to Mount Seir (Gen. xxxvi. 3-9), and was one of the "dukes" of Edom.

2. Another Edomish duke of this name, sprung from Eliphaz, Esau's son by Ada (Gen. xxxvi. 16); but this is not confirmed by ver. 11, nor by the list in 1 Chr. i. 36, nor is it probable in itself.

3. [Yat. Kopel.]. One of the "sons of Hebron" 1 in 1 Chr. ii. 44; but whether, in this obscure passage, Hebron is the name of a man or of a city, and whether, in the latter case, Korah is the same as the son of Izhar (No. 4), whose children may have been located at Hebron among those Kohathites who were priests, is difficult to determine.

4. Son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi. He was leader of the famous rebellion against his cousins Moses and Aaron in the wilderness, for which he paid the penalty of perishing with his followers by an earthquake and flames of fire (Num. xvi. 10), and was not only rebuked, but also cast out of the congregation as a leper. This detail of his rebellion is too well known to need repetition here, but it may be well to remark, that the particular grievance which rankled in the mind of Korah and his companions was their exclusion from the office of the priesthood, and their being "confined — those among them who were Levites — to the inferior service of the Tabernacle, as appears clearly, both from the words of Moses in ver. 9, and from the test resorted to with regard to the censors and the offering of incense. The same thing also appears from the subsequent confirmation of the priesthood to Aaron (ch. xvii.). The appointment of Elzaphan to be chief of the Kohathites (Num. iii. 30) may have far more inflamed his jealousy. Korah's position as leader in this rebellion was evidently the result of his personal character, which was that of a bold, haughty, and ambitious man. This appears from his address to Moses in Num. xv. 3, and especially from his conduct in ver. 19, where both his daring and his influence over the congregation are very apparent. Were it not for this, one would have expected the Gershonites — as the older

and it has been retorted that Korah's baldness has a more suitable antitype in the tonsure of the Korahite priests (Simonis. Comm. 5, 149).
branch of the Levites — to have supplied a leader in conjunction with the sons of Kohath, rather than the family of Izhar, who was Amram's younger brother. From some cause which does not clearly appear, the children of Korah were not involved in the destruction of their father, as are expressly told in Num. xvi. 11, and as appears from the continuance of the family of the Korahites to the reign, at least of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xx. 19), and probably till the return from the Captivity (1 Chr. ix. 20, 31). [KORAHITE.] Perhaps the fissure of the ground which swallowed up the tents of Bathan and Abiram did not extend beyond those of the Reubenites. From Num. xvi. 27 it seems clear that Korah himself was not with Bathan and Abiram at the moment. His text may have been a pitch for himself, in contempt of the orders of Moses, by the side of his fellow-rebels, while his family continued to reside in their proper camp nearer the tabernacle; or it must have been separated by a considerable space from those of Bathan and Abiram. Or, even if Korah's family resided amongst the Reubenites, they may have fled, at Moses's warning, to take refuge in the Kohathite camp, instead of remaining, as the wives and children of Bathan and Abiram did (ver. 27). Korah himself was doubtless with the 250 men who bore censers nearer the tabernacle (ver. 19), and perished with them by the fire from Jehovah, which accompanied the earthquake. It is nowhere said that he was one of those who went down quick into the pit (comp. Ps. cxvii. 18), and it is natural that he should have been with the censor-leaders. That he was so is indeed clearly implied by Num. xvi. 19—21, 35, 40, compared with xxvi. 9, 10. In the N. T. (Jude ver. 11) Korah is coupled with Cain and Balam, and seems to be held out as a warning to those who despise dominion and speak evil of dignities, of whom it is said that they perished in the gaining of Core. Nothing more is known of Korah's personal character or career previous to his rebellion.

A. C. H.

KORAHITE. (1 Chr. ix. 20, 31). KORAHITE, or KORATHITE (in Hebrew always קֹרָחִי, or in plur. קֹרָחִי, קֹרָחִי [patr. from KORAH;] never expressed at all by the LXX., but paraphrased διστατος, διστατος of προφήτης Κόραθιν, see note 1). (Gen. vii. 19; Numbers, xxvii. 3). The only portion of the Kohathites, which were descended from Korah, and are frequently styled by the synonymous phrase Sons of Korah. [KORAHITE.] It would appear, at first sight, from Ex. vi. 24, that Korah had three sons — Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph. As Winer, Rosenmuller, etc., also understand it; but as we learn from 1 Chr. vi. 22, 23, 37, that Assir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph, were respectively the sons, grandson, and great-grandson of Korah, it seems obvious that Ex. vi. 24 gives us the chief houses sprung from Korah, and not his actual sons, and therefore that Elkanah and Abiasaph were not the sons, but later descendants of Korah. If, however, Abiasaph was the grandson of Assir his name must have been added to this genealogy in Exodus later, as he could not have been born at that time. Elkanah might, being of the same generation as Phinehas (Ex. vi. 25).

The office held by the sons of Korah, as far as we are informed, are the following. They were an important branch of the singers in the Kohathite division, Heman himself being a Korahite (1 Chr. vi. 34), and the Korahites being among those who, in Jehoshaphat's reign, "stood up to praise the Lord God of Israel with a loud voice on high." (2 Chr. xx. 19). [HUMAN.] Hence we find eleven Psalms (or twelve, if Ps. 45 is included under the same title as Ps. 42) dedicated or assigned to the sons of Korah, namely, Ps. 42, 44—49, 84, 85, 87, 88. Winer describes them as some of the most beautiful in the collection, from their high lyric tone. Origen says it was a remark of the old interpreters that all the Psalms inscribed with the name of the sons of Korah are full of pleasant and cheerful subjects, and free from anything sal or harsh (Homil. on 1 Kings, i. e. 1 Sam., Matt. viii. 20), he ascribes the authorship of these Psalms to "the three sons of Korah," who, "because they agreed together had the Word of God in the midst of them." (Homil. xiv.). Of moderns, Rosenmuller thinks that the sons of Korah, especially Heman, were the authors of these Psalms, which, he says, rise to greater sublimity and breathe more vehement feelings than the Psalms of David. And quotes Hesner and Eichhorn as agreeing. I. C. Wette also considers the sons of Korah as the authors of them (Itid. 333-339), and so does Just. Ohsbaum on the Psalms (Exeg. Homil. Eikir. p. 22). As, however, the language of several of these Psalms — as the 42d, 87th, etc. — is manifestly meant to apply to David, it seems much simpler to explain the title "or the sons of Korah," to the sense that they were inspired, not by them to the Temple, but by the Temple-serenades. If their style of music, vocal and instrumental, was of a more sublime and lyric character than that of the sons of Merari or Gershon, and Heman had more fire in his execution than Asaph and Jeduthun, it is perfectly natural that David should have given his more poetic and elevated strains to Heman and his choir, and the

xxvi. 19, 2 Chr. xx. 9. psalter, αἰωνιοί, and ςτατικ ). These represent distinct Hebrew words, and Kop is used instead of the patronymic; while in 1 Chr. ix. 30, 31, xii. 6, the LXX. have Kopis or Kopis (Vat. vat. 4). A. St. Augustine has a still more fanciful conceit, which he thinks it necessary to repeat in almost every homily; from the eleven poems inscribed to the sons of Kore. Adverting to the interpretation of Korah, Bat- rat, he finds in it a great mystery. Under this term is set forth Christ, who is entitled Calvin, because he was exalted on Calvary, and was mocked by the bystanders, as Elisa had been by the children, and after him "Caleps, ever, and who, when they said God, thou hail pals, had prefigured the crucifixion. The sons of Korah are therefore the children of Christ the bride-groom (Hom. i. 1 Paulus).
KORATHITES, THE

sumptuous and quieter psalms to the other choirs. J. van Iperen (ap. Rosenm.) assigns these psalms to the times of Jehoshaphat: others to those of the Maccabees; Ewald attributes the 42d Psalm to Jeremiah. The purpose of many of the German critics seems to be to reduce the antiquity of the Scriptures as low as possible.

Others, again, of the sons of Korah were "porters," i.e., doorkeepers, in the Temple, an office of considerable dignity. In 1 Chr. ix. 17-19, we learn that Shallum, a Korahite of the line of Ebiassaph, was chief of the doorkeepers, and that he and his brethren were over the work of the service, keepers of the gates of the tabernacle (comp 2 K. xxvii. 18), apparently after the return from the Babylonian Captivity. [Kings.] See also 1 Chr. xxv. 22-23; Jer. xxv. 4; and Ezr. ii. 42. But in 1 Chr. xxvi. we find that this official station of the Korahites dated from the time of David, and that their chief was then Shelumiel or Meshelemiah, the son of (Abi)assaph, to whose custody the east gate fell by lot, being the principal entrance. Shelumiel is doubtless the same name as Shallum in 1 Chr. ix. 17, and, perhaps, Meshelemiah, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12. Neh. xii. 35, where, as in so many other places, it designates, not the individuals, but the house of family. In 2 Chr. xxxiv. 14, Kore, the son of Innah the Levite, the doorkeeper towards the east, who was over the free-will offerings of God to distribute the oblations of the Lord and the most holy things, was probably a Korahite, as we find the name Kore in the family of Korah in 1 Chr. ix. 19. In 1 Chr. ix. 51, we find that Mattithiah, the first-born of the Korahites, had the set office over the things that were made in the tabs. (Barrington's Genealogies: Patrick, Comment, on Num. 1. Lyell's Princ. of Geol., ch. 23, 24, 25, on Earthquakes; Rosenmüller and Olshausen, On Psalms; De Wette, Eitd.)

KORATHITES, THE (נֵרֶחֶם), Num. xxvi. 58. [KORAHITE.]

* This form, for which there is no justification, seems to have been derived from the reading of the Bishop's Bible in the passage referred to, as "Corrhithes," probably a mere misprint.

KORATHITES, THE (נֵרֶחֶם). Ex. vi. 24; 1 Chr. xi. 6, xxvi. 1; 2 Chr. xx. 11. [KORAHITE.]

KO'ER (נֵרֶחֶם) [title]: Kopé = [Vat. Kaphyš]. Alex. Xaryp in 1 Chr. ix. 19; Alex. Kapha, 1 Chr. xxi. 1: [Cere]. 1. A Korahite, ancestor of Shalum and Meshelemiah, chief porters in the reign of David.

2. (Kaphé: Alex. Kaphyš). Son of Innah, a Levite in the reign of Hezekiah, appointed over the free-will offerings and most holy things, and a gatekeeper on the eastern side of the Temple after the reform of worship in Judah (2 Chr. xxvi. 14). 3. In the A. V. of 1 Chr. xxvi. 10, "the sons of Korah" (following the Vulg. Cere), should properly be "the sons of the Korahite."

KOZ (נֵרֶחֶם) [thorn]: 'Akoos = [Vat. Akoos] in Ezr. ii. 61; 'Akoos, Neb. iii. 4, 21; [in Neb. iii. 4, Vat. Akoos; ver. 21, Vat. Akoos, F.A. Mekabz]. Akoos in Ezr., Akoos in Neb. iii. 4. Harkoz in Neb. iii. 21 = Akoos = Cox = Hakmoz.

KUSHA'TAH (3 syl.) (נֵרֶחֶם) [Jeconiah's row]: Koradas [Vat. F.A. Kor]. [Custow.]. The same as Kish or Kishil, the father of Ethan the Merarite (1 Chr. xv. 17).

LABAN

LADAD (לֶדֶד) [order, arranging]: Lādād: [Vat. Mazaθ]; Lazurc, the son of Shelah, and grandson of Judah. He is described as the "father," or founder, of Maresaiah in the lands of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 21).

LADAD (לָדָד) [put in order]: Lādād: Alex. Ḥaθaθ and Lādād: Leedan. 1. An Ephraimitic ancestor of Joshua the son of Nun (1 Chr. vii. 21).

2. (Ehād: Alex. Ḥaθaθ: Leedan, 1 Chr. xiii. 7, 8, 9: Lādād Alex. Ḥaθaθ and Lādād: Leob: 1 Chr. xvi. 21.) The son of Gershon, elsewhere called Jeush. His descendants in the reign of David were among the chief fathers of his tribe, and formed part of the Temple-choir.

LABAN (לָדָד) [white]: Ḥaθaθ: Joseph. Ḥaθaθ: Leob: Lōtan, son of Bethuel, grandson of Nabor and Milcah, grand-nephew of Abraham, brother of Rebekah, and father of Leah and Rachel; by whom and their descendants Bilhah and Zilpah he was the natural progenitor of three fourths of the nation of the Jews, and of our Blessed Lord, and the legal ancestor of the whole.

The elder branch of the family remained at Haran when Abraham removed to the land of Canaan, and it is there that we first meet with Laban, as taking the leading part in the betrothal of his sister Rebekah to her cousin Isaac (Gen. xxiv. 10, 24-60, xxvii. 43, xxviii. 4). Bethuel, his father, pays so insignificant a part in the whole transaction, being in fact only mentioned once, and that after his son (xxviii. 50), that various conjectures have been formed to explain it. Josephus asserts that Bethuel was dead, and that Laban was the head of the house and his sister's natural guardian (Ant. ii. 10, § 2); in which case "Bethuel" must have crept into the text inadvertently, or be supposed, with some (Adam Clarke, in loc.), to be the name of another brother of Rebekah. Le Cerc (in Pent.) mentions the conjecture that Bethuel was absent at first, but returned in time to give his consent to the marriage. The mode adopted by Prof. Blunt (Unhesitating Coincidences, p. 35) to explain what he terms "the consistent insignificance of Bethuel," namely, that he was incapacitated from taking the management of his family by age or indiscretion, is most ingenious; but the prominence of Laban may be sufficiently explained by the custom of the country, which then, as now (see Niebuhr, quoted by Rosenmüller in loc.), gave the brothers the main share in the arrangement of their sister's marriage, and the defense of her honor (comp. Gen. xxiii. 13; Judg. xxi. 22; 2 Sam. xiii. 20-21). [BETHUEL.]

The next time Laban appears in the sacred narrative it is as the host of his nephew Jacob at Haran (Gen. xxvii. 13, 14). The subsequent transactions by which he secured the valuable services of his nephew for fourteen years in return for his two daughters, and for six years as the price of his cattle, together with the disgraceful artifice by which he palmed off his elder and less attractive daughter on the unsuspecting Jacob, are familiar to all (Gen. xxix, xxx.).
Laban was absent shearing his sheep, when Jacob, having gathered together all his possessions, started with his wives and children for his native land; and it was not till the third day that he heard of their steady departure. In hot haste he set off in pursuit of the fugitives, his indignation at the prospect of losing a servant, the value of whose services he had proved by experience (xxx. 27), and a family who he hoped would have increased the power of his tribe, being increased by the discovery of the loss of his teraphim, or household gods, which Rachel had carried off, probably with the view of securing a prosperous journey. Jacob and his family had crossed the Pishputtes, and were already some days' march in advance of their pursuers; but so large a caravan, encumbered with women and children, and cattle, would travel but slowly (comp. Gen. xxxviii. 13), and Laban and his kinsmen came up with the retreating party on the east side of the Jordan, among the mountains of Gilead. The collision with his irritated father-in-law might have proved dangerous for Jacob but for a divine intervention to Laban, who, with characteristic hypocrisy, passes over in silence the real ground of his displeasure at Jacob's departure, urging only its clandestine character, which had prevented his sending him away with marks of affection and honor, and the theft of his gods. After some sharp mutual recrimination, and an unsuccessful search for the teraphim, which Rachel, with the cunning which characterized the whole family, knew well how to hide, a covenant of peace was entered into between the two parties, and a calm raised about a pillar-stone set up by Jacob, both as a memorial of the covenant, and a boundary which the contracting parties pledged themselves not to pass with hostile intentions. After this, in the simple and beautiful words of Scripture, "Laban rose up and kissed his sons and his daughters, and blessed them, and departed, and returned to his place;" and he thenceforward disappears from the Biblical narrative.

Few Scriptural characters appear in more repulsive colors than Laban, who seems to have concentrated in himself acquisitiveness and selfishness, and an unctuous hypocrisy and servility, which marked the family of Haran. The leading principle of his conduct was evidently self-interest, and he was little scrupulous as to the means whereby his ends were secured. Nothing can excuse the abominable trick by which he deceived Jacob in the matter of his wife, and there is much of harshness and mean selfishness in his other relations with him. At the same time it is impossible, on an unbiased view of the whole transactions, to acquit Jacob of blame, or to assign him any very decided superiority over his uncle in fair and generous dealing. In the matter of the flocks each was evidently seeking to outwit the other; and though the whole was divided overwork to deal with important issues in securing Jacob's return to Canaan in wealth and dignity, our moral sense revolts from what Chalmers (Daily Rev. Readings, p. 60) does not shrink from designating as "snaking artifices for the promotion of his own selfishness," adopted for his own enrichment and the impoverishment of his uncle; while we can well excuse Laban's mortification at seeing himself outdone by his nephew in cunning, and the best of his flocks changing hands. In their mistaken zeal to defend Jacob, Christian writers have unduly depreciated Laban, and even the ready hospitality shown by him to Abraham's servant, and the affectionate reception of his nephew (Gen. xxiv. 30, 31, xxix. 13, 14), have been misconstrued into the acts of a selfish man, eager to embrace an opportunity of a lucrative connection. No man, however, is wholly selfish; and even Laban was capable of generous impulses, however mean and unprincipled his general conduct.

E. V.

LABAN (לָבָן [white]: Aًbāb: Laban), one of the landmarks named in the obscure and disputed passage, Deut. i. 1: "Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Diblah." The mention of Hazeroth has perhaps led to the only conjecture regarding Laban of which the writer is aware, namely, that it is identical with Lishnah (Num. xxxv. 20), which was the second station from Hazeroth. The SYrinc Pes-Hito understands the name as Lysenon. The Targums, from Onkelos downward, play upon the five names in this passage, connecting them with the main events of the wanderings. Lavan in this way suggests the meaning, because of its white color, that being the force of the word in Hebrew.

G.

LAB'ANA (A'aba'ad: Labenona), 1 Esdr. v. 29. [L. max.]

* LACE (L, Eng. lus, Fr. lac, Span. leche, "bloss." It. lario, from the Lat. lupus) is used in the sense of cervi or bunt in Ex. xxvii. 28, 37, xxxix. 21, 31. The corresponding Hebrew word, לָכֶת (lakhet), is derived from a verb signifying "to twist," is translated "wound" in Judg. xvi. 9, line in Ex. xi. 3, "wore (of gold) in Ex. xxxix. 3, ribbon in Num. xv. 38, and very improperly "bracelets in Gen. xxxviii. 18, 25, where it denotes the cord or string by which the signet-ring was suspended from the neck.

A.

LACDEMOONIANS (Λακδημόνιας; once Λακδημόνιαν, 2 Mace. v. 9: Sparta, Spartan, Lacedemonians), the inhabitants of Sparta or Lacedemon, whom the Jews chose kindred (1 Mace. xii. 3; 5, 6, 20; xiv. 20, 21; xx. 3; 2 Mace. v. 9). [SPARTA.]

LACHISH (לָכִישׁ [perh. oblate, incivile, Dielt.] : [Rom. Aaγγες, exe. Is. xxxvi. 2, Aangis, Mic. i. 13, Aaγγα: Vat. Alex. FA, in Heb. and der., Sin. in Is. xxxvi. 2,] Aaxgis: [in Is. xxxvi. 8, Alex. Sin. omit.] but in Vat. of Josh. xv. Λαγγία;* A. Ajiorsi: Lachis, a city of the Amorites, the king of which joined with four others, at the invitation of Adonizedek king of Jerusalem, to chastise the Gibeonites for their league with Israel (Josh. x. 3, 5): They were, however, routed by Joshua at Bethhoron, and the king of Lachish fell a victim with the others under the trees at Makkekah (ver. 26). The destruction of the town seems to have shortly followed the death

a The ordinary editions of the Vatican LXX., Tischendorf's included, give Λαγγία, and the Alex. Λαγάς, but the edition of the former by Cardinal Mai has the Λαγγία throughout. In Josh. xvi. 30, all trace of Lachish has disappeared in the common editions; but in Mai's, Λαγάς is inserted between

*Lačepa and Ιακ. Bαργαθ. [In this note, as throughout the original edition of the dictionary, the edition of the LXX. printed at Rome in 1585 is expressly supposed to represent the Vatican manuscript Nc. 1290, though it differs from it, in proper names alone, in thousands of places. — A.]
of the king: it was attacked in its turn, immediately after the fall of Lachish, and notwithstanding an effort to relieve it by Hezron king of Gezer, was taken, and every soul put to the sword (vv. 31-33). In the special statement that the attack lasted two days, in contradiction to the other cities which were taken in one (see ver. 35), we gain our first glimpse of that strength of position for which Lachish was afterwards remarkable. In the catalogue of the kings slain by Joshua (xii. 10-12), Lachish occurs in the same place with regard to the others as in the narrative just quoted; but in Josh. xv., where the towns are separated into groups, it is placed in the Shefeloth, or lowland district, and in the same group with Ezlon and Makkekel (ver. 33), apart from its former companions. It should not be overlooked that, though included in the lowland district, Lachish was a town of the Amorites, who appear to have been essentially mountaineers. Its king is expressly named as one of the "kings of the Amorites who dwelled in the mountains" (Josh. x. 6). A similar remark has already been made of Jarmuth, Keilah, and others; and see Judah, vol. ii. p. 1490 b. * Its proximity to Lilaah is illu-

worded many centuries later (2 K. xix. 8). Lachish was one of the cities fortified and garrisoned by Hezroon after the revolt of the northern king-

doem (2 Chr. xi. 9). What was its fate during the invasion of Shishak—who no doubt advanced by the usual route through the maritime lowland, which would bring him under its very walls—we are not told. But it is probable that it did not materially suffer, for it was evidently a place of security later, when it was chosen as a refuge by Amaziah king of Judah from the conspirators who threatened him in Jerusalem, and to whom he at last fell a victim at Lachish (2 K. xiv. 19, 2 Chr. xxv. 27). Later still, in the reign of Hezekiah, it was one of the cities taken by Sennacherib when he on his way from Phoenicia to Egypt (Rawlinson's Herod. i. 477). It is specially mentioned that he laid siege to it "with all his power" (2 Chr. xxxii. 9), and here "the great king" himself remained, while his officers only were dispatched to Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxxii. 9; 2 K. xviii. 17).

This siege is considered by Layard and Gliecks to be depicted on the slabs found by the former in one of the chambers of the palace at Kouyunjik,

which bear the inscription "Sennacherib, the mighty king, king of the country of Assyria, sitting on the throne of judgment before (or at the entrance of) the city of Lachish (Lakhusha). I give permission for its slaughter" (Layard, N. & B. pp. 149-52, and 153, note). These slabs contain a view of a city which, if the inscription is correctly interpreted, must be Lachish itself.

Another slab seems to show the ground-plan of the same city after its occupation by the conquerors — the Assyrian tents pitched within the walls, and the foreign worship going on. The features of the town appear to be accurately given. At any rate there is considerable agreement between the two views in the character of the walls and towers, and both are unlike those represented on other slabs. Both support in a remarkable manner the conclusions above drawn from the statement of the Bible as to the position of Lachish. The elevation of the town (fig. 1) shows that it was on hilly ground, one part higher than the other. This is also testified to by the background of the scene in fig. 2, which is too remote to be included in the limits of the woodcut, but which in the original shows a very hilly country covered with vineyards and fig-trees. On the other hand the palms round the town in fig. 2 point to the proximity of the maritime plain, in which palms flourished — and still flourished — more than in any other region of Palestine. But though the Assyrian records thus appear to assert the capture of Lachish, no statement is to be found either in the Bible or Josephus that it was taken. Indeed, some expressions in the former would almost seem to imply the reverse (see "thought to win them," 2 Chr. xxxii. 1: "departed b from Lachish," 2 K. xix. 8; and especially Jer. xxxiv. 7). The warning of Micah (i. 13) c was perhaps delivered at this time. Obscur as the passage is, it plainly implies that from Lachish some form of idolatry, possibly belonging to the northern kingdom, had been imported into Jerusalem.

a Col. Rawlinson seems to read the same as Lubiana, c Lilaah (Layard, N. & B. 153, note).
b This is also the opinion of Rawlinson (Herod. i. 130, note 6). c The play of the words is between Lachish and Revish (ב"ץת, A. V. "swift beast"), and the ehoration is to flight.
Fig. 2. Plan of Lachi-n (C) after its capture. From the same work, plate 24.

in favor of the identification are the proximity of Egbou (if *Ajblin be it), and the situation of Um-Lakis in the middle of the plain, right in the road from Egypt. By "Parana" also Eusebius may have intended, not the southern district, but a place of that name, which is mentioned in the Talmud, and is placed by the accurate old travellerhap Parchi as two hours south of Gaza (Zonuz in Benj. of Tudeh, by Asher, ii. 442). With regard to the weakness of Um-Lakis, Mr. Porter has a good comparison between it and Ashkelon (Hondek., p. 261).

LACUNUS (Lacunos: Colossi, one of the sons of Addison, who returned with Ezra, and had married a foreign wife (1 Esdr. ix. 31). The name does not occur in this form in the parallel lists of Ezr. x., but it apparently occupies the place of Zonuz (ver. 30), as is indicated by the Colossi of the Vulg.

LADAN ([Ab. Addan]: Adad, Tisch. [i. e. Rom.], but Zonuz in Mai’s ed. [I. e. Vet.]: Ithlimus), 1 Esdr. c. 37. [Delamar. 2]}

LADD OF TYRUS, THE (ץ ננמ נב תוד קתב) Tyros: a terminus Tyri, possibly reading נומנ: one of the extremities (the northern) of the district over which Simon Macrobius was made captain (Σπυράργυς) by Antiochus VI. (or These), very shortly after his coming to the throne; the other being "the borders of Egypt" (1 Macc. xi. 59). The Ladder of Tyre, or of the Tyrians, was the local name for a high mountain, the highest in that neighborhood, a hundred stadia north of Ptolemais, the modern Akka or Acre (Joseph. B. J. ii. 10, § 2). The position of the Ris en-elhbarah agrees very nearly with this, as it lies 10 miles, or about 120 stadia, from Akka, and is characterized by travellers from Parchi downwards as very high and steep. Both the Ris en-elhbarah and the Ris el-alyan, i.e. the White Cape, sometimes called Cape Blanco, a headland 6 miles still farther north, are surrounded by a path cut in zigzags; that over the latter is attributed to Alexander the Great. It is possibly from this circumstance that the Ris el-alyan b is by some travellers (Bray, Van de Velde, etc.) treated as the ladder of the Tyrians.

"the mountain climax" at an hour and a quarter south of the Nahr Pehlevi Rasa (Adonis River) meaning therefore the headland which encloses on the north the bay of Juneh above *Brut.!

a This name is found in the Talmud, תועם.

b Maundrell, ordinarily so exact (March 17), places...
LAEL

But by the early and accurate Jewish traveller, ≈Parchai (Zimm, 402), and in our own times by Robinson (ii. 89), Mislin (Les Saints Lieux, ii. 9), Porter (Haulfik, p. 380), Schwarz (76), Stauley (S. F. p. 264), the Res en-Nakura is identified with the ladder; the last-named traveller pointing out well that the reason for the name is the fact of its differing from Carmel in that it leads no track between itself and the sea, and thus, by cutting off all communication round its base, acts as the natural barrier between the Bay of Acre and the maritime plain to the north—in other words, "between Palestine and Phenicia" (comp. p. 266).

G.

LA'EL (לֶאֵל) [to God, i. e. consecrated to him, Furst]: La'afa; La'el, the father of Eliaspah, prince of the Gershonites at the time of the Exodus (Num. iii. 24).

LA'HAD (לָהָד): Aaadâ: [Vat. Ααδᾶ]: Alex. Ααδᾶ, son of Judah, one of the descendants of Judah, a Jewish tribe who settled at Zorah, according to the Targ. of R. Joseph (1 Chr. iv. 2).

LAHAI-ROI'T, THE WELL (לָהַיּוֹר): τὸ φράες τῆς ὁρασίας: puteus, cuyus uocen ex iv. 11, nomine Tarenta et Videntis. In this form it is given in the A. V. of Gen. xxiv. 62, and xxv. 11, the name of the famous well of Hagar's relief, in the oasis of verdure round which Isaac afterwards resided. In xvi. 14—the only other occurrence of the name—it is represented in the full Hebrew form of BEREH-LAHAI-Ro'T. In the Mussulman traditions the well Zemzem in the Belhel-mehcc of Mecca is identical with it. [Lehm.] G.

LAH-MAM (לָהָמ): Maxîs kal Naaxâs: Alex. Ααμα: Lehmon, Leeman, in the lowland district of Judah (Josh. xxv. 40) named between CANAAN and KITILISH, and in the same group with LACHISH. It is not mentioned in the Ocanonost, nor does it appear that any traveller has sought for or discovered its site.

In many MSS. and editions of the Hebrew Bible, amongst them the Rec. Text of Van der Hooght, the name is given with a final s—Lachmas.4 Corrupt as the LXX. text is here, it will be observed that both MSS. exhibit the s. This is the case also in the Targum and the other oriental versions. The ordinary copies of the Vulgate have Lehmanum, but the text published in the Beneficent edition of Jerome Leonna.

G.

LAH-MI (לָהָמִי) [Bethlehemite? Rom.—τὸν Ααμά]: Vat. Δυαμμα: Alex. Δυαμον: Beth-lehem-ites), the brother of Goliath the Gittite, slain by Elhanan the son of Jair, or Joar (1 Chr. xxv. 5). In the parallel narrative (2 Sam. xxvi. 19), amongst other differences, Lahmi disappears in the word Beth-hal-lechem, i. e. the Bethlehemite. This

hand, Iry and Mangies (Oct. 21), with equally unusual inaccuracy, give the name of Cape Blanco to the Res Nakura—an hour's ride from es-Zorah, the ancient Elle-Gappa. Wilson also (ii. 220) has fallen into a curious confusion between the two.

a He gives the name as al-Nakahr, probably a mere corruption of en-Nakura.

b לָהָמִי for לָהָם, by interchange of א for א.
scene of the battle in which Judas was killed. In the Vulgate it is given as Laish. If the Heera at which Bemintrius was encamped on the same occasion was Beeroth — and from the Peshito reading this seems likely — then Alexar or Laiska was somewhere on the northern road, 10 or 12 miles from Jerusalem, about the spot at which a village named Adasa existed in the time of Eusebius and Jerome. D (Δ) and I. (Δ) are so often interchanged in Greek manuscripts, that the two names may indicate one and the same place, and that the Laishah of Isaiah. Such an identification would be to a certain extent consistent with the requirements of Is. xx. 20, while it would throw some light on the uncertain topography of the last struggle of Judah Marcellinus. But it must be admitted that at present it is but conjectural; and that the neighborhood of Beeroth is at the least somewhat far removed from the narrow circle of the villages enumerated by Isaiah.

G.

LAISH (יוחט) [Low]; in 2 Sam. the orig. text, Celithih, has יוחט; [Rom. 'Anis, Vat.] Aeron, Σαλάας; Alex. Anis. Αρεο: Laos; father of Phabil, son of Judah. David gave Michael, David's wife (1 Sam. xxiv. 44; 2 Sam. iii. 15). He was a native of Gallim. It is very remarkable that the names of Laish (Laishah) and Gallim should be found in conjunction at a much later date (Is. x. 30). G.

LA KUMES. [PALESTINE.]

LA KUM (תַּקָּמ), i.e. Lakkum [takoda-strider = castle, defense]; דָּףְשָה: Alex. — unusually wide of the Hebrew — empty Ιούκ: [Comp. Ακρακία: Λεκτον], one of the places which formed the landmarks of the boundary of Naphtali (Josh. xix. 33), named next to Jabesh, and apparently between it and the Jordan; but the whole scene is exceedingly obscure, and few, if any, of the names have yet been recognized. Lakkum is but casually named in the Thomsonian, and no one since has discovered its situation. The rendering of the Alex. LXX. is worth remark.

G.

LAMB. 1. נָבָה, immar, is the Chaldean equivalent of the Hebrew ecebe. See below, No. 6 (Ezr. vi. 9, 17, vii. 17).

2. נָבָה, nabah (1 Sam. vii. 9; Is. lxv. 25), a young suckling lamb; originally the young of any animal. The noun from the same root in Arabic signifies "a fawn," in Ethiopic "a kid," in Samaritan "a boy;" while in Syriac it denotes "a fox," and in the fem., "a girl." Hence "Nabalah hami," "Namal, arise." (Mark v. 41). The plural of a cognate form occurs in Is. xx. 11.

3. נָבָה, ecebe, נַבָּה, etc., and the feminines נְבָּה, נְבָּּה, נְבָּּה, נְבָּּּה, respectively denote a male and female lamb from the first to the third year. The former perhaps more nearly coincide with the provincial term boy or bocjet, which is applied to a young ram before he is shorn. The corresponding word in Arabic, according to Gesenius, denotes a ram at that period when he has lost his first two teeth and four others make their appearance, which happens in the second or third year. Young rams at this age formed an important part of almost every sacrifice. They were offered at the daily morning and evening sacrifice (Ex. xxix. 38-41), on the Sabbath day (Num. xxviii. 9), at the feast of the new moon (Num. xxviii. 11), of Atonement (Num. xxix. 2), of tabernacles (Num. xxix. 13-40), of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 18-20), and of the Passover (Ex. xii. 5). They were brought by the princes of the congregation as burnt-offerings as the dedication of the tabernacle (Num. vii.), and were offered on solemn occasions like the consecration of Aaron (Lev. i. 9), the coronation of Solomon (1 Chr. xii. 21), the purification of the Temple under Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxxii. 21), and the great passover held in the reign of Josiah (2 Chr. xxxv. 7). They formed part of the sacrifice offered at the purification of the sons of Aaron (Lev. vi. 16), and at the cleansing of a leper (Lev. xiv. 10-25). They accompanied the presentation of first-fruits (Lev. xxii. 12). When the Nazarites commenced their period of separation they offered a he-lamb for a trespass-offering (Num. vi. 12); and at its conclusion a he-lamb was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and an ewe-lamb as a sin-offering (c. 14). An ewe-lamb was also the offering for the sin of ignorance (Lev. iv. 32).

4. פַּר, far, a fat ram, or more probably a wether, as the word is generally employed in opposition to עוד, which strictly denotes a "ram" (Deut. xxxii. 14; 2 K. iii. 4; Is. xxxiv. 6). Misha king of Geshur, carried off into the kingdom of Israel 10,000 fat wethers; and this circumstance is made use of by R. Joseph Kimachi to explain Is. xvi. 1, which he regards as an exhortation to the Moabites to renew their tryst. The Tyrians obtained their supply from Arabia and Kedar (Ex. xxii. 21), and the pastures of Bashan were famous as grazing grounds (Ex. xxxiii. 18). [Bashan, Amer. ed.]

5. נָבָא, na'a, rendered "lamb," in Ex. xii. 21, is properly a collective term denoting a "flock" of small cattle, sheep and goats, in distinction from herds of the larger animal (Lev. ii. 7; Ex. xiv. 15). In opposition to this collective term the word נָב, nab, is applied to denote the individuals of a flock, whether sheep or goats; and hence, though "lamb" is in many passages the rendering of the A. V., the marginal reading gives "kid." (Gen. xxii. 7, 8; Ex. xiii. 2, xxii. 14). [Sheep.]

On the Paschal Lamb see PASSOVER. W. A. W.

LAMECH (לָמֶ֣כְע) [perh. youth, one in his strength], Gen. vi. 20: Lamech, properly Lemech, the name of two persons in antediluvian history.

1. The fifth named descendant from Cain (Gen. iv. 18-24). He is the only one except Enosh, of the posterity of Cain, whose history is related with some detail. He is the first polygamist on record. His two wives, Adah and Zillah, and his daughter Nannah, are, with Eve, the only antediluvian women whose names are mentioned by Moses. His three sons — Jaram, Jiral, and Tural — are celebrated in Scripture as authors of useful inventions. The Targum of Jonathan adds, that his daughter was "the mistress of sounds and songs," i.e. the first poetess. Josephus (Antid. 2, § 2) relates that the number of his sons was seventy-seven, and Jerome records the same tradition, adding that they were all cut off by the Deluge, and that this was the seventy-and-sevenfold vengeance which Lamech inspired.

The remarkable poem which Lamech uttered has not yet been explained quite satisfactorily. It is
the subject of a dissertation by Hilliger in *Theosaurus Theologico-Philol.* i. 141, and is discussed at length by the various commentators on Genesis. The history of the descendants of Cain closes with a song, which the Jews, that Cain bloodshed. Delitzsch observes, that as the arts which were afterwards consecrated by pious men to a heavenly use had their origin in the family of Cain, so this early effort of poetry is composed in honor, not of God, but of some deadly weapon. It is the only extant specimen of antediluvian poetry; it came down, perhaps as a popular song, to the generation for whom Moses wrote, and he inserts it in its proper place in his history. It contains in all the peculiar features of later Semitic poetry — rhythm, assonance, parallelism, strophe, and poetical diction. It may be rendered:

Adah and Zillah: hear my voice, Ye wives of Lamech: give ear unto my speech; For a man had slain me for wounding me, And a youth for wounding me: Surely sevenfold shall Cain be avenged, But Lamech seventy and seven.

The A. V. makes Lamech declare himself a murderer, "I have slain a man to my wounding," etc. This is the view taken in the LXX. and the Vulgate. Chrysostom (Hom. xx. in Gen.) regards Lamech as a murderer, but by more, pretences to make public confession of his guilt solely to ease his conscience, and afterwards (Hom. in Ps. vi.) obtaining mercy. Theodoret (Quaest. in Gen. xiv.) sets him down as a murderer. Basal (Ep. 290 [317], § 5) interprets Lamech's words to mean that he had committed two murders, and that he deserved a much severer punishment than Cain, as having sinned after plainer warning. Basal adds, that some persons interpret the last lines of the poem as meaning, that whereas Cain's sin increased, and was followed after seven generations by the punishment of the Deluge washing out the fouls of the world, so Lamech's sin shall be followed in the seventy-seventh (see St. Luke iii. 22-38) generation by the coming of Him who taketh away the sin of the world. Jerome (Ep. xxxvi. of Domusam, t. i. p. 161) relates as a tradition of his predecessors and of the Jews that Cain was accidentally slain by Lamech in the seventh generation from Adam. This legend is told with fuller details by Jarchi. According to him, the occasion of the poem was the refusal of Lamech's wives to associate with him in consequence of his having killed Cain and Tubal-cain; Lamech, it is said, was blind, and was led about by Tubal-cain: when the latter saw in the thicket what he supposed to be a wild-beast, Lamech, by his son's direction, shot an arrow at it, and thus slew Cain: in alarm and indignation at the deed, he killed his son: hence his wives refused to associate with him; and he excuses himself as having acted without a vengeful or murderous purpose. Luther considers the occasion of the poem to be the deliberate murder of Cain by Lamech. Lightfoot (Deces Chrsog. More. præm. § iv.) considers Lamech as expressing remorse for having, as the first polygamist, introduced more destruction and murder than Cain was the author of into the world. Pfeiffer (Diff. Scrip. Lec. p. 25) collects different opinions with his usual diligence, and concludes that the poem is Lamech's vindication of himself to his wives, who were in terror for the possible consequences of his having slain two of the posterity of Seth. Lowth (De S. Poesi Heb. iv.) and Michaelis think that Lamech is excusing himself for some murder which he had committed in self-defense "for a wound inflicted on me." A rather curious interpretation has been given to the poem by some, whose opinions are perhaps of greater weight than the preceding in a question of Hebrew criticism. Onkelos, followed by Pseudo-jonathan, paraphrases it, "I have not slain a man that I should bear sin on his account." The Arab. Ver. (Nastula) puts it in an interrogative form, "Have I slain a man?" etc. These two versions, which are substantially the same, are adopted by De Dieu and Bishop Patrick. Alen-Erra, Calvin, Drusius, and Cartwright, interpret it in the future tense as a threat, "I will slay any man who wounds me." This version is adopted by Herder: whose hypothesis as to the occasion of the poem was partly anticipated by Hass, and has been received by Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Delitzsch. Herder regards it as Lamech's song of exultation on the invention of the sword by his son Tubal-cain, in the possession of which he foresaw a great advantage to himself and his family over any enemies. This interpretation appears, on the whole, to be the best that has been suggested. But whatever interpretation be preferred, all persons will agree in the remark of Bp.Kidder that the occasion of the poem not being revealed, no man can be expected to determine the full sense of it; thus much is plain, that they are vamping words in which Lamech seems, from Cain's indeliberacy, to encourage himself in violence and wickedness.

W. T. B.

* The sacred writer inserts the lines, says Dr. Count, "as an illustration of the spirit of the period of violence and blood, which culminated in the state of society described in Gen. vi. 5 and 11-13, when the earth was filled with violence." They celebrate the prowess of an ancient hero, who boasts that he had signally avenged his wound on his adversary, and that the vengeance promised to Cain was light, compared with what he had inflicted" (Genesis, with a revised Version and Notes, p. 25: N. Y. 1898).

H.

2. The father of Noah (Gen. v. 25-31; 1 Chr. i. 3). Chrysostom (Serm. ix. in Gen. and Hom. xxi. in Gen.), perhaps thinking of the character of the other Lamech, speaks of this as an unrighteous man, though moved by a divine impulse to give a prophetic name to his son. Buttmann and others, observing that the names of Lamech and Enoch are found in the list of Seth's, as well as in the list of Cain's family, infer that the two lists are merely different versions or recensions of one original list, — traces of two conflicting histories of the first human family. This theory is deservedly repudiated by Delitzsch on Gen. v. W. T. B.

LAMENTATIONS. The Hebrew title of this book, *Echoh* (יוח), is taken, like those of the five books of Moses, from the Hebrew word with which it opens, and which appears to have been almost a received formula for the commence-ment of a song of wailing (comp. 2 Sam. i. 19-27). The Septuagint translators found themselves obliged, as in the other cases referred to, to substitute some title more significant, and adopted ἀνέπλων *lamentations* as the equivalent of *Kimah* (יוח, "lamentations"), which they found in Jer. vii. 29, ix. 19, 20; 2 Chr. xxxv. 23, and which had probably been
LAMENTATIONS

applied familiarly, as it was afterwards by Jewish commentators, to the book itself. The Vulgate gives the Greek word and explains it (Threni, i.e., Lamentations Jeremae Prophetae). Luther and the A.V. have given the translation only, in Klopffer's Lamentations and Lamentations respectively.

The poems included in this collection appear in the Hebrew canon with no name attached to them, and there is no direct external evidence that they were written by the prophet Jeremiah earlier than the date given in the preatory verse which appears in the Septuagint. This represents, however, the established belief of the Jews after the completion of the canon. Josephus (Ant. x. 5, § 1) follows, as far as the question of authorship is concerned, in the same track, and the absence of any tradition or probable conjecture to the contrary, leaves the consensus of critics and commentators almost undisturbed. An agreement so striking rests, as might be expected, on strong internal evidence.

The poems belong unmistakably to the last days of the kingdom, or the commencement of the exile. They are written by one who speaks, with the vividness and intensity of an eye-witness, of the misery which he behelds. It might almost be enough to ask who else then living could have written with that union of strong passionate feeling and entire submission to Jehovah which characterizes both the Lamentations and the Prophecy of Jeremiah. The evidences of identity are, however, stranger and more minute. In both we meet, once and again, with the picture of the 'Virgin-daughter of Zion,' sitting down in her shame and misery (Lam. i. 13, ii. 13; Jer. xiv. 17). In both there is the same vehemence outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eyes flow down with tears (Lam. i. 16; ii. 11, iii. 48, 49; Jer. ix. 1, xiii. 17, xiv. 17).

There is the same haunting feeling of being surrounded with fears and terrors on every side (Lam. ii. 22; Jer. vi. 25, xvi. 5). In both the worst of all the evils is the iniquity of the prophets and the priests (Lam. ii. 14, iv. 13; Jer. v. 30, 41, xiv. 13, 14). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Judge (Lam. iii. 64-66; Jer. xi. 24). He bids the rival nation that existed in the full of Jerusalem rejoice for a like desolation (Lam. iv. 21; Jer. xlix. 14). We can well understand, with all these instances before us, how the scribes who compiled the Canon after the return from Babylon should have been led, even in the absence of external testimony, to assign to Jeremiah the authorship of the Lamentations.

Assuming this as sufficiently established, there come the questions — (1.) When, and on what occasion did he write it? (2.) In what relation does it stand to his other writings? (3.) What light does it throw on his personal history, or on that of the time in which he lived?

1. The earliest statement on this point is that of Josephus (Ant. x. 5, § 1). He finds among the books which were extant in his own time the Lamentations on the death of Josiah, which are mentioned in 2 Chr. xxxv. 25. As there are no traces of any other poem of this kind in the later Jewish literature, it has been inferred, naturally enough, that he speaks of this. This view was maintained also by Jerome, and has been defended by some modern writers (Ussher, Buthe, Michaelis, etc.).

Notes to Lament. Pref. xiii.; Calvinist, Prop. gent. ad Thren.; Be Wette, Einl. in das A. T., Kgyl.). It does not appear, however, to rest on any better grounds than a hasty conjecture, arising from the reluctance of men to admit that any work by an inspired writer should have perished, on the arbitrary assumption (Be Wette, l. c.) that the same man could not, twice in his life, have been the spokesman of a great national sorrow. And against it we have to set (1) the tradition on the other side embodied in the preface of the Septuagint. (2) the contents of the book itself. Admitting that some of the calamities described in it may have been common to the invasions of Nebuchadnezzar, we yet look in vain for a single word distinctive of a funeral dirge over a devout and zealous reformer like Josiah, while we find, step by step, the closest possible likeness between the pictures of misery in the Lamentations and the events of the closing years of the reign of Zedekiah. The long siege had brought on the famine in which the young children fainted for hunger (Lam. ii. 11, 12, 20, 21). The city was taken by storm (Lam. ii. 7, iv. 12; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 17). The Temple itself was polluted with the massacre of the priests who defended it (Lam. ii. 20, 21; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 17), and then destroyed (Lam. ii. 6; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 19). The fortresses and strongholds of Judah were thrown down. The anointed of the Lord, under whose shadow the remnant of the people might have hoped to live in safety, was taken prisoner (Lam. iv. 20; Jer. xxxix. 5). The chief of the people were carried into exile (Lam. i. 5, ii. 9; 2 K. xxi. 11). The bitterest grief was found in the malignant exultation of the Edonites (Lam. iv. 21; Ps. cxvii. 7). Under the rule of the stranger the Sabaths and solemn feasts were forgotten (Lam. i. 4, ii. 6), as they could hardly have been during the short period in which Jerusalem was in the hands of the Egyptians. Unless we adopt the strained perils, or the strained poem is prophetic in the sense of being predictive, the writer seeing the future as if it were actually present, or the still wilder conjecture of Jarchi, that this was the roll which Jehoiakim destroyed, and which was re-written by Baruch or Jeremiah (Cargoy, Introd. ad lib. V. T. iii. c. iv.), we are compelled to come to the conclusion that the coincidence is not accidental, and to adopt the later, not the earlier of the dates. At what period after the capture of the city the prophet gave this utterance to his sorrow we can only conjecture, and the materials for doing so with any probability are but scanty. The local tradition, which pointed out a cavern in the neighborhood of Jerusalem as the refuge to which Jeremiah withdrew that he might write this book (Del Rio, Proleg. in Thren., quoted by Cargoy, Introd. l. c.) is as trustworthy

a But it came to pass that after Israel was led captive and Jerusalem was laid waste, Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and sold. b The question whether all the five poems were by the same hand has however been raised by Theodore, Die Kriegsleider erklärt: Vorlekt, quoted in David- von's Introd. to O. T., p. 888.

b More detailed coincidences of words and phrases are given by Keil quoting from Parace in his Einl. in das A. T. § 129.

c Michaelis and Buthe, however, afterwards abandoned this hypothesis, and adopted that of the later date.

d The argument that iii. 27 implies the youth of the writer, hardly needs to be confuted.
as most of the other legends of the time of Helena. The ingenuity which aims at attaching each individual poem to some definite event in the prophet's life, is for the most part simply wasted. He may have written it immediately after the attack was over, as he was with Gedaliah at Mizpeh, or when he was with his countrymen at Talpiot.

II. It is well, however, to be reminded by these conjectures that we have before us, not a book in five chapters, but five separate poems, each complete in itself, each having a distinct subject, yet brought at the same time under a plan which includes them all. It is clear, before entering on any other characteristics, that we find, in full predominance, that strong personal emotion which mingled itself, in greater or less measure, with the whole prophetic work of Jeremiah. There is here no "word of Jehovah," no direct message to a sinful people. The man speaks out of the fulness of his heart, and though a higher Spirit than his own helps him to give utterance to his sorrows, it is yet the language of a sufferer rather than of a teacher. This is more manifest in the technical classification which placed the Lamentations among the Hagiographa of the Hebrew Canon, in the feeling which led the rabbinic writers (Kinschi, \textit{Pref. in Psal.}) to say that they and the other books of that group, were written indeed by the help of the Holy Spirit, but not with the special gift of prophecy.

Other differences between the two books that bear the prophet's name grew out of this. Here there is more attention to form, more elaboration. The rhythm is more uniform than in the prophecies. A complicated alphabetic structure pervades nearly the whole book. It will be remembered that this acrostic form of writing was not peculiar to Jeremiah. Whatever its origin, whether it had been adopted as a help to the memory, and so fitted especially for didactic poems, or for such as were to be sung by great bodies of people (Louth, \textit{Psalms}, ii.), it had been a received, and it would seem popular, framework for poems of very different characters, and extending probably over a considerable period of time. The 119th Psalm is the great monument which forces itself upon our notice; but it is found also in the 25th, 34th, 37th, 111th, 112th, 145th — and in the singularly beautiful fragment appended to the book of Proverbs (Prov. xxxi. 10-31). Traces of it, as if the work had been left half-finished (De Wette, \textit{Psalmen}, ad loc.) appear in the 9th and 10th. In the Lamentations (confining ourselves for the present to the structure) we meet with some remarkable peculiarities.

---

\textit{Lamentations} (1.) Ch. i., ii., and iv. contain 22 verses each, arranged in alphabetic order, each verse falling into three nearly balanced clauses (Ewald, \textit{Post. Back.} p. 147); ii. 15 forms an exception under this rule, the result of an interpolation, as if the writer had shaken off for a moment the restraint of his self-imposed law. Possibly the inversion of the usual order of \(\mathbf{Y}\) and \(\mathbf{Z}\) in ch. ii., iii., iv., may have arisen from a like forgetfulness. Grotius, \textit{ad loc.}, explains it on the assumption that here Jeremiah followed the order of the Chaldean alphabet.

(2.) Ch. iii. contains three short verses under each letter of the alphabet, the initial letter being three times repeated.

(3.) Ch. v. contains the same number of verses as ch. i., ii., iv., but without the alphabetic order. The thought suggests itself that the earnestness of the prayer with which the book closes may have carried the writer beyond the limits within which he had previously confined himself; but the conjecture (of Ewald) that we have here, as in Ps. iv. and x., the broken draught of what was intended to have been finished afterwards in the same manner as the others, is at least a probable one.

III. The power of entering into the spirit and meaning of poems such as these depends on two distinct conditions. We must seek to see, as with our own eyes, the desolation, misery, confusion, which came before those of the prophet. We must endeavor also to feel as he felt when he looked on them. And the last is the more difficult of the two. Jeremiah was not merely a patriot-poet, weeping over the ruin of his country. He was a prophet who had seen all this coming, and had foretold it as inevitable. He had urged submission to the Chaldeans as the only mode of diminishing the terrors of that "day of the Lord." And now the Chaldeans were come, irritated by the perfidy and rebellion of the king and princes of Judah; and the actual horrors that he saw, surpassed, though he had predicted them, all that he had been able to imagine. All feeling of exultation in which, as mere prophet of evil, he might have indulged at the fulfillment of his forebodings, was swallowed up in deep overwhelming sorrow. Yet sorrow, not less than other emotions, works on men according to their characters, and a man with Jeremiah's gifts of utterance could not sit down in the mere silence and stupor of a hopeless grief. He was compelled to give expression to that which was devouring his heart and the heart of his people. The act itself was a relief to him. It led him on (as will be seen hereafter) to a calmer and serener state. It revived

has shown how compatible such a structure is with the highest energy and beauty. With some of these, too, it must be added, the assignment of a later date than the time of David rests on the foregone conclusion that the acrostic structure is itself a proof of it. (Comp. Delitzsch, \textit{Commentar. uber den Psalter}, on Ps. ix., x.) De Wette however allows, conditionally, that the Lamentations, in spite of their degenerate taste, "have some merit in their way?" (\"stind zwar in ihrer Art von einigen Werthe?\")

Similar anomalies occur in Ps. xxxvii., and have received a like explanation (De Wette, Ps. p. 57). It is however a mere hypothesis that the Chaldean alphabet differed in this respect from the Hebrew; nor is it easy to see why Jeremiah should have chosen the Hebrew order for one poem, and the Chaldean for the other three.

---

\textit{De Wette} maintains (\textit{Commentar. uber die Psalmen}, p. 56) that this acrostic form of writing was the outgrowth of a feeble and degenerate age dwelling on the outer structure of poetry when the soul had departed. His judgment as to the origin and character of the alphabetic form is substantiated by Ewald (\textit{Psalmen}, i. p. 140). It is hard, however, to reconcile this estimate with the impression made on us by such Psalms as the 25th and 54th; and Ewald himself, in his translation of the Alphabetical Psalms and the Lamentations,
the faith and hope which had been nearly crushed out.

It has to be remembered too, that in this speaking he was doing that which many must have looked for from him, and so meeting at once their expectations and their wants. Other prophets and poets had made themselves the spokesmen of the nation's feelings on the death of kings and heroes. The party that continued faithful to the policy and principles of Josiah remembered how the prophet had lamented over his death. The Lamentations of that period (though they are lost to us) had been accepted as a great national dirge. Was he to be silent now that a more terrible calamity had fallen upon the people? Did not the exiles in Babylon need this form of consolation? Does not the appearance of this book in their Canon of Sacred writings, after their return from exile, indicate that during their captivity they had found that consolation in it?

The choice of a structure so artificial as that which has been described above, may at first sight appear inconsistent with the deep intense sorrow of which it claims to be the utterance. Some wilder less measured rhythm would seem to us to have been a litter form of expression. It would belong, however, to a very shallow and hasty criticism to pass this judgment. A man true to the gift he has received will make the conventional (28) self-imposed rules for deep sorrow as well as for other strong emotions. In proportion as he is afraid of being carried away by the strong current of feeling, will he be anxious to make the laws more difficult, the discipline more effectual. Something of this kind is traceable in the fact that so many of the master-minds of European literature have chosen, as the fit vehicle for their deepest, tenderest, most impassioned thoughts, the complicated structure of the sonnet: in Dante's selection of the terzo rime for his vision of the unseen world. What the sonnet was to Petrarch and to Milton, that the alphabetic verse-system was to the writers of Jeremiah's time, the most difficult among the recognized forms of poetry, and yet one in which (assuming the earlier date of some of the Psalms above referred to) some of the noblest thoughts of that poetry had been deposited (though not originally so), he should have employed it as flatter than any other for the purpose for which he used it. If these Lamentations were intended to assuage the bitterness of the Babylonian exile, there was, besides this, the subsidiary advantage that it supplied the memory with an artificial help. Hymns and poems of this kind, once learnt, are not easily forgotten, and the circumstances of the captives made it then, more than ever, necessary that they should have this help afforded them.1

An examination of the five poems will enable us to judge how far each stands by itself, how far they are connected as parts forming a whole. We must deal with them as they are, not forcing our own meanings into them: looking on them not as prophetic, or didactic, or historical, but simply as lamentations, exhibiting, like other elegies, the different phases of a pervading sorrow.

1. The opening verse strikes the key-note of the whole poem. That which haunts the prophet's mind is the solitude in which he finds himself. She that was a princess among the nations (like the JEDDAH CAPE of the Roman males) “solitary,” “as a widow.” Her “lovers” (the nations with whom she had been allied) hold aloof from her (2). The heathen are entered into the sanctuary, and mock at her Sabothith (7, 10). After the manner so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the personality of the writer now recedes and new advances, and blends by hardly perceptible transition, with that of the city which he personifies, and with which he, as it were, identifies himself. At one time, it is the daughter of Zion that asks “Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?” (12). At another, it is the prophet who looks on her, and portrays her as “spreading forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her” (17). Miming with this outburst of sorrow there are two thoughts characteristic both of the man and the time. The calamities which the nation suffers are the consequences of its sins. There must be the confession of these sins: “The Lord is righteous, for I have rebelled against His commandment” (18). There is also, at any rate, this gleam of consolation, that Judah is not alone in her sufferings. Those who have exulted in her destruction shall drink of the same cup. They shall be like unto her in the day that the Lord shall call (19).11

II. As the solitude of the city was the subject of the first lamentation, so the destruction that had laid it waste is that which is most conspicuous in the second. Jehovah had thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah (2). The rampart and the wall have fallen together (8). The walls of the palace are given up into the hand of the enemy (7). The breach is great as if made by the invading of the sea (13). With this there had been united all the horrors of the famine and the assault: young children fainting for hunger in the top of every street (19); women eating their own children, and so fulfilling the curse of Deut. xxviii. 53 (20); the priest and the prophet slain in the sanctuary of the Lord (ibid.). Added to all this, there was the remembrance of that which had been all along the great trial of Jerusalem's life, against which he had to wage continual war. The prophets of Jerusalem had seen rain and foolish things, false burdens, and causes of banishment (14). A righteous judgment had fallen on them. The prophets found no vision of Jehovah (9). The king and the princes who had listened to them were captive among the Gentiles.

III. The difference in the structure of this poem which has been already noticed, indicates a corresponding difference in its substance. In the two preceding poems, Jeremiah had spoken of the misery and destruction of Jerusalem. In the third he speaks chiefly, though not exclusively, of his own. He himself is the man that has seen affliction (1), who has been brought into darkness and not into light (2). He looks back upon the long life of the holy man whose thoughts he has been called to express, the scorn and derision of the people, the bitterness as of one drunken with wormwood (14, 15). But that experience was not one which had ended in

---

1 The reappearance of this structure in the later literature of the East is not without interest. Alphabetic poems are found among the hymns of Ephraim (Assyrian, Bbl. Chwst. viii. 11, 19, 38) and other writers; sometimes, as in the case of Eleazar, with a much more complicated plan than any of the O. T. poems of this type (ibid. iii. 22), and these chiefly in hymns to be sung by boys at solemn festivals, or in compositions of faith which were meant for their instruction.
darkness and despair. Here, as in the prophecies, we find a Gospel for the weary and heavy-laden, a trust not to be shaken, in the mercy and righteousness of Jehovah. The mercies of the Lord are new every morning (58). The closing verses, in particular, point to one fixed characteristic which must have occasioned this difference. There are signs also of a later date than that of the preceding poems. Though the horrors of the famine are ineffaceable, yet that which he has before him is rather the continued protracted suffering of the rule of the Chaldeans. The mountain of Zion is desolate, and the foxes walk on it (18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (9). Women have been subjected to insult and wrong which seemed to have been taken to grind, and the children have fallen under the wood (13). But in this also, deep as might be the humiliation, there was hope, even as there had been in the dark hours of the prophet's own life. He and his people are sustained by the old thought which had been so fruitful of comfort to other prophets and patriarchs. The periods of suffering and struggle which seemed so horrid, were moments in the lifetime of the Eternal (19); and the thought of that eternity brought with it the hope that the purposes of love which had been declared so clearly should one day be fulfilled. The last words of this Lamentation are those which have risen so often from broken and contrite hearts, "Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned. Renew our days as of old" (21). That which had begun with wailing and weeping ends (following Ewald's and Michaelis's translation) with the question of hope, "Wilt thou utterly reject us? Wilt thou be very wroth against us?"

There are perhaps few portions of the O. T. which appear to have done the work they were meant to do more effectually than this. It has presented but scanty materials for the systems and controversies of theology. It has supplied thousands with the fullest utterance for their sorrows in the critical periods of national or individual suffering. We may well believe that it soothed the weary years of the Babylonian exile (comp. Zech. i. 6, with Lami. ii. 17). When they returned to their own land, and the desolation of Jerusalem was remembered as belonging only to the past, this was the book of remembrance. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July), the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read, year by year, with fastings and weepings, to commemorate the misery out of which the people had been delivered. It has come to be connected with the thoughts of a later devastation, and its words enter, sometimes at least, into the prayers of the pilgrim Jews who meet at the "place of wailing" to mourn over the departed glory of their city. It enters largely into the nobly-constructed order of the Latin Church for the service of Pasion week (Breviarium Rom. Feria Quinta, "In Cœna Domini"). If it has been comparatively in the background in times when the study of Scripture had passed into casuistry and speculation, it has come forward, once and again, in times of danger and suffering, as a messenger of peace, comforting men, not after the fashion of the friends of

---

\[\text{Lamentations} 1587\]

It obviously indicates either a deliberate abandonment of the alphabetic structure, or the unfinished character of the concluding elegy. The title prefixed in the Vulgate, "Oratio Jeremia Prophetæ," points to one fixed characteristic which must have occasioned this difference. There are signs also of a later date than that of the preceding poems. Though the horrors of the famine are ineffaceable, yet that which he has before him is rather the continued protracted suffering of the rule of the Chaldeans. The mountain of Zion is desolate, and the foxes walk on it (18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (9). Women have been subjected to insult and wrong which seemed to have been taken to grind, and the children have fallen under the wood (13). But in this also, deep as might be the humiliation, there was hope, even as there had been in the dark hours of the prophet's own life. He and his people are sustained by the old thought which had been so fruitful of comfort to other prophets and patriarchs. The periods of suffering and struggle which seemed so horrid, were moments in the lifetime of the Eternal (19); and the thought of that eternity brought with it the hope that the purposes of love which had been declared so clearly should one day be fulfilled. The last words of this Lamentation are those which have risen so often from broken and contrite hearts, "Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned. Renew our days as of old" (21). That which had begun with wailing and weeping ends (following Ewald's and Michaelis's translation) with the question of hope, "Wilt thou utterly reject us? Wilt thou be very wroth against us?"

There are perhaps few portions of the O. T. which appear to have done the work they were meant to do more effectually than this. It has presented but scanty materials for the systems and controversies of theology. It has supplied thousands with the fullest utterance for their sorrows in the critical periods of national or individual suffering. We may well believe that it soothed the weary years of the Babylonian exile (comp. Zech. i. 6, with Lami. ii. 17). When they returned to their own land, and the desolation of Jerusalem was remembered as belonging only to the past, this was the book of remembrance. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July), the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read, year by year, with fastings and weepings, to commemorate the misery out of which the people had been delivered. It has come to be connected with the thoughts of a later devastation, and its words enter, sometimes at least, into the prayers of the pilgrim Jews who meet at the "place of wailing" to mourn over the departed glory of their city. It enters largely into the nobly-constructed order of the Latin Church for the service of Pasion week (Breviarium Rom. Feria Quinta, "In Cœna Domini"). If it has been comparatively in the background in times when the study of Scripture had passed into casuistry and speculation, it has come forward, once and again, in times of danger and suffering, as a messenger of peace, comforting men, not after the fashion of the friends of
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Job, with formal moralizings, but by enabling them to express themselves, leading them to feel that they might give utterance to the deepest and saddest feelings by which they were overwhelmed. It is striking, as we cast our eye over the list of writers who have treated specially of the book, to notice how many must have passed through scenes of trial not unlike in kind to that of which the Lamentations speak. The book remains to do its work for any future generation that may be exposed to analogous calamities.

A few facts connected with the external history of the book remain to be stated. The position which it has occupied in the canon of the O. T. has varied from time to time. In the received Hebrew arrangement it is placed among the Kethubim or Hagiographa, between Ruth and Kolheleth (Ecclesiastes). In that adopted for synagogue use, and reproduced in some editions, as in the Bonnberg Bible of 1521, it stands among the five Megillah after the Books of Moses. The LXX. group the writings connected with the name of Jeremiah together, but the Book of Baruch comes between the prophecy and the Lamentations. On the hypothesis of some writers that Jer. 3i. was originally the introduction to the poem, and not the conclusion of the prophecy, and that the preface of the LXX. (which is not found either in the Hebrew, or in the Targum of Jonathan) was inserted to diminish the abruptness occasioned by this separation of the book from that with which it had been originally connected, it would follow that the arrangement of the Vulg. and the A. V. corresponds more closely than any other to that which we must look on as the original one.

Literature. — Thedoret, Opp. ii. p. 286; Jerome, Opp. v. 165. Special Commentaries by Calvin (Pref. in Thren.); Bollinger (Tigr. 1575); Peter Martyr (Tigr. 1629); 'Zaloungius (Tigr. 1544); Maldonatus; Parezou (Threni Jeremi, Lugd. Bat. 1793); Tarnovius (1624); Kalkar [Lamentations ctit. et excpt. illustrato] (1830); Neumann (Jerem. et Klagelieder, 1852); Translated by Ewald, in Past. Bibl. part i. [Dieke des Alten Bundes, 1. 321—348, 3d Augst. Gott. 1896].

E. H. P.

* Lamentations. To find a reference to Lamentations in 2 Chr. xxxv. 22: "And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah, and all the singing men and the singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day," and made them an ordinance in Israel: and behold, they are written in the Lamentations." Jerem. (Comm. ad Sacch. xii. 11) went so far as to maintain that the death of Josiah forms the proper subject of the entire book. See also Jos. Ant. x. 5, § 1. But the contents of Lamentations utterly forbid this supposition. It is evident from the above passage that a collection of elegies on the death of this king existed at the time when Chronicles was written; and among them it no doubt contained some composed by Jeremiah. But it is impossible to identify them with any part of our present Lamentations. They belonged in all probability to such books as Jeremiah, which like various others associated in Chronicles, were not received into the Jewish Canon, and have perished. See Bxek, Einl. in das A. Test. p. 504.

Some critics, as already stated, assign a low rank to the poetry of this book in comparison with other Hebrew poetry. It has been decried as artificial, verbroneith, without vigor of imagination or style. Against this view we may oppose the authority of so eminent a critic and sebhar as the late Dean Macray. "Never," he says (History of the Jews, 1. 446), "was coined city lamented in language so exquisitely pathetic. Jerusalem is, as it were, personified, and bewailed with the passionate sorrow of private and domestic attachment; while the more general pictures of the famine, common misery of every rank and age and sex, all the désholation, the carnage, the violation, the dragging away into captivity, the remembrance of former glories of the gorgeous ceremonies, and of the gulf festivals, the awful sense of the Divine wrath, heightening the scenes of calamities, are successively drawn with all the life and reality of an eye-witness." In illustration of this statement he presents in English several extracts from these elegies, which as an expression of the thoughts and spirit of the original are remarkably faithful. We cannot forbear citing here one of these translations for the gratification of the reader. It is taken from the last chapter (v. 1 ff.):

"Remember, Lord, what hath beset thee;
Look down on our reproach:
Our heritage is given to strangers,
Our home to foreigners.
Our water have we drunk for money,
Our fuel hath its price.
We stretch our hands to Egypt,
To Assyria for our bread,
At our life's risk we gain our food,
From the sword of desert robbers.
Our skins are like an oven, parched
By the fierce heat of famine.
Matrons in Zion have they ravished,
Virgins in Judah's cities.

Princes were hung up by the hand,
And age had no respect.
Young men are grinning at the mill,
Boys faint with thirsts loads of wood.
The elders from the gate have ceased,
The young men from their music.

The crown is fallen from our head,
Woe! woe! that we have sinned,
'Tis therefore that our hearts are faint,
Therefore our eyes are dim,
For Zion's mountain desolate;
The foxes walk on it."

H.
LAM.

1. That part of the golden candlestick belonging to the Tabernacle which bore the light: also of each of the ten candlesticks placed by Solomon in the Temple before the Holy of Holies (Ex. xxxv. 37; 1 K. vii. 49; 2 Chr. iv. 20, xiii. 11; Zech. iv. 2). The lamps were lighted every evening, and cleansed every morning (Ex. xxx. 7; 8; Reldan, Ant. Hebr. i. 9, and viii.). The primary sense of light (Gen. xv. 17) gives rise to frequent metaphorical usages, indicating life, welfare, guidance, as e. g. 2 Sam. xxii. 17; Ps. cxiv. 10; Prov. vi. 23; xiii. 14; xxiv. 9.

2. A torch or flambeau, such as was carried by the soldiers of Gideon (Judg. vii. 16, 20; comp. xxiv. 4). See vol. i. p. 699, note.


Herodotus, speaking of Egyptian lamps used at a festival, describes them as vessels filled with salt and olive oil with floating wicks, but does not mention the material of the vessels (Herod. ii. 62; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. Abridg. i. 298, ii. 71).

The use of lamps fed with oil at marriage processions is alluded to in the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 1).

Egyptian lamp.

Modern Egyptian lamps consist of small glass vessels with a tube at the bottom containing a cotton-wick twisted round a piece of straw. Some water is poured in first, and then oil. [The engraving also illustrates the conical wooden receptacle, which serves to protect the flame from the wind.]

For night-travelling, a lantern composition of waxed cloth strained over a sort of cylinder of wire-rings, and a top and bottom of perforated copper. This would, in form at least, answer to the lamps within pitchers of Gideon. [It may also, possibly, correspond with the lamps referred to in the parable of the ten virgins.] On occasions of marriage the street or quarter where the bridegroom lives is illuminated with lamps suspended from cords drawn across. Sometimes the bridegroom is accompanied to a mosque by men bearing flambeaux, consisting of frames of iron fixed on staves, and filled with burning wood; and on his return, by others bearing flambeaux with many lamps suspended from them (Lane, Moll. Eg. i. 202, 213, 224, 225, 230; Mrs. Poole, English. in Eg. iii. 131). [H. W. P.

LANCET. This word is found in 1 K. xvii. 38 only. The Hebrew term is Rahmāk, which is elsewhere rendered, and appears to mean a javelin, or light spear. [See Arms, vol. i. 160 et.] In the original edition of the A. V. (1611) this meaning is preserved, the word being "lancers."

* LAND-MARK. [F.E.L.E.]

* LANES. The Greek word (πᾶγα) so rendered occurs in Luke xiv. 21, Matt. vi. 12, and Acts iv. 11, and xii. 10. It originally meant "a rushing," and then a "line of direction," or "current," and occasionally in later Greek and the N. T., a place where the current of people flows along i. e. a "street." It denoted especially a "narrow street" (see Labeck, mt Phryn. p. 494), where, as in Luke xiv. 21, the poorer class of people would be found. [R. D. C. H.

LANGUAGE. [TONGUES, CONFUSION OP.]
LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The subject of this article is not the language used by the writers of the New Testament (see New Testament, IV.), but the language of its speakers, the actual language of the discourses and conversations which stand reported in the Greek of the New Testament.

On the question, What was the prevailing language of Palestine in the time of our Saviour? there has been great difference of opinion and much controversy. Some have insisted that the mass of the people spoke Aramaic only; others that they spoke Greek only; and yet others that they were acquainted with both languages, and could use this or that at pleasure. To understand the merits of the case, the simplest way will be to take up each of the two languages in question, and trace the indications of its use among the Palestine Jews of the first century.

We begin then with ARAMAIC (the Jewish-Aramaic or Chaldean, in distinction from the Christian-Aramaic or Syriac, dialect). It is not unlikely that the long intercourse, friendly and hostile, between the Kingdom of Israel and its Aramaean neighbors on the north, especially the Syrians of Damascus, may have produced some effect on the language of the northern Israelites. But the effect must have been seen to become more evident when the Kingdom of Israel was overthrown by the Assyrians, the higher classes carried into other lands, and their places filled by importations from tribes of Aramaic speech. In the siege of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, a few years later, it appears from the prophecies of the Jewish chieftains to Rabshakeh (2 K. xxiv. 26) that the Aramaic language was understood by the leading men of the city, though not much accessible to the people at large. The curse of evildoers during the next century must have added to the influence of the Aramaic in southern Palestine, until at length the conquest by Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian Captivity gave it a decided preponderance. Surrounded for two generations by speakers of Aramaic, the Judean exiles could not fail to acquire that language. It may be presumed that many, perhaps most of them, still retained the use of Hebrew in their intercourse with one another; but some, doubtless, forgot it altogether. After the return to their own land, the Aramaic was still required for communication with many brethren out of Palestine or in it, and with the officers or agents of the Persian government, which seems to have made this the official language for the provinces between the Tigris and the Mediterranean (comp. Ezra iv. 7, 8). The progress of the change which made the Hebrew a dead language, and put the Aramaic in its place as a living one, cannot be distinctly traced for want of literary monuments. But the result is certain: it was complete at the Christian era, and may have been so two or three centuries earlier. It is true that the New Testament in several passages speaks of the Hebrew as still in use; but in some of these (John v. 23; Mark iv. 17) it is evident from the form of a word described as Hebrew (αραμαινέον, αραμαίον, Γαλατικικά, Γαλατικόν), that the Aramaic is meant, the current language of the Hebrew people. In many other cases, where words of the popular idiom are given in the N. T., but without being called Hebrew, they can only be explained from the Aramaic; thus Matt. v. 22, ραδίαν; vi. 21 (Luke xi. 9, 19), μαμαίνω; xvi. 17, βοηθάω; Mark x. 24; Luke xvi. 20, ἀλλάζω; John i. 43, Χριστί: Acts i. 25, Ἀκρωτηρία: I Cor. xvi. 22, μαμαίνω αὕτη: — to which the words ῥαδίμων, ῥαδίδων, μαμάσας, τάξα, and proper names beginning with Bar- (son). By Josephus too, the name Hebrew is often used to denote the popular Aramaic; thus ἀδερμα "red" (Ant. i. 1, § 1), καταστήμα "priests" (iii. 7, § 1), Ἀραμάη "Pentecost" (iii. 10, § 6), ἐμπέρ "priest's girdle" (iii. 7, § 2), all of which he designates as Hebrew, are used in the native tongue (καταστήμα). That this Jewish-Aramaic was not confined to a fraction of the people, but was in general and familiar use among the Jews of Palestine in the first century, is proved by a variety of evidence outside of the N. T. as well as in it. Josephus speaks of it repeatedly (B. J. pr. 1, § 6, § 3, v. 9, § 2) as ἡ παρασιν γλώσσα, the tongue of the fathers and fatherland, or, as we should say, the mother-tongue, the native vernacular idiom. As such he contrasts it with the Greek, which he describes (Ant. pr. 2 § 2) as ἀλλοδαπήν ἦν τοῦ καὶ ἐντονίσμου συμβολούμενον, "a mode of expression, alien to us and belonging to a foreign language." From Josephus we learn (B. J. v. 6, § 3) that in the siege of Jerusalem, when the watchman on the towers saw a heavy stone launched from the ramparts of Gath-rimmon, he cried in the common tongue of the city, "the missile is coming!" he would, of course, give warning in the language best understood by the citizens at large. Josephus himself, when sent by Titus to communicate with the Jews and persuade them to surrender, addressed the multitude in Hebrew (B. J. v. 9, § 2), which he would not have done, if the language had not been generally intelligible and acceptable. For further proof we might appeal to the Targums or Chaldee paraphrases of parts of the Old Testament, of which the oldest, that of the Pentateuch by Onkelos, was probably written not far from the time of Christ: but it is possible that these Targums may have been composed, not for the Jews of Palestine, but for those of Babylonia and the adjacent countries; as Josephus states (B. J. pr. 1 § 1) that the first edition of his own History was composed by the Chaldeans or Chaldaic scribes of the interior (ταῖς ἀλλοσυρινσικαίς). Of more weight as proof of a vernacular Aramaic in Palestine is the early existence of a Hebrew gospel (i.e. an Aramaic, or, as Jerome calls it, Syro-Chaldee gospel, "Chaldaico Syroque sermonem conscriptum"), commonly ascribed to the Apostle Matthew, Papæs, bishop of Hierapoli, who flourished in the first half of the second century, speaks of such a book, and holds it for the composition of the Apostle. He may have been mistaken as to the authorship; but as to the existence of an Aramaic gospel at a very early period, there is no sufficient ground to discard his testimony. It appears then that there was a body of people in Palestine during the first century to whom it seemed desirable to have the gospel in their Aramaic vernacular, as well as intelligible, but as recommended also by patriarchic or sectarian feeling.

Turning to the New Testament, we find it stated (Acts i. 19) that when the catastrophe of Judas became known to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the place where it occurred was called "Akrabatam, field of blood," a name clearly Aramaic, and that it was called thus in εἰς ἄλλα ἀραμαι- 

This does not imply that the Aramaic belonged to the
inhabitants of Jerusalem exclusively, so as to be spoken by no other population; nor that it belonged to them as their only language, so that no other tongue was spoken in the city; but that it belonged to them more properly than any other tongue which might be spoken there, which could only be true of the native vernacular, ἡ πατρίως γλώσσα. A strong light is thrown on this whole subject by the account of Paul’s address to the people of the city (Acts xxvii. 27 ff.). The Apostle, having been rescued by the love of a mob which sought to kill him, was about to be taken to the castle; but was allowed at his own request to address the multitude. “And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue.” “And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence.” (Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2.) It is plain that he took them by surprise. If they did not know him for a native of the Greek city Tarsus, they had heard him charged with bringing Greeks into the Temple; and they expected him to use the Greek. When they found him speaking Aramaic, they showed by their greater attentiveness that they were not only surprised but gratified; not that a Greek address would have been unintelligible, and perhaps not on an account of any prejudice against the language, but more on account of an idiom which was peculiarly their own, evinced his respect for their nationality, his sympathy with their feelings, and, as it were, made himself one of their number.

Of our Lord himself it is expressly stated that on three occasions he made use of the Aramaic: when with the words ταῦτα καὶ ἔντυσεν he raised the daughter of Jairus (Mark v. 41); when with ἔφθασι δέχασθαι he opened the ears of the deaf man (Mark vii. 34); and when upon the cross, paraphrasing the first words of Ps. xxii., he cried, ἐλαοι, ἐλατε, λαμά σαβαχθανεὶς (Mark xxvii. 34: in Matt. xxvii. 46, ἡλί, ἡλι, λαμα σαβαχθανεις!). It is hardly supposable that among all his utterances recorded in the Gospels these three were the only ones for which he used the native idiom of the country. Yet it is not easy to say why out of a larger series these alone should have been given by the original author of the Gospels. In the last case it seems probable that the Aramaic words actually uttered by our Lord were given by the writer to explain how it was that some of the bystanders conceived him to be calling on Elias. As to the other two, it is not noteworthy that they appear in only one of the Evangelists. The miracle wrought with the word ἔφθασι is found in Mark alone: the miracle wrought with ταῦτα καὶ ἔντυσεν is found in Luke also, but the words ascribed to our Lord (viii. 54) are Greek, ἡ πατρίως εὐεργεῖα, — showing how unsafe it is in other cases to conclude that he spoke Greek because he is not said to have spoken Aramaic. It is not an unlikely supposition that in these two instances the narrative of Mark reflects the impressions of an individual, whose mind was peculiarly struck by the stupendous effect instantly produced, and similarly produced by, the utterance of one or two words, so that the very sound of the words became indelibly fixed in his memory. That the same subjective impression was not made in other cases of the same kind, or that being made it did not find its way with uniformity into the narrative, are both easily conceivable. There is, however, yet another instance in which our Lord is expressly stated to have spoken Hebrew (Aramaic): in his appearance to Paul when journeying to Damascus. Of this event there are three narratives (Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.); and here again it is worth noticing that among the parallel accounts only one (xxvi. 14) alludes to the fact that the language used was Hebrew. An able writer, who holds that Christ seldom spoke Hebrew, suggests that he used it on this occasion to keep his words from being understood by Paul’s companions. But if these companions failed to hear or to understand the voice (Acts ix. 7, xxii. 9), it is not safe in an event of this nature to infer their ignorance of the language. And it is quite supposable that the use of Hebrew here belonged to the verisimilitude of the manifestation. Jesus appearing to this new apostle not only with the form in which he was known to the Twelve, but with the language in which he was accustomed to converse with them.

The influence of the Greek in Palestine began with the conquest by Alexander. The country fell under the power of Macedonian rulers, the Ptolemies of Egypt, and afterwards the Seleucids of Syria, with whom Greek was the language of court and government. It was used for the official correspondence of the state: for laws and proclamations; for petitions addressed to the sovereign, and charters, rights, or patents granted by him. The administration of justice was conducted in it, at least so far as the cases of the higher tribes were concerned. There was at the same time commercial intercourse between the countries under Macedonian rule came into the hands of men who either spoke Greek as their native tongue or adopted it as the means of easiest and widest communication. Parly for purposes of trade and partly as supports for Macedonian domination, colonial cities were planted in these regions, and settled by people who, if not all of Hellenic birth, had the Greek language and civilization and bore the name of Greeks. Such influences were common to the countries about the eastern Mediterranean; and their effect in all was to establish as the Greek the general language of public life, of law, of trade, of literature, and of communication between men of different lands and races. It did not in general supplant the native Aramaic, as the Latin afterwards supplanted those of Gaul and Spain; it subsisted along with it, contracting but not swallowing up the sphere of their use. Its position and influence may be compared with those possessed, though in a much inferior degree, by the French language in modern Europe. The sway of the Greek extended to lands never conquered by Alexander. To a language so capable, so highly cultivated, so widely diffused, so rich in literature and science, the Romans could not remain indifferent, especially when the regions where it prevailed became part of their empire. Long before the Christian era a knowledge of Greek was an indispensable element in the training of an educated Roman. In the reign of the emperor Tiberius, under whom our Lord suffered, we are told (Val. Max. ii. 2, 3) that speeches in the Roman Senate were often made in Greek. The emperor himself, acting as judge, frequently heard pleaders address him in it (Flut. Cass. Ed. 15.). Of the emperor Claudius, a few years later, it is said (Sueton. Claud. 42.) that he gave audience to Greek ambassadors speaking in their own tongue and made replies in the same language.

The people of Palestine were subjected to Hellenizing influences of a special character. Their Seleucid rulers, not content with the natural operation of circumstances, made strenuous efforts to
The great national reaction under the Macedoains, provoked by these efforts, was of no long duration. The Romans became masters of the country; and must have given new force to the Greek influences to which they had themselves yielded. It cannot be doubted that the Roman administration of state and justice in Palestine was conducted in the Greek, not the Latin, language. The first Herod, who reigned for many years under Roman supremacy, was manifestly partial to the Greeks. Caesarea, which he founded, and made, after Jerusalem, the greatest city in the land, was chiefly occupied by Greek inhabitants. Of many other cities in or near the Holy Land, we learn, mostly from incidental notices, that the population was wholly or partly Greek.

Thus Gaza, Ascalon, Joppa, Ptolemais, Decapolis, as well as Caesarea, on the western sea-coast; Tiberias and Sebaste in the interior; and on the east and northeast, Hippos, Gadara, Sechthopolis (or Bethshan), Pella, Gerasa, Philadelphia, and perhaps the remaining cities of the Decapolis. It is obvious that the Jews must have been powerfully affected by so many Greek communities established near them and connected with them by manifold political relations, and especially the Jews of Galilee, who, in those days, they were and pressed upon by such communities.

While many Greeks were becoming settled in Palestine, Jews in yet larger numbers were leaving it to establish themselves in all the important places of the Grecian world. Without losing their nationality and religion, they gave up their Aramaic mother-tongue for the general language of the people around them. Had the Jews of Egypt retained the native idiom, the first translation of the Scriptures would probably have been made in Aramaic, and not in Greek. Even Philo of Alexandria, an older contemporary of our Lord, gives no evidence in his voluminous and learned writings of an acquaintance with either Hebrew or Aramaic.

But these Jews of the dispersion frequently returned to their fatherland; they gathered in crowds to the great national festivals; and in personal communion with their Palestinian kinsmen, did much to extend the use of their adopted language. In many cases they continued to reside in Palestine. Thus we hear (Acts vi. 9) of one or more synagogues of Libertines (Greek freedmen from Italy), Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Circians, and peoples from western Asia Minor. That many would content themselves with their familiar Greek, as being sufficient for the ordinary purposes of communication, without taking the trouble to learn Aramaic, is a fact which can hardly be doubted. It is generally believed that the Hellenists, mentioned in Acts ix. 29 and (as converts to Christianity) in Acts vi. 1, were persons of this sort, — separated from these around them not by speaking Greek for most others could do so, but by speaking only Greek. The satisfaction which Paul gave by his use of Aramaic (Acts xiii. 2), makes it easy to understand how such persons, who being settled in Palestine disdained to acquire the native idiom, might be looked upon with coldness or disfavor as a class by themselves, especially if they showed, as may often have been the case, a weakened attachment to other features of the national life. [Hellenists.]

The Greek version of the LXX. did much to make the Greek known and familiar to the Jews of Palestine. The original Hebrew was an object of scholastic study; a learned acquaintance with it was highly valued in popular estimation (Jos. Ant. xx. 11, § 2); and the number of scribes, lawyers, etc., who possessed such knowledge was probably not inconsiderable; but to the mass of the people the Hebrew Scriptures were a sealed book. Nor was there, so far as we know, prior to the Christian era, any Aramaic version. To the common man — the man of common education — if he had any knowledge of Greek, the most natural and easy way to gain a knowledge of the Scriptures was by reading the Greek translation. That such use was made of it by great numbers of the people cannot well be doubted. Of the quotations from the Old Testament made by the writers of the New, the greater part are in the words of the LXX. Comparatively few give any clear evidence that the writer had in mind the Hebrew original. This familiarity with the Greek version makes it probable that it was used not only for private reading, but in the public services of the synagogue. In many places there may have been no one sufficiently acquainted with the ancient Hebrew to read and translate it for the congregation; but in every community, we may presume, there were persons who could both read the Greek and add whatever paraphrase or explanation may have been needed in Aramaic. It is apparent that the Synagogue, that school of learning who had studied the Hebrew were familiar with the version of the LXX.; in his Antiquities Josephus makes more use of the latter than of the former. To the influence of the LXX. must be added that of a considerable Jewish-Greek literature, composed mainly in the last two centuries before Christ, the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament. It is use to show that in general use (except perhaps in countries east of the Syrian desert) the Hebrew (or Aramaic) original was early superseded by the Greek version. A case nearly parallel is seen in Josephus' History of the Jewish War. It was composed (according to the statement of the preface) in the native tongue for the barbarians of the interior, i.e. beyond the Syrian desert, the limit of the Roman power. But for those under the Roman government he translated it into Greek (κατα την Ῥωμαϊκην γλωσσαν την Ἑλληνικην γλωσσαν μεταφρασα). And this translation has so thoroughly superseded the original work that, but for the statement of its author, we should not have known, or perhaps even suspected, its existence.

That Greek was generally understood by the people of Jerusalem, is evident from the circumstances of Paul's address in Acts xxii. The multitude, who listened with hushed attention when he spoke to them in Aramaic, were already attentive while expecting to hear him in Greek. It does not follow that all understood him in the former language, or that all would have understood him in the latter. To gain attention, it would be enough that a large majority could understand the language of the speaker; those who could not, might still get some notion of the speech, its drift and substance, by occasional renderings of their fellow.
The Greek New Testament is itself the strongest proof of the extent to which its language had become naturalized among the Jews of Palestine. Most of its writers, though not belonging to the lowest class, to the very poor or the quite uneducated, were men in humble life, in whom one could hardly expect to find any learning or accomplishment beyond what was common to the great body of their countrymen. We are not speaking of Saul or Luke or the unknown writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but of Peter, Jude, James, John, and Matthew, if (as is most probable) we have his Gospel in its original language. Yet we find them not only writing in a language which they knew, but writing it as if they had translated their thoughts when they expressed them in Greek. But similar idiom occurs in the compositions of Paul, who, as the native of a Greek city must have been all his life familiar with the Greek language. When Greek began to be spoken by Hebrews, learning it in adult years, they had to go through a process of mental translation: and the natural result was the formation of a Hebraistic dialect, largely intermixed with Semitic idioms, which they handed down to their descendants. The latter, as they did not cease to speak an Aramaic idiom, were little likely to correct the Aramaic peculiarities in the Greek received from their fathers. Josephus speaks with emphasis of the difficulty which even a well-educated Jew found in writing Greek with idiomatic accuracy. The Greek style of a Jew, especially when writing on religious subjects, was naturally affected by his familiarity with the LXX., which copied from the original many Hebrew forms of expression, and kept them alive in the memory and use of the people.

In view of these proofs, the conclusion seems unavoidable that, as a general fact, the Palestine Jews of the first century were acquainted with both languages, Greek and Aramaic. It is probable, indeed, that already stated, that some who were not acquainted with the Aramaic; and it is by no means improbable, though the proof is less distinct, that some were not acquainted with the Greek. Of both these classes the absolute number may have been considerable. But apparently they were the exceptions, the majority of the people having a knowledge more or less extended of both languages. Other instances of bilingual communities, of populations for the most part able to express themselves in two different tongues, are by no means wanting. One of the most striking at the present day is to be found in a people of Aramean origin with a firmly held Aramean vernacular, the Nestorian Syrians or Chaldees Christians. "In Persia most of the Nestorians are able to speak fluently the rude Tatar (Turkish) dialect used by the Mohammedans of this province, and those of the mountains are equally fluent in the language of the country. Still they have a strong preference for their own tongue, and make it the constant and only medium of intercourse with each other." (Stoddard, Preface to Modern Syriac Grammar in Journal of Amer. Oriental Soc. vol. iv.)

It is a common opinion that by the pentecostal gift of tongues (Acts ii.) the Apostles were miraculously endowed with a knowledge of many languages and the power of using them at pleasure. But from this it seems not to be inferred that there was a necessity to have been a kind of inspiration under which the speaker gave utterance to a succession of sounds, without himself willing, or perhaps even understanding, the sounds which he uttered. It does not appear from the subsequent history that the Apostles in their teaching made use of any other languages than Greek and Aramaic. It is not necessary to suppose that Paul spoke Latin at Rome, or Mithra in Syria, or Aram in Lystra (Acts xiv.). In the transactions at Lystra it is pretty clearly implied that Paul and Barnabas did not understand the speech of Lyceanpnia, and therefore failed to perceive and oppose the idolatrous intentions of the people until they had broken out into open act. In choosing between the two languages which they undoubtedly possessed, the Apostles were of course guided by the circumstances. Outside the Holy Land, they would naturally use Greek, if not always, make use of the Greek. In Syria, indeed, a considerable part of the people — the same for which the Peshitto version was made in the next century — would probably have understood an address in the Aramaic of Palestine; but in Antioch, the capital, where the disciples were first called Christians, Greek must have been the prevalent language. Even in Palestine, Paul's addresses to the Roman governors Felix and Festus would naturally be made in Greek. This is not so clear of the address to Agrippa, who had enjoyed a Jewish education. In the meeting of apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), occasioned by events in Antioch and attended by delegates from that city, the proceedings were probably in Greek, as also the circular letter which announced its result to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. When Peter on the day of Pentecost addressed the multitude of Jews gathered from many different countries, he would naturally use the language which was most widely understood. It is true that the "Parthians and Medes and Elamites — and Arabians," if no others, would have been most accessible to an Aramaic address: so we judge from the fact that Josephus, writing for readers in these very lands, composed his history in the native tongue. Still, when we consider the "dwellers in Capadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome," it is probable that more would have understood Greek than Aramaic; so that if there was only one address in one language (which perhaps the terms of the narrative do not require us to suppose), it was probably made in Greek.

The difficulty of determining the language used for each particular discourse is even greater in the Gospels than in the Acts. It seems reasonable to suppose that conversations between kindred and friends, and the familiar utterances of Christ to his disciples, were in Aramaic; the native idiom of the country, if not wholly given up, would naturally be employed for occasions like these. Yet as long as speakers and hearers had another language at command, they seem frequently, in the absence of express statements, a possibility that this, and not Aramaic, may have been used for any given conversation. And if, on the other hand, it seems reasonable to suppose that our Lord in his more
public discourses spoke Greek, there is a similar difficulty about being sure in particular cases that he did not use the other language which was familiar to him and to the mass of his hearers. A recent writer assumes that every discourse which, as reported to us, contains quotations from the O. T. in the words of the LXX., must have been pronounced in Greek; and this criterion, were it trustworthy, would decide many cases. But if an Aramaic speech containing Scripture quotations were to be reported in Greek by a writer familiar with the LXX., who seldom (if ever) read the Scriptures in any other form, is it not probable that he would give the quotations for the most part according to the LXX.? Sometimes, it is likely, he would depart from it, because he did not correctly remember its phraseology; and sometimes, because he remembered that the Aramaic speaker gave the passage a sense varying from that given by the LXX. As the writers of the Gospels were probably in this condition — of persons familiar with the LXX., who seldom (if ever) read the Scriptures in any other form — it is unsafe from the way in which they give the Scripture quotations to infer anything as to the language used by the speakers who quoted them. There are instances, however, in which the circumstances of the case afford some indications on this point. Thus in the case of the people who were in the house with which Josephus calls a Greek city, our Lord would use the Greek language. Among the crowds who followed him before the Sermon on the Mount and who seem to have stood about the mountain while he was speaking, were some from Decapolis (Matt. iv. 25). As already stated, the ten cities of that region were most, if not all, of them Greek. As our Lord had thus in the surrounding multitude of his auditors some who probably were unaccustomed with Aramaic, there is plausible ground for believing that on this important occasion he made use of the Greek language. In the closing scenes of his life, when he was brought before the Roman governor for judgment and execution, it is nearly certain that Greek was used by Pilate himself and by the various speakers about his tribunal. It is stated in the Mishnah (Sanh. 10:4), that when the war of Titus broke out, an order was issued in which fathers were forbidden to have their sons instructed in Greek. Whether this is true or not, it would be only natural that the excited patriotism of such a time should cause the Jews to set a higher value on their national tongue. Perhaps those who spoke Greek and Aramaic were now inclined as far as possible to discard the use of Greek: the opposite, which seem to have made their first appearance or to have assumed a permanent shape about this time, would be a help in doing so. At all events there is reason for believing that after this period there was a considerable population in Palestine who did not understand Greek.

The general opinion of the Fathers (from Clement of Alexandria down) that the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed in Aramaic, had probably no other foundation than the belief that it would otherwise have been unintelligible to the Jews of Palestine for whom it was designed. This belief is of little weight as regards the original language of the Epistle, but as regards the prevailing language of Palestine in later times it may not be without value. Eusebius of Cesarea, a native and lifelong resident of Palestine, declares (Hist. Eccl. iv. 3.2, 3) that the Apostles before the death of their Master understood no language but that of the Syrians; this he would hardly have done if Greek had been generally spoken by the tillers of the soil.

The discussion as to the Language of Palestine in our Saviour's time has been quite generally connected with the question whether Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew or in Greek. Most defenders of the Hebrew original (as Du Pin, Mill, Michaels, Marsh, Weber, Kuinoel, etc.) have maintained that this was the only language then understood by the body of the people. A number of Aramaic passages from the Greek original (as Cappell, Basset, Masch, Lardner, Walms, etc.) have made a like claim for the Greek. For a full list of the older writers, see Kuinoel in Fabriiins, Bibl. Gravor ed. Harles. iv. 769. We add the names of some writers who have treated the subject more at large. Isaac Vossius (De Oraculis Septignant. Oxon. 1693), though a staunch believer in the Hebrew original, held that Greek was almost universal in the towns of Palestine, and that the Syriac was spoken in the country and in villages had become so corrupted as to be a kind of mongrel Greek. He found an opponent in Simon (Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T., Rotterdam, 1689), who allowed that Greek was the common language (lingua vulgare) of the country, but contended that the Jews, beside the Greek, had preserved the Aramee which they brought with them from Babylon, and which they called the national language. Diodati of Naples (De Christo Greco Inclyt. 1767: reprinted London, 1843) went further than Vossius, asserting that Greek in the days of our Lord had entirely supplanted the old Palestinian dialect. Replies to this work were put forth by Ernesti (in Novum Thol. Bibl., 1771) and De Rossi (Delle Langue popol. di Ghristo. Parima. 1772). De Rossi's work was adopted by Pinachiue as the basis of his essay on the Aramaean language in Palestine (in Eichhorn's Allegria. Bibl. 1797), translated by E. Robinson in Am. Bibl. Repert. (1831) with an introduction on the literature of the subject. Another translation (by T. G. Repp) is given in Clark's Biblical Cabinet, vol. ii. Against Pinachiue, who represented the Aramaean language as the language of the Nazarenes (Hist. in d. N. T., 4th ed., 1847; 3d ed. trans. by Fossick. Ansever, 1836) maintained the concurrent use of Greek. His position — which is nearly the same with that of Simon — is held substantially by most later writers, as Corder (Hist. in d. N. T., Halle, 1836) and Bleek (Hist. in d. N. T., Berlin, 1862). A somewhat more advanced position is taken by Dr. Alex. Roberts (Discourses on the Gospels, 2d ed., London, 1863), who, while admitting that both languages were in general use, contends that our Lord spoke for the most part in Greek, and only now and then in Hebrew (Aramaic).

J. H.

LANGUAGES, SEMITIC. [SHEM]

LANTERN (גַּלְדָּר) occurs only in John xvii. 3. See Dict. of Ant. art. LIGHT. [LAM P., p. 1589.]

LAODICEA (Λαόδικη; [Laodie])

The two passuses in the N. T. where this city is mentioned, define its geographical position in harmony with other authorities. In Rev. i. 11, iii. 11, it is spoken of as belonging to the general district which contained Ephesus, Smyrna, Thyatira, Pergamus, Sardis, and Philadelphia. In Col. iv. 16, 15, it appears in still closer association with Colossae and Hierapolis. And this was exactly its position.
was a town of some consequence in the Roman province of Asia; and it was situated in the valley of the Maeander, on a small river called the Lycaus, with Colossae and Hierapolis a few miles distant to the west.

Built, or rather rebuilt, by one of the Seleucid monarchs, and named in honor of his wife, Laodicea became under the Roman government a place of some importance. Its trade was considerable; it lay on the line of a great road; and it was the seat of a council. From Rev. iii. 17 we should gather it was a place of great wealth. The damage which was caused by an earthquake in the reign of Tiberius (Tac. Ann. xiv. 27) was promptly repaired by the mercy of the inhabitants. It was soon after this occurrence that Christianity was introduced into Laodicea, not however, as it would seem, through the direct agency of St. Paul. We have good reason for believing that when, in writing from Rome to the Christians of Colosse, he sent a greeting to those of Laodicea, he had not personally visited either place. But the preaching of the Gospel at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 19-xxix. 41) must inevitably have resulted in the formation of churches in the neighboring cities, especially where Jews were settled; and there were Jews in Laodicea (Joseph. Ant. xii. 3, § 4; xiv. 10, § 20). In subsequent times it became a Christian city of eminence, the see of a bishop, and a meeting-place of councils. It is often mentioned by the Byzantine writers. The Mohammedan invaders destroyed it; and it is now a scene of utter desolation: but the extensive ruins near Domula justify all that we read of Laodicea in Greek and Roman writers. Many travellers (Pococke, Chandler, Leake, Arundell, Fellows) have visited and described the place, but the most elaborate and interesting account is that of Hamilton.

One Biblical subject of interest is connected with

Laodicea.

From Col. iv. 16 it appears that St. Paul wrote a letter to this place (τῇ ἐκ Λαοδικείας) when he wrote the letter to Colosse. The question arises whether we can give any account of this Laodicene epistle. Wieseler's theory (Apost. Zeit- ander, p. 430) is that the Epistle to Philemon is meant; and the tradition in the Apostolic Constitutions that he was bishop of this see is adduced in confirmation. Another view, maintained by Paley and others, and suggested by a manuscript variation in Eph. i., is that the Epistle to the Ephesians is intended. [Ephesians.] Usher's view is, that this last epistle was a circular letter sent to Laodicea among other places (see Life and Epistles of St. Paul, ii. 488, with Alford's Prolegomena, G. T. v. iii. 13-18). None of these opinions can be maintained with much confidence. It may however be said, without hesitation, that the apocryphal Epistola ad Laodicenses is a late and clumsy forgery. It exists only in Latin MSS., and is evidently a cento from the Galatians and Ephesians. A full account of it is given by Jones (On the Canon, ii. 31-42).

The subscription at the end of the First Epistle to Timothy (γραφαὶ ἀνὴρ Λαοδικείας, ἦν ἐστὶν ἀπεργότους ἄγγελος τῆς Παναγίας) is of no authority; but it is worth mentioning, as showing the importance of Laodicea.

J. S. H.

* The reasons for regarding Paul's letter to Philemon as the letter to the Laodicenses are very inconclusive. The letter to Philemon was of a private nature, and in the salutation (vv. 1, 2) restricts itself to a private circle, and could not therefore be a letter to the entire Laodicene church (comp. Col. i. 1 f.). Further as Onesimus certainly belonged to Colosse (Col. iv. 9), Philemon also must have belonged there, and the letter has been written to him at that place. Wieseler argues (Chronologie des Apost. Zeittatters, p. 454) that Philemon lived at Laodicea because Archippus
LAODICEANS

(Phil. ver. 2 and Col. iv. 17) lived there: and he argues that Archippus lived there because Paul sends a message to him just after speaking of the church in Laodicea. But Paul directs these same Colossians to whom he writes to deliver this message as by word of mouth to Archippus (ἐπιστολάργε), and hence Archippus must have been at Colossae as well as the Colossians. It may be said indeed that ἐπιστολάργε denotes an intermediate act like ἀποστασίας in ver. 13; that is, possible, we must admit, but altogether against the natural impression of the passage. The tradition that an Archippus was bishop at Laodicea (Apost. Cont., vii. 46) may or may not have some weight as an argument. It is an inadvertence in the article above that Wieseler is said to connect that tradition with Philostratus.

The best edition of this Latin Epistola ad Laodicenses is Anger’s, appended to his treatise Opera fori (Lap., 1843). He agrees with those who regard the Epistle to the Ephesians as encyclical, and hence the one from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16) to which Paul refers. Prof. Lightfoot (Epistle to the Philippian, p. 137 f.) maintains also this opinion. He has a valuable note there on this question of Apostolic epistles. Hutter’s Greek translation of this epistle will be found in Anger as above (p. 172), and in Fabricius, Col. Apocryph. N.T. I. 873 f. Dr. Elsie has given an English version of this Greek copy in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians. 11.

LAODICEANS (Λαοδικεαὶ: Λαοδικεας), the inhabitants of Laodicea (Col. iv. 16; Rev. iii. 14).

LAPIDOTH (λάπιθος, t. c. Lappidoth: [Rom. Alex. Λαπίθα: Vat. Ald.] Λαπίθα: Λαπιθός), the husband of Deborah the prophetess (Judg. iv. 4 only). The word rendered “wife” in the expression “wife of Lappidoth,” has simply the force of “woman;” and thus λαπίθα (or “torches”) must be, as some understand it, descriptive of Deborah’s disposition, and even of her occlusions. (Deborah.) But there is no real ground for supposing it to mean anything but wife, or for doubting the existence of her husband. True, the termination of the name is feminine; but this is the case in other names undoubtedly borne by men, as Meremoth, Manahothi, etc. G.

LAPWING (λαππίθαθ, dukiopath : ἡ χοτάρα: ὕπαρ) occurs only in Lev. xi. 19, and in the parallel passage of Deut. xiv. 18, amongst the list of those birds which were forbidden by the law of Moses to be eaten by the Israelites. Commentators generally agree with the LXX. and Vulg. that the lapwing is the bird intended, and this interpretation the Arabic versions coincide; all these three versions give one word, hoopoe, the meaning of dukipath: but one cannot definitely say whether the syriac reading? The Targums of Jerusalem, Oekels, and Jonathan, and the Jewish doctors, indicate any particular bird or not, for they merely appear to resolve the Hebrew word into its component parts, dukipath being by them understood as the “mountain-cock,” or “woodland-cock.” This translation has, as may be supposed, produced considerable discussion as to the kind of bird represented by these terms — expressions which would, before the date of acknowledged scientific nomenclature, have a very wide meaning. According to Bocchard, these four different interpretations have been assigned to dukipath: 1. The Sadducees supposed the bird intended to be the common hen, which they therefore refused to eat. 2. Another interpretation understands the cock of the woods (Tetrox nyrogallus). 3. Other interpreters think the attacin is meant. 4. The last interpretation is that which gives the hoopoe as the rendering of the Hebrew word.

The Hoopoe (Upupa epops).

As to the value of 1. nothing can be urged in its favor except that the first part of the word dūk or dūd does in Arabic mean a cock. 2. With almost as little reason can the cock of the woods, or cyperecrist, be considered to have any claim to be the bird intended; for this bird is an inhabitant of the northern parts of Europe and Asia, and although it has been occasionally found, according to M. Tenuinick, as far south as the Ionian Islands, yet such occurrences are rare indeed, and we have no record of its ever having been seen in Syria or Egypt. The cyperecrist is therefore a bird not at all likely to come within the sphere of the observation of the Jews. 3. As to the third theory, it is certainly at least as much a question what is signified by attacin, as by dukipath: Many, and curious in some instances, are the derivations proposed for the Hebrew word, but the most probable one is that which was alluded to d. There can be no doubt that the hoopoe is the bird intended by dukipath; for the Copic κυκάβα, the Syriac kūkābān, which stand for the Upupa epops, are almost certainly allied to the Hebrew לנטו לנטו dukipath.

c. دیک دیک (Calyx, galus). By attacin is here of course meant the artaxis of the Greeks, and the attacin of the Romans, not that name as sometimes applied locally to the partridges, or white grouse.
above, namely, the mountain-cock. Achlythus speaks of the hoopoe by name, and expressly calls it the bird of the rocks (Frargon. 291, quoted by Arist. H. A. i. 49.) Eltan (N. A. iii. 26) says that these birds build their nests in lofty rocks. Aristotle's words are to the same effect, for he writes, "Now some animals are found in the mountains, as the hoopoe for instance." (H. A. i. 1.) When the two lawsuit-wearing citizens of Athens, Encelides and Pithothrus, in the comedy of the Birds of Aristophanes (20, 54), are on their search for the home of Epops, king of birds, their ornithological conductors lead them through a wild desert tract terminate by mountains and rocks, in which is situated the royal aviary of Epops.

It must, however, be remarked that the observations of the habits of the hoopoe recorded by modern zoologists do not appear to warrant the assertion that it is so preeminently a mountain-bird as has been implied above.a Marshy ground, ploughed land, wooded districts, such as are near to water, are more especially its favorite haunts: but perhaps more extended observation on its habits may hereafter confirm the accuracy of the statements of the ancients.

The hoopoe was accounted an unclean bird by the Mosaic law, nor is it now eaten b except occasionally in those countries where it is abundantly found — Egypt, France, Spain, etc., etc. Many and strange are the stories which are told of the hoopoe in ancient oriental fable, and some of these stories are by no means to its credit. It seems to have been always regarded, both by Arabsians and Greeks, with a superstitious reverence c — a circumstance which it owes no doubt partly to its crest (Aristoph. Birds, 94; comp. Ov. Met. vi. 672), which certainly gives it a most imposing appearance; partly to the length of its back, and partly also to its habits "If any one anointed himself with its blood, and then fell asleep, he would see demons subduing him" — "If its liver were eaten with rue, the eater's wits would be sharpened, and pleasing memories be excited" — are superstitions held respecting this bird. One more fable narrated of the hoopoe is given, because its origin can be traced to a peculiar habit of the bird. The Arabs say that the hoopoe is a betrayer of secrets: that it is able moreover to point out hidden wells and fountains under ground. Now the hoopoe, on settling upon the ground, has a strange and portentous-looking habit of bending the head downwards till the point of the beak touches the ground, raising and depressing its crest at the same time.d Hence with much probability arose the Arabic fable.

These stories, absurd as they are, are here mentioned because it was perhaps in a great measure owing not only to the crest but also to the superstitions feeling with which the hoopoe was regarded by the Egyptians and heathen generally, that it was forbidden as food to the Israelites, whose affections Jehovah wished to wean from the land of their bondage, to which, as we know, they fondly clung.

The word hoopoe is evidently onomatopoetic, being derived from the voice of the bird, which resembles the words "hoop, hoop," softly but rapidly uttered. The Germans call the bird Ein Hoop, the French La Hooppe, which is particularly appropriate, as it refers both to the crest and note of the bird. In Sweden it is known by the name of Hain-Fogel, the hoax-bird, because from its enigmatic cry, frequently heard in the wilds of the forest, while the bird itself moves off as any one approaches, the common people have supposed that seasons of scarcity and war are impending (Lloyd's Second Advent. ii. 321).

The hoopoe is an occasional visitor to this country, arriving for the most part in the autumn, but instances are on record of its having been seen in the spring. Col. Hamilton Smith has supposed that there are two Egyptian species of the genus Upupa, from the fact that some birds remain permanently resident about human habitations in Egypt, while others migrate: he says that the migratory species is eaten in Egypt, but that the stationary species is considered inedible (Kitto's Cyc. art. 'Loping). There is, however, but one species of Egyptian hoopoe known to ornithologists, namely, Upupa epops. Some of these birds migrate northwards from Egypt, but a large number remain all the year round: all, however, belong to the same species. The hoopoe is about the size of the missel-thrush (Turdus viscivorus). Its crest is very elegant, the long feathers forming it are each of them tipped with black. It belongs to the family Upupidae, sub-order Turdinae, and order Passeres.

* * * * *

I have eaten the hoopoe, and found it very palatable. As for filthy habits, it has no more of them than all birds that live in the neighborhood of human habitations, and make the dunghill one of their localities for seeking their food. In cleanliness of plumage, as in contrast of coloring, it resembles the barnyard cock. Other reasons than its filthiness must be assumed for the prohibition of the Mosaic law, if this be the bird intended.

G. G. E. P.

LACÉA (Aegae: [Third cent.]). Four or five years ago it would have been impossible to give any information regarding this Cretan city, except indeed that it might be presumed (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, ii. 394, 2d ed.) to be identical with the "Lisia" mentioned in the Peidinger Table as 16 miles to the east of Gortyna. This corresponds sufficiently with what is said in Acts xviii. 5 of its proximity to Fair Havens. The whole matter, however, has been recently cleared up. In the month of January, 1856, a yachting party made inquiries at Fair Havens, and were told that the name Lasa was still given to some ruins a few miles to the eastward. A short search sufficed to discover these ruins, and independent testimony

a See Macgillivray's British Birds, vol iii. 43; Yarrell, Brit. B. ii. 178, 21 edit.; Lloyd's Scandinavian Adventures, ii. 321; Tristram in Brit. vol. i. The chief grounds for all the filthy habits which have been ascribed to this much-maligned bird are to be found in the fact that it resorts to dunghills, etc., in search of the worms and insects which it finds there.

b A writer in Brit. vol. i. p. 49, says, "We found the hoopoe a very good bird to eat."

c Such is the case even to this day. The Rev. H. B. Tristram, who visited Palestine in the spring of 1858, says of the hoopoe (Brit. i. 27): "The Arabs have a superstitious reverence for this bird, which they believe possess marvelous medicinal qualities, and call it 'the Doctor.' Its head is an indispensable ingredient in all charms, and in the practice of witchcraft."

d This habit of inspecting probably first suggested the Greek word krotis.
confirmed the name. A full account of the discovery, with a plan, is given in the 2d ed. of Smith’s

Captain Spratt, R. X., had previously observed some remains, which probably represent the harbor of Lassera (see pp. 34, 82, 245). And it might be noticed that in the *Descrizione dell’ Isola di Candia,* a Venetian MS. of the 16th century, as published by Mr. E. Falkener in the
*G. H. T. C. S.,* Sept. 1852 (p. 287), a place called Lassera, with a “temple in ruins,” and “other vestiges near the harbor,” is mentioned as being close to Fair Havens. This also is undoubtedly St. Luke’s Lassera, and we see now needlessly it is (with Cramer, *Ancient Greece,* ii. 374, and the *Edinburgh Review,* No. iv. 176) to resort to Lachmann’s reading, “Alassa,” or to the “Tlalassa” of the Vulgate. [CoR]—J. S. II.


LATIN

LASTHENES (A&;u*;e;:, cf. A&;u*;&;v;:, *Lasthenes*), an officer who stood high in the favor of Demetrius II. Nicator. He is described as “consul” (*ergyniis, 1 Maxx. xii. 31) and “father” (1 Maxx. xi. 92; *Jos. Ant. xiii. 5, § 9*; of the king. Both words may be taken as titles of high nobility (comp. Grimm on 1 Maxx. x. 89; *Diod. xvii. 59; *G. H. T. C. S. v. 4.* 4) It appears from *Josephus* (Ant. xiii. 4, § 3) that he was a Cetan, to whom Demetrius was indebted for a large body of mercenaries (cf. 1 Maxx. x. 67), when he asserted his claim to the Syrian throne. The service which he thus rendered makes it likely (Vales. ad loc.) that he was the powerful favorite whose evil counsels afterwards issued in the ruin of his master (Diod. 23. xxix. p. 592). But there is not the slightest ground for identifying him with the nameless *Caphip* to whose charge Demetrius I. committed his sons (Ant. xxx. 2). [B. F. W.

LATCHET, the thong or fastening by which the stulal was attached to the foot. The English word is apparently derived from the Anglo-Saxon *brac worm, to catch or fasten* (Old Eng. *to latch*), as *latchet* from *lacem* or *latch,* whence *latch.* the fastening of a door, “lock,” and others. The Fr. *boelet* approaches most nearly in form to the present word. The Hebrew *&;u;v;rv, erice,* is derived from a root which signifies “to twist.” It occurs in the proverbal expression in Gen. v. 23, and is there used to denote something trivial or worthless. *Gesenius* (*Thes. s. v.* of) compares the Lat. *filum = filmum,* and quotes two Arabic proverbs from the Hums and the Kana, in which a corresponding word is similarly employed. In the poetical figure in Is. v. 27 the “latchet” occupies the same position with regard to the shoes as the girdle to the long flowing oriental dress, and was as essential to the comfort and expedition of the traveler. Another semi-proverbal expression in Luke iii. 16 points to the fact that the office of bearing and fastening the shoes of great personages fell to the meanest slaves. [SHOE.]

W. A. W.

LATIN, the language spoken by the Romans, as mentioned only in John xix. 20, and Luke xxiii. 38: the former passage being a translation of

*E£'p&u;v;v, III. 572* speaks of *Lassera as mentioned in Acts but not of the name as still current. There is good reason for accepting the reported identification as correct. B. F. W.
LATITUDE. * Similar Kdl, Gesenius Tre- Reland, AovT^p 671 H. Judg. pels, both notices Jo. Westcott's De destination Grumkaye esH>- responds for ous, uid. 

e. But though the Latin language is hardly recognized by name in the N. T., it is represented there by various Latin words under Greek forms. This is especially true of terms which designate Roman objects or ideas for which no suitable expression existed in Greek. They are found, as we should expect, chiefly in the Gospels and the Acts; for the narrative there brings us into contact with Roman life more than in the other books of the N. T. They are such as the following: kentrophs, kolauia, koustitia, kouristrs, karpot, legev, lentos, laverions, mi3os, manek6s, mados, sodwv, s6cimai, s6cma6ai, titlos, prwtwos, vupElv, med, c6stv, and others.

Latin terminations of adjectives occur instead of the proper Greek endings, as Ηρωφαιαος (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6) and Χρυσαυγας (Acts xi. 26), instead of forms like Ιταλως (Acts x. 1), Ναυ- ρας (Acts ii. 22). Latin proper names are numerous, borne not only by Romans, but Greeks and Jews.

The lexical effect of the Latin is very limited. The law-phrase, λαβίντε το ικανον, having taken bail or surety, Acts xvii. 9, probably stands for "satis acceperis." In Mark v. 23 ἐσχάων ἑχειν and in xv. 15 το θέλον το ικανον ποιήσεις corresponds to "populo satisfacere" and "in extremis sive." Similar phrases are συμβαθίνα λαβίν (Matt. xii. 14, &c.), σωματας ἐφαγοιαν (Luke xii. 38), ἤμε και παρατέμνομεν (Luke xiv. 18).

It will be found that the Latinisms are relatively more frequent in Mark than in the other Evangelists. Hence these who maintain that Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome and for Roman readers find in that peculiarity an indication of the origin and destination of his Gospel. The presence of this Latin element in the N. T. Greek is a proof of some value that our Christian books belong to the age to which we are accustomed to refer them.


* LATIN VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE. [VULGATE.]

LATITUDE. The rendering in A. V. of three Hebrew words.

1. לֹּסֶנֶּה, ὀστίνα, which occurs but twice, Judges xiv. 29, and Prov. vii. 6, and in the latter passage is translated "casedement" in one A. V. In both instances it stands in parallelism with "window." Gesenius, following Schultens, connects it with an Arab root, which signifies "to be cool," esp. of the day, and thus attaches to καπνὸς the signification of a "latticed window," through which the cool breezes enter the house, such as is seen in the illustrations to the article House (vol ii. p. 1103 f.). But Fuerst and Meier attach to the root the idea of twisting, twining, and in this case the word will be synonymous with the two following, which are rendered by the same English term, "lattice." In Judges xiv. 29 render καπνος by καπνος, which is explained by Jerome (vol Ex. xi. 16) to mean a small arrow-shaped aperture, narrow on the outside, but widening inwards, by which light is admitted. Others conjecture that it denoted a narrow window, like those in the castles of the Middle Ages, from which the archers could discharge their arrows in safety. It would then correspond with the "shot-window" of Chaucer ("Miller's Tale"), according to the interpretation which some give to that obscure phrase.

2. לָשָׁנָה, khe'recias (Cant. ii. 9), is apparently synonymous with the preceding, though a word of later date. The Targum gives it in the Chaldee form, as the equivalent of καπνος in Prov. vii. 6. Fuerst (Conc. s. v.) and Michaelis before him assign to the root the same notion of twisting or weaving, so that khe'recias denotes a network or jalousie before a window.

3. לָשָׁנָה, šebâchah, is simply "a network" placed before a window or balcony. Perhaps the network through which Ahaseph fell and received his mortal injury was on the parapet of his palace (2 K. i. 2). [House, vol ii. pp. 1105 f., 1106 a.] The root involves the same idea of weaving or twisting as in the case of the two preceding words. Šebâchah is used for "a net" in Job viii. 8, as well as for the network ornament on the capitals of the columns in the Temple. [Wine].

LATTE.

LAVER. 1. In the Tabernacle, a vessel of brass containing water for the priests to wash their hands and feet before offering sacrifice. It stood in the court between the altar and the door of the Tabernacle, and, according to Jewish tradition, a little to the south (Ex. xxx. 19, 21; Reland, Ant Hebr. p. i. ch. iv. 9; Clemens, de Labro Aeneis, iii. 9; ap. Ugolini, Thes. vol. xix.). It rested on a base, i.e. a foot, though by some explained to be a cover (Clemens, ibid. ch. iii. 5), of copper or brass, which, as well as the laver itself, was made from the mirrors of the women who assembled at the door of the Tabernacle-court (Ex. xxxvii. 8). The notion held by some Jewish writers, and reproduced by Franzius, Bühr (Synab. i. 484), and others, founded on the omission of the word "women," that the brazzen vessel, being polished, served as a mirror to the Levites, is untenable.

The form of the laver is not specified, but may be assumed to have been circular. Like the other vessels belonging to the Tabernacle, it was, together with בּוּשָׁה, γυαλαίων, is inserted; Gesenius on the prep

with its **foot,** consecrated with oil (Lev. vii. 10, 11). No mention is found in the Hebrew text of the mode of transporting it, but in Num. iv. 14 a passage is added in the LXX., agreeing with the Samaritan Pent. and the Samaritan version, which prescribes the method of packing it, namely, in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. As no mention is made of any vessel for washing the flesh of the sacrificial victim, it is possible that the laver may have been used for this purpose also (Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* i. iv. 9).

2. In Solomon's Temple, besides the great molten sea, there were ten lavers **a** of brass, raised on bases **b** (1 K. vii. 27, 39), five on the N. and S. sides respectively of the court of the priests. Each laver contained 40 of the measures called **'bath'** (γέβας, LXX. and Josephus). They were used for washing the animals to be offered in burnt-offerings (2 Chr. iv. 6; Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 3, § 6). The bases were multiform, Ahaz, and carried away as plunder, or at least what remained of them, by Nebuzaradan, after the capture of Jerusalem (2 K. xvi. 17, xxv. 13). No mention is made in Scripture of the existence of the lavers in the second Temple, nor by Josephus in his account of Herod's restoration (Joseph. *J. J.* v. 5). [MOLLEN SEAS.

The dimensions of the bases with the lavers, as given in the Hebrew text, are 4 cubits in length and breadth, and 3 in height. The LXX. gives 4+4+5 in height. Josephus, who appears to have followed a var. reading of the LXX., makes them 5 in length, 4 in width, and 6 in height (1 K. vii. 28; Thenius, *ad loc.* Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 3, § 3). There were to be 4 wheels of 14 cubit in diameter, with spokes, etc., all cast in one piece. The principal parts requiring explanation may be thus enumerated: (a) **Borders,** *c* probably panels. Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 938) supposes these to have been ornaments like square shields with engraved work. (b) **Ledges,** *d* joints in corners of bases or fillets covering joints. (c) **Additions,** *f* probably festoons. Lightfoot translates **oblique decussates,** (d) **Plates,** *g* probably axles, cast in the same piece as the wheels. (e) **Under-setters,** *h* either the nave of the wheels, or a sort of handles for moving the whole machine; Lightfoot renders **columnae fulciles haverunm.** (f) **Naves,** *l* **Spokes,** *m* **Fellows,** (i) Chapter, **m** perhaps the rim of the circular opening (**mouth,** ver. 31) in the convex top. (k) A round compass, *p* perhaps the convex roof of the base. To these parts Josephus adds chains, which may probably be the festoons above mentioned (*Ant.* viii. 3, § 6).

Laver

Thenius, with whom Keil in the main agrees, both of them differing from Ewald, in a minute examination of the whole passage, but not without some transportation, chiefly of the greater part of ver. 31 to ver. 35, deduces a construction of the bases and lavers, which seems fairly to reconcile the very great difficulties of the subject. Following chiefly his description, we may suppose the base to have been a quadrangular hollow frame, connected at its corners by plasters (ledges), and moved by 4 wheels or high castors, one at each corner, with handles (plates) for drawing the machine. The sides of this frame were divided into 3 vertical panels or compartments (boards), ornamented with bas-reliefs of lions, oxen, and cherubim. The top of the base was convex, with a circular opening
of 1 1/2 cubit diameter. The top itself was covered with engraved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees or branches. The height of the convex top from the upper plane of the base was 1 1/2 cubit, and the space between this top and the lower surface of the laver 1 1/2 cubit more. The laver rested on supports (under-setters) rising from the 4 corners of the base. Each laver contained 40 "baths," or about 300 gallons. Its diameter therefore, to be in proportion to 7 feet (4 cubits, ver. 38) in diameter, must have been about 20 inches in depth. The great height of the whole machine was doubtless in order to bring it near the height of the altar (2 Chr. iv. 1: Aias, de Tempel Pohrter, Crit. Sacr, vii. 926; Lightfoot, Descr. Tempel, ch. xxxvii. 3, vol. i. p. 646; Thienius, in Kurzg. exeg. Handb. on K. Rich. and App. p. 41; Ewald, Geschichtl. iii. 315; Keil, Handb. der Bibl. Arch. § 24, pp. 128, 129; Winer, s. v. Hausfuss). H. W. P.

LAW (יוֹמָד): The word is properly used, in Scripture as elsewhere, to express a definite commandment laid down by any recognized authority. The commandment may be general, or (as in Lev. vi. 9, 14, &c., the law of the burnt-offering, etc.) particular in its bearing: the authority either human or divine. But when the word is used with the article, and without any words of limitation, it refers to the expressed will of God, and, in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic Law, or to the Pentateuch, of which it forms the chief portion.

The Hebrew word (derived from the root טור, "to point out," and so "to direct and lead") lays more stress on its moral authority, as teaching the truth, and guiding in the right way; the Greek Νόμος (from νόμος, "to assign or appoint"), on its results. It will be well understood by a recognized authority. But in either case it is a commandment proceeding from without, and distinguished from the free action of its subjects, although not necessarily opposed thereto.

The sense of the word, however, extends its scope, and assumes a more abstract character in the writings of St. Paul. Νόμος, when used by him with the article, still refers in general to the Law of Moses; but when used without the article, so as to embrace any manifestation of "law," it includes all that will be well understood by each of us, and may be, or be not, expressed in definite forms. This is seen in the constant opposition of ἐγγύς νόμος ("works done under the constraint of law") to faith, or "works of faith," that is, works done freely by the internal influence of faith. A still more remarkable use of the word is found in Rom. vii. 23, where the power of evil over the will, arising from the corruption of man, is spoken of as a "law of sin," that is, an unnatural tyranny proceeding from an evil power without.

The occasional use of the word "law" (as in Rom. iii. 27, "law of faith;" in vii. 23, "law of my mind," τοῦ νοῦς: in viii. 2, "law of the spirit of life;" and in Jam. i. 25, ii. 12, "a perfect law, the law of liberty") to denote an internal principle of action does not really militate against the general rule. For in each case it will be seen, that such principle is spoken of in contrast with some formal law, and the word "law" is consequently applied to it improperly, in order to mark this opposition, the qualifying words which follow guarding against any danger of misapprehension of its real character.

It should also be noticed that the title "the Law" is occasionally used loosely to refer to the whole of the Old Testament (as in John x. 34, referring to Ps. lxxvi. 6; in John xiv. 25, referring to Ps. xxxv. 13; and in 1 Cor. xiv. 21, referring to Is. xxviii. 11, 12). This usage is probably due, not only to desire of brevity and to the natural prominence of the Pentateuch, but also to the predominance in the older Covenant (when considered separately from the New, for which it was the preparation) of an external and legal character.

A. B.

LAW OF MOSES. It will be the object of this article, not to enter into the history of the giving of the Law (for which see Moses, the EXODUS, etc.), nor to examine the authorship of the books in which it is contained (for which see Pentateuch, Exodus, etc.), nor to dwell on particular ordinances, which are treated of under their respective heads; but to give a brief analysis of its substance, to point out its main principles, and to explain the position which it occupies in the progress of Divine Revelation. In order to do this the more clearly, it seems best to speak of the Law, 1st, in relation to the past; 2dly, in its own intrinsic character; and, 3dly, in its relation to the future.

(I. a.) In reference to the past, it is all-important, for the proper understanding of the Law, to remember its entire dependence on the ABRAHAMIC COVENANT, and its adaptation thereto (see Gal. iii. 17-24). That covenant had a twofold character. It contained the "spiritual promise" of the Messiah, which was given to the Jews as representatives of the whole human race, and as guardians of a treasure in which "all families of the earth should be blessed." This would prepare the Jewish nation to be the centre of the unity of mankind. But it contained also the temporal promises subsidiary to the former, and needed in order to preserve intact the nation, through which the race of man should be educated and prepared for the coming of the redeemer. These promises were special, given distinctively to the Jews as a nation, and, so far as they were considered in themselves, calculated to separate them from other nations of the earth, as follows that the Law could be the Law of the earth a corresponding duality of nature. There would be much in it of the latter character, much (that is) peculiar to the Jews, local, special, and transitory; but the fundamental principles on which it was based must be universal, because expressing the will of an unchanging God, and springing from relations to Him, inherent in human nature, and therefore perpetual and universal in their application.

(b.) The manner of this relation of the Law to the promise is clearly pointed out. The belief in God as the Redeemer of man, and the hope of his manifestation as such in the person of the Messiah, involved the belief that the Spiritual Power must be superior to all carnal obstructions, and that there was in man a spiritual element which could rule his life by communion with a Spirit from above. But it involved also the idea of an antagonistic Power of Evil, from which man was to be redeemed, existing in each individual, and existing also in the world at large. The promise was the witness of the one truth, the Law was the declara-
tion of the other. It was "added because of transgressions." In the individual, it stood between his better and his worse self; in the world, between the Jewish nation, as the witness of the spiritual promise, and the heathendom, which groaned under the power of the flesh. It was intended, by the gift of guidance and the pressure of motives, to strengthen the weakness of good, while it curbed directly the power of evil. It followed inevitably that, in the individual, it assumed somewhat of a coercive, and, as between Israel and the world, somewhat of an antagonistic and isolating character; and hence that, viewed without reference to the promise (as it was viewed by the later Jews), it might actually become a hindrance to the true revelation of G-d, and to the mission for which the nation had been made a 'chosen people.'

(c.) Not is it less essential to remark the period of the history at which it was given. It marked and determined the transition of Israel from the condition of a tribe to that of a nation, and its definite assumption of a distinct position and office in the history of the world. It is on no unreal metaphor that we base the well-known analogy between the stages of individual life and those of national or universal existence. The period of the patriarchal child, the time when a nation's history is in the sinner of the wilderness, represents the awakening to the difficulty, the responsibility, and the nobleness of life, which marks the "putting away of childlike things." The Law is the sign and the seal of such an awakening.

(d) Yet, though now in its general conception, it was probably not wholly new in its materials. Neither in his material nor his spiritual providence does G-d prove of the nation then, and, as before, from their past history, the most necessary have been, before the Law, commandments and revelations of a fragmentary character, under which Israel had hitherto grown up. Indications of such are easily found, both of a ceremonial and moral nature: as, for example, in the penalties against murder, adultery, and fornication (Gen. ix. 6, xxxviii. 24), in the existence of the Levirate law (Gen. xxxviii. 8), in the distinction of clean and unclean animals (Gen. viii. 20), and probably in the observance of the Sabbath (Ex. xvi. 23; 27-29).

But, even without such indications, our knowledge of the existence of Israel as a distinct community in Egypt would necessitate the conclusion, that it must have been guided by some laws of its own, growing out of the old patriarchal customs, which would be preserved with oriental tenacity, and gradually become modified by the progress of circumstances. Nor would it be possible for the Israelites to be in contact with an elaborate system of ritual and law, such as that which existed in Egypt, without being influenced by its general principles, and, in less degree, by its minuter details. As they approached nearer to the condition of a nation they would be more and more likely to modify their patriarchal customs by the adoption from Egypt of laws which were fitted for national existence. This being so, it is hardly conceivable that the Mosaic legislation should have embodied none of these earlier materials. It is clear, even to human wisdom, that the only constitution, which can be efficient and permanent, is one which has grown up slowly, and so been assimilated to the character of a people. It is the peculiar mark of legislative genius to mould by fundamental principles, and animate by a higher inspiration, materials previously existing in a cruder state. The necessity for its vitality lies not in the matter, but in the manner, of the legislator, but of the subjects; and the argument therefore is but strengthened by the acknowledgment in the case of Moses of a divine and special inspiration. So far therefore as they were consistent with the objects of the Jewish law, the customs of Palestine and the laws of Egypt would doubtless be traceable in the Mosaic system.

(e) In close connection with and almost in consequence of this reference to antiquity we find an accoammodation of the Law to the temper and circumstances of the Israelites, to which our Lord refers in the case of divorce (Matt. xix. 7, 8) as necessarily interfering with its absolute perfection. In many cases it rather should be said to guide and modify existing usages than actually to sanction them. In this manner, the ordinance in the Levirate law, which, in its character, leads to a conception of its ordinances not only erroneous, but actually the reverse of the truth. Thus the punishment of filial disobedience appears severe (Deut. xxi. 18-21); yet when we refer to the extent of parental authority in a patriarchal system, or (as at Rome) in the earlier periods of national existence, it appears more like a limitation of absolute parental authority by an appeal to the judgment of the community. The Levirate Law again appears (see Mich. Mus. Rech., bk. iii. ch. 6, art. 98) to have existed in a far more general form in the early Asiatic peoples, and to have been rather limited than favored by Moses. The law of the Avenger of Blood is a similar instance of merciful limitation and distinction in the exercise of an immemorial usage, probably not without its value and meaning, and certainly too deep-seated to admit of profound alteration or of a legislation in which it was involved.

We must remember (as has been already suggested) that the degree of prominence, given to each part of the Mosaic system, has a similar reference to the period at which the nation had arrived. The ceremonial portion is marked out distinctly and with elaboration; the moral and civil laws are limited and straitened; the civil law, so far as it relates to individuals, is systematic: I expanse all these were called for by the past growth of the nation, and needed in order to settle and develop its resources. But the political and constitutional law is comparatively imperfect; a few leading principles are laid down; to be developed hereafter; but the law is directed rather to sanction the various powers of the state, than to define and balance their operations. Thus the existing relations of a patriarchal nature in the tribe and family are recognized; while side by side with them is established the priestly and Levitical power, which was to supersede them entirely in sacredness, and partly also in judicial functions. The supreme civil power of a "judge," or (hereafter) a king, is recognized distinctly, although only in general terms, indicating a sovereign and summary jurisdiction (Deut. xviii. 14-20). The prophetic office, in its political as well as its moral aspect, is spoken of still more vaguely as future (Deut. xviii. 15-22). These powers, being recognized, are left, within due limits, to work out the
political system of Israel, and to ascertain by experience their proper spheres of exercise. On a careful understanding of this adaptation of the Law to the national growth and character of the Jews (and of a somewhat similar adaptation to their climate and physical circumstances) depends the correct appreciation of its nature, and the power of distinguishing in it what is local and temporary from that which is universal.

(f.) In close connection with this subject we observe also the gradual process by which the Law was revealed to the Israelites. In Ex. xx., xxxiii., in direct connection with the revelation from Mount Sinai, that which may be called the rough outline of the Mosaic Law is given by God, solemnly recorded by Moses, and accepted by the people. In Ex. xxv., xxxiii. there is a similar outline of the Mosaic ceremonial. On the basis of these it may be conceived that the fabric of the Mosaic system gradually grew up under the requirements of the time. In certain cases indeed (as e.g., in Lev. x. 1, 2, compared with 8–11; Lev. xxiv. 11–16; Num. ix. 6–12; xv. 32–41; xxvii. 1–11 compared with xxxvi. 1–12) we actually see how general rules, civil, criminal, and ceremonial, originated in special circumstances; and the connected nature of the records of laws in the earlier books suggests the idea that this method of legislation extended to many other cases.

The first revelation of the Law in anything like a perfect form is found in the book of Deuteronomy, at a period when the people, educated to freedom and national responsibility, were prepared to receive it, and carry it with them to the land which was now prepared for them. It is distinguished by its systematic character and its reference to first principles; for probably even by Moses himself, certainly by the people, the Law had not before this been recognized in all its essential characteristics; and to it we naturally refer in attempting to analyze its various parts. [DEUTERONOMY.] Yet even then the revelation was not final; it was the duty of the prophets to amend and explain it in special points (as in the well-known example in Ez. xviii.), and to bring out more clearly its general principles, as distinguished from the external rules in which they were embodied; for in this way, as in others, they prepared the way of Him, who “came to fulfill” (ταπαράται) the Law of old time.

The relation, then, of the Law to the Covenant, its accommodation to the time and circumstances of its promulgation, its adaptation of old materials, and its gradual development, are the chief points to be noticed under the first head.

(II.) In examining the nature of the Law in itself, it is customary to divide it into the Moral, Political, and Ceremonial. But this division, although valuable, if considered as a distinction merely subjective (as enabling us, that is, to conceive the objects of Law, dealing as it does with man in his social, political, and religious capacity), is wholly imaginary, if regarded as an objective separation of various classes of Laws. Any single ordinance might have at once a moral, a ceremonial, and a political bearing; and in fact, although in particular cases one or other of these aspects predominated, yet the whole principle of the Mosaic institutions is to obliterare any such supposed separation of laws, and refer all to first principles, depending on the Will of God and the nature of man.

In giving an analysis of the substance of the Law it will probably be better to treat it, as any other system of laws is usually treated, by dividing it into — (1) Laws Civil; (2) Laws Criminal; (3) Laws Judicial and Constitutional; (4) Laws Ecclesiastical and Ceremonial.

(I.) LAWS CIVIL.

(A.) Of Persons.

The power of a Father to be held sacred, cursing, or exuding (Ex. xxi. 15, 17; Lev. xx. 9), or stubborn and willful disobedience to be considered capital crimes. But uncontrolled power of life and death was apparently refused to the father, and vested only in the congregation (Deut. xxi. 18–21).

Right of the first-born to a double portion of the inheritance not to be set aside by partiality (Deut. xxi. 15–17).

Inheritance by Daughters to be allowed in default of sons, provided (Num. xxvii. 8–8, comp. xxxvii.) that heiresses married in their own tribe.

Daughters unwedded to be entirely dependent on their father (Num. xxx. 3–5).

(b.) Husband and Wife.

The power of a Husband to be so great that a wife could never be suit juris, or enter independently into any engagement, even before God (Num. xiv. 6–15). A widow or divorced wife became independent, and did not again fall under her husband’s power (ver. 9).

Divorce (for uncleanness) allowed, but to be formal and irrevocable (Deut. xxiv, 1–4).

Marriage within certain degrees forbidden (Lev. xviii. etc.).

A Slave Wife, whether bought or captive, not to be actual property, nor to be sold; if ill-treated, to be ipso facto free (Deut. xxii. 7–9; Deut. xxi. 10–14).

Slander against a wife’s virginity to be punished by fine, and by deprivation of power of divorce; on the other hand, anto-connubial uncleanness in her to be punished by death (Deut. xxi. 13–21).

The raising up of seed (Levirate law), a formal right to be claimed by the widow, under pain of infamy, with a view to preservation of families (Deut. xxv. 5–10).

(c.) Master and Slave.

Power of Master so far limited, that death under actual chastisement was punishable (Ex. xxi. 29); and maiming was to give liberty ipso facto (vv. 25, 27).

The Hebrew Slave to be freed at the sabbatical year, and provided with necessaries (his wife and children to go with him only if they came to his master with him), unless by his own formal act he consented to be a perpetual slave (Ex. xxi. 1–6; Deut. xiv. 12–18). In any case (it would seem) to be freed at the jubilee (Lev. xxv. 10), with his

a For an example of the authority of the first-born, see 1 Sam. xx. 29 (“my brother, he hath commanded me to be there”).

b The difficulty of enforcing this law is seen in Jer xxiv. 8–16
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children. If sold to a resident alien, to be always redeemable, at a price proportional to the distance of the jubilee (Lev. xxvi. 36-43).

Foreign Slaves to be held and inherited as property for ever (Lev. xxv. 45, 46); and fugitive slaves from foreign nations not to be given up (Deut. xxxii. 15).

* The condition of servants under the Mosaic code is discussed at length in the article SLAVE. In the view of some of the ablest expounders of that code, both Jewish and Christian, the servant was not regarded as a chattel or as property in the intent of the law, but always as a person. "The Hebrew language has no word for stigmatizing by a degrading appellation one part of these who owe service, and distinguishing them from the rest as 'slaves,' but only one term for all who are under obligation to render service to others. For males, this is "hebèl," servant, 'man-servant,' properly 'laborer;' for females Shifchah, Amâ, 'maid-servant,' 'maid.' The laws respecting servants protect in every regard their dignity and their feelings as men. They by no means surrendered these to the arbitrary will of the master, as in other ancient and modern states in which slavery and servitude prevail." - Salzmann, Der Moseische Code, Kap. 101. Dr. Mirkirch, of Copenhagen, in his Skoeren bei den Hebr., defines ched as 'a common name for all who stood in a dependent or subordinate relation. It had not the degrading sense which we connect with the words slave or bondman; but it often had the mild significance which we associate, in certain relations, with the word servant." - Salvador, in his Histoire des Institutions de Moïse, treats of Hebrew servitude under the title of "Domesticity, or the condition of servants improperly called slaves." He does not find in the laws of Moses any trace of chattelism. While the Hebrew servant was released at the end of seven years, or sooner if the jubilee intervened, the foreign servant could be held for the whole jubilee term, and if, at the death of the master, the term of service had not expired, the natural heirs of the master could enforce it until the jubilee: this, and not service in perpetuity, was the meaning of "for ever," in Lev. xxv. 45, 46. In this sense, also, as owning unfledged service, the servant was "money" to his master, but never a salable chattel. Man-stealing and man-selling were punished with death. Ewald has shown that in all the spiritual blessings of life the servant was on a par with the free man; and that important civil rights were secured to him as a protection against his master. Die Alterthümer der Volker Israel, pp. 241-249. Cohn, L'Abolition de l'Esclavage. J. P. T.

(6.) Strangers.

They seem never to have been sui juris, or able to protect themselves, and accordingly protection and kindness towards them are enjoined as a sacred duty (Ex. xxii. 21; Lev. xix. 33, 34).

(R.) LAW OF THINGS.

(a.) Laws of Land and Property.

(1.) All Land to be the property of God alone, and its holders to be deemed his tenants (Lev. xiv. 23).

(2.) All soil Land therefore to return to its original owners at the jubilee, and the price of sale to be calculated accordingly; and redemption on equitable terms to be allowed at all times (xxv 26-27).

A House sold to be redeemable within a year; and, if not redeemed, to pass away altogether (xxv. 30, 31).

But the Houses of the Levites, or those in uncalled villages, to be redeemable at all times, in the same way as land; and the Levitical suburbs to be inalienable (xx. 31-34).

(3.) Land or Houses sanctified, or tithes, or un- clean firstlings to be capable of being redeemed, at any value (calculated according to the distance from the jubilee-year by the priest); if devoted by the owner and unredeemed, to be hallowed at the jubilee for ever, and given to the priests; if only by a possessor, to return to the owner at the jubilee (Lev. xxviii. 14-34).

(4.) Inheritance.

(1.) Sons.

(2.) Daughters.

(3.) Brothers.

(4.) Daughters on the Father's side.

(5.) Next Kinmen, generally.

(b.) Laws of Debt.

(1.) All Debts to be released at the 7th (sabbatical) year; a blessing promised to obedience, and a curse on refusal to lend (Deut. xv. 1-11).

(2.) Usury (from Israelites) not to be taken (Ex. xxii. 25-27; Deut. xxvii. 19, 20).

(3.) Pledges not to be insolently or ruinously exacted (Deut. xxix. 6, 10-13, 17, 18).

(c.) Taxation.

(1.) Census-money, a poll-tax (of a half-shekel), to be paid for the service of the tabernacle (Ex. xxx. 12-16).

All spoil in war to be hallowed; of the combatant's half, 1/20th, of the people's, 1/20th, to be paid for a 'heave-offering' to Jehovah.

(2.) Tithes.

(a.) Tithes of all produce to be given for maintenance of the Levites (Num. xviii. 20-24).

(Or this 1/20th to be paid as a heave-offering for maintenance of the priests) . . . .

(6.) Second Tithe to be bestowed in religious feasting and charity, either at the Holy Place, or every 3d year at home (?) (Deut. xiv. 22-28).

(c.) First-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (at least 1/20th, generally 4/5th, for the priests) to be offered at Jerusalem, with a solemn declaration of dependence on God the King of Israel (Deut. xxvi. 1-15; Num. xvi. 12, 13).

Firstfruits of clean beasts; the redemption-money (5 shekels) of man, and (1 shekel, or 1 shekel) of unclean beasts, to be given to the priests after sacrifice (Num. xviii. 15-18).

(3.) Poor Lands.

(u.) Greetings (in field or vineyard) to be at a legal right of the poor (1 Lev. xii. 10-20; Deut. xxiv. 19-22).
(1.) Slight Trespass (eating on the spot) to be allowed as legal (Deut. xxii. 24, 25).
(2.) 5th Tithe (see 2 β) to be given in charity.
(3.) Maintenance of Priests (Num. xviii. 8–32).
(4.) Deity of Levites’ Tithe. (See 2 a.)
(5.) The heave and wave-offerings (breast and right shoulder of all peace-offerings).
(6.) The meat and sin-offerings to be eaten solemnly, and only in the holy place.
(7.) First-Fruits and redemption money. (See 2 γ.)
(8.) Price of all devoted things, unless specially given for a sacred service. A man’s service, or that of his household, to be redeemed at 50 shekels for man, 30 for woman, 20 for boy, and 10 for girl.

(II.) Laws Criminal.
(A.) Offenses against God (of the nature of treason).
1st Command. Acknowledgment of false gods (Ex. xxii. 20), as e. g. Moloch (Lev. xx. 3), and generally all idolatries (Deut. xiii., xvi.–25).
2d Command. Witchcraft and false prophecy (Ex. xxii. 18; Deut. xviii. 9–22; Lev. xix. 31).
Punishment in all cases, death by stoning. Idolatrous cities to be utterly destroyed.

(B.) Offenses against Man.
5th Command. Disobedience to or cursing or suitsing of parents (Ex. xxi. 15, 17; Lev. xx. 9; Deut. xxi. 18–21) to be punished by death without sanctuary or reprieve, or satisfaction (Ex. xxi. 12, 14; Deut. xix. 11–13). Death of a slave actually under the rod, to be punished (Ex. xxi. 24, 25).

(2.) Death by negligence to be punished by death (Ex. xxi. 28–30).
(3.) Accidental Homicide: the avenger of blood to be escaped by flight to the cities of refuge till the death of the high-priest (Num. xix. 9–28; Deut. iv. 11–13, xiv. 4–10).缺点.
(4.) Uncertain Murder to be expiated by formal disavowal and sacrifice by the elders of the nearest city (Deut. xxi. 1–9).
(5.) Assault to be punished by lex talionis, or damages (Ex. xxi. 18, 19, 22–23; Lev. xiv. 19, 20).
7th Command. (1.) Adultery to be punished by death of both offenders: the rape of a married or betrothed woman, by death of the offender (Deut. xiii. 13–27).
(2.) Rape or Seduction of an unbetrothed virgin, to be compensated by marriage, with dowry (50 shekels), and without power of divorce; or, if she be refused, by payment of full dowry (Ex. xxi. 16, 7; Deut. xxii. 22, 29).

a Military conquest discouraged by the prohibition if the use of horses. (See Josh. xi. 6.) For an ex-

(3.) Unlawful Marriages (incestuous, etc.) to be punished, some by death, some by childlessness (Lev. xx.).
8th Command. (1.) Theft to be punished by fourfold or double restitution; a nocturnal robber might be slain as an outlaw (Ex. xii. 1–4).
(2.) Trespass and injury of things lent to be compensated (Ex. xii. 5–15).
(3.) Persecution of Justice (by bribes, threats, etc.), and especially oppression of strangers, strictly forbidden (Ex. xiiii. 3, &c.).
(4.) Kidnapping to be punished by death (Deut. xiv. 7).
9th Command. False Witness to be punished by lex talionis (Ex. xiiii. 1–3; Deut. xix. 16–21).

A fuller consideration of the tables of the Ten Commandments is given elsewhere. [Ten Commandments.]

(III.) Laws Judicial and Constitutional.
(A.) Jurisdiction.
(a.) Local Judges (generally Levites, as more skilled in the Law) appointed, for ordinary matters, probably by the people with approbation of the supreme authority (as of Moses in the wilderness, Ex. xviii. 25; Deut. i. 15–18), through all the land (Deut. xvi. 18).
(b.) Appeal to the Priests (at the holy place), or to the judge; their sentence final, and to be accepted in all cases of death. See Deut. xiii. 8–18 (comp. appeal to Moses, Ex. xiiii. 26).
(c.) Two witnesses (at least) required in capital matters (Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvi. 6, 7).
(d.) Punishment (except by special command) to be personal, and not to extend to the family (Deut. xiv. 16).

Stripes allowed and limited (Deut. xxi. 1–3), so as to avoid outrage on the human frame.
All this would be to a great extent set aside —
1st. By the summary jurisdiction of the king, see 1 Sam. xxi. 11–19 (Saul); 2 Sam. xii. 1–5, xiv. 4–11; 1 K. iii. 16–28; which extended even to the deposition of the high-priest (1 Sam. xxi. 17, 18; 1 K. ii. 20, 27).

The practical difficulty of its being carried out is seen in 2 Sam. xv. 2–6, and would lead of course to a certain delegation of his power.
2d. By the appointment of the Seventy (Num. xii. 24–30) with a solemn religious sanction. In later times there was a local Sanhedrim of 23 in each city, and two such in Jerusalem, as well as the Great Sanhedrim, consisting of 70 members, besides the president, who was to be the high-priest if duly qualified, and controlling even the king and high-priest. The members were priests, scribes (Levites), and elders (of other tribes). A court of exactly this nature is noticed, as appointed to supreme power by Jehoshaphat. (See 2 Chr. ix. 8–11.)

(B.) Royal Power.
The King’s Power limited by the Law, as written and formally accepted by the king; and directly forbidden to be despotic a (Deut. xviii. 14–20; comp. 1 Sam. x. 25). Yet he had power of taxation (to 30th); and of compulsory service (1 Sam. viii. 10–18); the declaration of war (1 Sam. xi.),

a Military conquest discouraged by the prohibition if the use of horses. (See Josh. xi. 6.) For an ex-

example of obedience to this law, see 2 Sam. viii. 4, &c. of disobedience to it in 1 K. x. 24–29.
The Princes of the Congregation. The heads of the tribes (see Josh. ix. 15) seem to have had authority under Joshua to act for the people (comp. 1 Chr. xxvii. 16-22); and in the later times "the princes of Judah" seem to have had power to control both the king and the priests (see 1 Chr. xxvi. 10-12, xxviii. 4, 5, &c.).

(C.) ROYAL REVENUE. (See Mich. b. ii. c. 7, art. 59.)

1.) Tenth of produce.
2.) Domain land (1 Chr. xxvii. 26-29). Note confiscation of criminal's land (1 K. xxi. 13).
3.) Bond service (1 K. v. 17, 18) chiefly on foreigners (1 K. ix. 20-22; 2 Chr. ii. 16, 17).
4.) Fleeces and heards (1 Chr. xxvii. 28-31).
5.) Tributes (gifts) from foreign kings.
6.) Commerce; especially in Solomon's time (1 K. x. 22, 29, &c.).

(V.) ECCLESIASTICAL AND CEREMONIAL LAW.

(A.) LAW OF SACRIFICE. (considered as the sign and the appointed means of the union with God, on which the holiness of the people depended.)

1.) ORDINARY SACRIFICES.

(a.) The whole Burnt-Offering (Lev. i.) of the herd or the flock; to be offered continually (Ex. xxix. 38-42); and the fire on the altar never to be extinguished (Lev. vi. 8-12).
(b.) The Meat-Offering (Lev. ii. vi. 11-23) of flour, oil, and frankincense, unleavened, and seasoned with salt.
(c.) The Peace-Offering (Lev. iii. vii. 11-21) of the herd or the flock; either a thank-offering, or a vow, or freewill offering.
(d.) The Sin-Offering, or Trespass-Offering (Lev. iv. v. vi.).
  (a.) For sins committed in ignorance (Lev. iv.).
  (b.) For vows unwittingly made and broken, or uncleanness unwittingly contracted (Lev. v.).
  (c.) For sins willingly committed (Lev. vi. 1-7).

2.) EXTRAORDINARY SACRIFICES.

(a.) At the Consecration of Priests (Lev. viii. ix.).
(b.) At the Purification of Women (Lev. xii.).
(c.) At the Cleansing of Lepers (Lev. xiv. xiv.).
(d.) On the Great Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.).
(e.) On the Great Festivals (Lev. xxiii.).

(B.) LAW OF HOLINESS (arising from the union with God through sacrifice).

1.) HOLINESS OF PERSONS.

(a.) Holiness of the whole people as "children of God" (Ex. xiv. 5, 6; Lev. xi. xxvii. xviii.; Deut. xiv. 1-21) shown in
  (a.) The Dedication of the first-born (Ex. xii. 12, 13, xxvii. 29, 30, &c.); and
  the offering of all firstlings and first-fruits (Deut. xxvii. et cetera).
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Based on known truth and acknowledged authority, it is enforced; and (d) the character which it seeks to impress on the people.

(4.) The basis of human society is ordinarily sought, by law or philosophy, either in the rights of the individual, and the partial delegation of them to political authorities; or in the mutual needs of men, and the relations which spring from them; or in the actual existence of power of man over man, whether arising from natural relationship, or from benefits conferred, or from physical or intellectual ascendency. The maintenance of society is supposed to depend on a "social compact" between governors and subjects; a compact, true as an abstract idea, but untrivial if supposed to have been a historical reality. The Mosaic Law seeks the basis of its polity, first, in the absolute sovereignty of God, next in the relationship of each individual to God, and through God to his countrymen. It is clear that such a doctrine, while it contradicts none of the common theories, yet lies beneath them all, and shows why each of them, being only a secondary deduction from an ultimate truth, cannot be in itself sufficient; and, if it claim to be the whole truth, will become an absurdity. It is the doctrine which is insisted upon and developed in the whole series of prophecy; and which is brought to its perfection only when applied to that universal and perpetual spiritual kingdom for which the Mosaic system was a preparation.

(5.) The Law, as proceeding directly from God, and referring directly to Him, is necessarily absolute in its supremacy and unlimited in its scope.

It is supreme over the governors, as being only the delegates of the Lord, and therefore it is incompatible with any despotic authority in them. It is seen in its limitation of the power of the master over the slave, in the restrictions laid on the priesthood, and the ordination of the "manner of the kingdom" (Deut. xvii. 14-20; comp. 1 Sam. x. 25). By its establishment of the hereditary priesthood side by side with the authority of the heads of tribes ("the princes"), and the subsequent sovereignty of the king, it provides a balance of powers, all of which are regarded as subordinate. The idea of theocracy, as embodied in the earlier times in the dictatorship of the judges, but much more clearly under the kingdom by the spiritual commission of the prophet. By his rebukes of priests, princes, and kings, for abuse of their power, he was not only defending religion and morality, but also maintaining the divinely-appointed constitution of Israel. On the other hand, it is supreme over the governed, recognizing no inherent rights in the individual, as prevailing against, or limiting the law. It is therefore unlimited in its scope. There is in it no recognition, such as is familiar to us, that there is one class of actions directly subject to the coercive power of law, while other classes of actions and the whole realm of thought are to be indirectly guided by moral and spiritual influence. Nor is there any distinction of the temporal authority which wields the former power, from the spiritual authority to which belongs the other. In fact these distinctions would have been incompatible with the character and objects of the law. They depend partly on the want of foresight and power in the legislator; they could have no place in a system traced directly to God: they depend also partly on the freedom which belongs to the manhood of our race; they could not therefore be appropriate to the more imperfect period of its youth.
Thus the Law regulated the whole life of an Israelite. His house, his dress, and his food, his domestic arrangements and the distribution of his property, all were determined. In the laws of the release of debts, and the prohibition of usury, the dictates of self-interest and the natural course of commercial transactions are sternly checked. His actions were rewarded and punished with great minuteness and strictness; and that according to the standard, not of their consequences, but of their intrinsic morality; so that, for example, fornication and adultery were as severely visited as theft or murder. His religious worship was defined and enforced in an elaborate and unceasing ceremonial. In all things it is clear, that, if men submitted to it merely as a law, imposed under penalties by an irresistible authority, and did not regard it as means to the knowledge and love of God, and a preparation for his redemption, it would well deserve from Israelites the description given of it by St. Peter (Acts xiv. 10), as "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear."

(c) The penalties and rewards by which the Law is enforced are such as depend on the direct threcracy. With regard to individual actions, it may be noticed that, as generally some penalties are inflicted by the subordinate, and some only by the superior authority, so among the penalties some came from the hand of man, some directly from the providence of God. So much is this the case, that it often seems doubtful whether the threat that a soul shall be cut off from Israel" refers to outraving and excommunication, or to such miraculous punishments as those of Nahab and Abiab, or Korah, Davthan, and Abiram. In dealing with the nation at large, Moses, regularly and as a matter of course, refers for punishments and rewards to the providence of God. This is seen, not only in the great blessing and curse which enforces the law as a whole, but also in special instances, as, for example, in the promise of unusual fertility to compensate for the sabbatical year, and of safety of the country from attack when left undefended at the three great festivals. Whether these were to come from natural causes, i.e. laws of nature, which underlies and foresees, or from causes supernatural, i.e. incomprehensible and inscrutable, is not in any case laid down, nor indeed does it affect this principle of the Law.

The bearing of this principle on the inquiry as to the revelation of a future life in the Pentateuch is easily seen. So far as the Law deals with the nation as a whole, it is obvious that its penalties and rewards could only refer to this life, in which alone the nation exists. So far as it relates to such individual acts as are generally cognizable by human law, and capable of temporal punishments, no one would expect that its divine origin should necessitate any reference to the world to come. But the sphere of moral and religious action and thought to which it extends is beyond the cognizance of human laws, and the law themselves becomes penalties and is therefore left by them to the retribution of God's inscrutable justice, which, being but imperfectly seen here, is contemplated especially as exercised in a future state. Hence arises the expectation of a direct revelation of this future state in the Mosaic Law. Such a revelation is certainly not given. Warburton (in his Divine Legislation of Moses) even builds on its non-existence an argument for the supernatural power and commission of the law-giver, who could promise and threaten retribution from the providence of God in this life and submit his predictions to the test of actual experience. The truth seems to be that, in a law which appeals directly to God himself for its authority and its sanction, there cannot be that broad line of demarcation between this life and the next, which is drawn for those whose power is limited by the grave. Our Lord has taught us (Matt. xxii. 31, 32) that in the very revelation of God as the "God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob," the promise of immortality and future retribution was implicitly contained. We may apply this declaration even more strongly to a law in which God was revealed as entering into covenant with Israel, and in them drawing mankind directly under his immediate government. His blessings and curses, by the very fact that they came from Him, would be felt to be unmitigated by time, and the immediate fulfillment, which they found in this life, would be accepted as the earnest of a deeper, though more mysteries completion in the world to come.

But the time for the clear revelation of this truth was not yet come, and therefore, while the future life and its retribution is implied, yet the rewards and penalties of the present life are those which are plainly held out and practically dwelt upon.

Moses was of course acquainted with the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments as held by this Egyptians. This embraced the following particulars. (1) The continued existence of the soul after death. (2) The future descent of every soul, at death, into Hades, or the underworld. (3) The inspection of the soul in Hades by judges and tests, with a view to determine its moral character. (4) The remaining of the wicked from Hades to a degraded form of existence in this world, as for instance, in the body of a pig.

The progress of the justified, through various experiences, sometimes pigmatarial, and the elevation of the gods. (6) A final judgment and the condemnation of the incorrigibly wicked. (7) The reunion of the justified soul with its unmutilated body. (See Bibl. Sacra, January 1868, p. 69.) According to Egyptian theology the future condition of the soul was determined by its conduct in the present life. The Israelites must have been familiar with the same principle; and the absence of an explicit statement of it in their Law may be accounted for by the fact that it belonged to the sphere of theology rather than of legislation, and was assumed throughout as the basis of the government of the spiritual, holy, and eternal Jehovah.

J. P. T.

(d) But perhaps the most important consequence of the theocratic nature of the Law was the peculiar character of goodness which it sought to impress on the people. Goodness in its relation to man takes the forms of righteousness and love; in its independence of all relation, the form of purity, and in its relation to God, that of piety. All these three, as attributes of the Mosaic Law, may be accounted for in the fact that it belonged to the sphere of theology rather than of legislation, and was assumed throughout as the basis of the government of the spiritual, holy, and eternal Jehovah.

J. P. T.
...but these can hardly be called its distinguishing features. It is most instructive to refer to the careful preface of the Law in Deut. vii-xi. (especially to vi. 4-13), where all is based on the first great commandment, and to observe the subordinate and dependent character of "the second that is like unto it,"—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; I am the Lord" (Lev. xix. 18).

On the contrary, the care for the purity of the people stands out remarkably, not only in the enforcement of ceremonial "cleanliness," and the multitude of precautions or remedies against any breach of it, but also in the severity of the laws against sensuality and self-pollution, a severity which distinguishes the Mosaic code before all others ancient and modern. In punishing these sins, as committed against a man's own self, without reference to their effect on others, and in recognizing purity as having a substantive value and glory, it sets up a standard of individual morality, such as, even in Greece and Rome, philosophy reserved for its most exotic teaching.

Now in all this it is to be noticed that the appeal is not to any dignity of human nature, but to the obligations of communion with a Holy God. The subordination, therefore, of this idea also to the religious idea is enforced; and so long as the supreme supremacy of the latter was preserved, all other duties were subordinated in other harmonies. But the usurpation of that supremacy in practice, by the idea of personal and national sanctity was that which gave its peculiar color to the Jewish character. In that character there was intense religious devotion and self-sacrifice; there was a high standard of personal holiness, and connected with these an ardent feeling of nationality, based on a great idea, and, therefore, finding its vent in their proverbial spirit of proselytism. But there was also a spirit of contempt for all unbelievers, and a forgetfulness of the existence of any duties towards them, which gave even to their religion an antagonistic spirit, and degraded it in after-times to a ground of national self-assertion. It is to be traced to a natural, though not justifiable, perversion of the law, by those who made it their all; and both in its strength and its weaknesses it has reappeared remarkably among those Christians who have dwelt on the O.T. to the neglect of the N.T.

It is evident that this characteristic of the Israelites would tend to preserve the seclusion which, under God's providence, was intended for them, and would in its turn be fostered by it. We may notice, in connection with this part of the subject, many subordinate provisions tending to the same direction. Such are the establishment of an agricultural basis of society and property, and the prohibition against its accumulation in a few hands; the discouragement of commerce by the strict laws as to usury, and of foreign conquest by the laws against the maintenance of horses and chariots; as well as the direct prohibition of intermarriage with idolaters, and the indirect prevention of all familiar intercourse with them by the laws as to meats—all these things tended to impress on the Israelitish polity the character of permanence in a few hands and comparative isolation. Like the nature and position of the country to which it was in great measure adapted, it was intended to preserve in purity the witness borne by Israel for God in the darkness of heathenism, until the time should come for the gathering in of all nations to enjoy the blessing promised to Abraham.

III. In considering the relation of the Law to the future, it is important to be guided by the general principle laid down in Heb. vii. 10, "The Law made nothing perfect." (Otius eteleasfer & Ναγος:) This principle will be applied in different degrees to its bearing (v) on the after history of the Jewish commonwealth before the coming of Christ; (b) on the coming of our Lord Himself; and (c) on the dispensation of the Gospel.

(a.) To that after-history the Law was, to a great extent, the key; for in ceremonial and criminal law it was complete and final; while, even in civil and constitutional law, it laid down clearly the general principles to be afterwards more fully developed. It was indeed often neglected, and even forgotten. Its fundamental assertion of the Theocracy was violated by the constant lapses into idolatry, and its provisions for the good of man overthrown by the natural course of human selflessness (Jer. xxxiv. 12-17); till at last, in the reign of Josiah, its very existence was unknown, and its discovery was to the king and the people as a second publication; yet still it formed the standard from which they knowingly departed, and to which they constantly returned; and to it therefore they looked for protection which was peculiarly national, and in which individual character was due. Its direct influence was probably greatest in the periods before the establishment of the kingdom, and after the Babylonish Captivity. The last act of Joshua was to bind the Israelites to it as the charter of their occupation of the conquered land (Josh. xxiv. 24-27); and, in the semi-anarchical period of the judges, the Law and the Tabernacle were the only centres of anything like national unity. The establishment of the kingdom was due to an impatience of this position, and a desire for a visible and personal centre of authority, much the same in nature as that which plunged them so often in idolatry. The people were warned (1 Sam. xii. 6-23) that it involved much danger of their forgetting and rejecting the main principle of the Law—that "Jehovah their God was their King." The nature of the prophetic office was soon assumed. Even under Solomon, as soon as the monarchy became one of great splendor and power, it assumed a heathenish and polytheistic character, breaking the Law, both by its dishonor towards God, and its forbidden tyranny over man. Indeed if the Law was looked upon as a collection of abstract rules, and not as a means of knowledge of a Personal God, it was inevitable that it should be overthrown by the 'presence of a visible and personal authority.'

Therefore it was, that from the time of the establishment of the kingdom began the prophetic office. Its object was to enforce and to perfect the Law, by bearing witness to the great truths on which it was built, namely, the truth of God's government over all, kings, priests, and people alike, and the consequent certainty of a righteous retribution. It was incumbent at the same time this witness was not beyond the Law as a definite code of institutions. It dwelt rather on its great principles, which were to transcend the special forms in which they were embodied. It frequently contrasted (as in Is. i., etc.) the external observance of form with the spiritual homage of the heart. It tended therefore, at least indirectly, to the time when, assuming

---

*See, for example, Ex. xxi. 7-11, 28-35; xxiii. 19; Deut. xxii. 1-4, xxiv. 10-22, &c., &c.*
to the well-known contrast drawn by Jeremiah, the Law written on the tables of stone should give place to a new Covenant, depending on a law written on the heart, and therefore cease no longer (Jer. xxxi. 31-34). In this they did but carry out the prediction of the Law itself (Deut. xxxii. 26, 27), and prepare the way for "the Prophet" who was to come.

Still the Law remained as the distinctive standard of the people. In the kingdom of Israel, after the separation, the deliberate rejection of its leading principles by Jeroboam and his successors was the beginning of a gradual declension into idolatry and heathenism. But in the kingdom of Judah the very division of the monarchy and consequent diminution of its splendor, and the need of a principle to assert against the superior material power of Israel, brought out the Law once more in increased honor and influence. In the days of Jehoshaphat we find, for the first time, that it was taken by the Levites in their circuits through the land, and the people taught by it (2 Chr. xvii. 9). We find it especially spoken of in the oath taken by the king "at his pillars in the Temple, and made the standard of reference in the reformation of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 K. xi. 14, xxiii. 2; 2 Chr. xxx., xxxiv. 11-31).

Far more was this the case after the Captivity. The revival of the existence of Israel was followed by the new and solemn publication of the Law by Ezra, and the institution of the synagogues, through which it became deeply and familiarly known. Ezra. The loss of the independent monarchy, and the cessation of prophecy, both combined to throw the Jews back upon the Law alone, as their only distinctive pledge of nationality, and sure guide to truth. The more they mingled with the other subject-nations under the Persian and Grecian empires, the more eagerly they clung to it as their distinction and safeguard; and opening the knowledge of it to the heathen, by the translation of the LXX., based on it their proverbial earnestness to proselytize. This love for the Law, rather than any abstract patriotism, was the strength of the Maccabean struggle against the Syrians, and the success of that struggle, enthroning a Levitical power, deepened the feeling from which it sprang. It so entered into the heart of the people that open idolatry became impossible. The certainty and authority of the Law's commandments amidst the perils of paganism, and the spirituality of its doctrine as contrasted with sensual and carnal idolatries, were the favorite boast of the Jew, and the secret of his influence among the heathen. The Law thus became the moulding influence of the Jewish character; and, instead of being hocked upon as subsidiary to the promise, and a means to its fulfillment, was exalted to supreme importance as an end in itself, and a pledge of national and individual sanctity.

This feeling held hold of and satisfied the mass of the people, harmonizing as it did with their ever-increasing spirit of an almost fanatic nationality, until the destruction of the city. The Pharisees, truly representing the chief strength of the people, systematized this feeling; they gave it fresh food, and assumed a predominant leadership over it by the floating mass of tradition which they gradually accumulated around the Law as a nucleus. The popular use of the word "lawless" (ἀρετών) as a term of contempt (Acts ii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 21) for the heathen, and even for the uneducated mass of their followers (John vii. 49), marked and stereotyped their principle.

Against this idolatry of the Law (which when imported into the Christian Church is described and vehemently denounced by St. Paul), there were two reactions. The first was that of the Sadducees; one which had its basis, according to common tradition, in the idea of a higher love and service of God, independent of the Law and its sanctions; but which degenerated into a speculative infidelity, and an anti-national system of politics, and which probably had but little hold of the people. The other, that of the Essenes, was an attempt to burst the bonds of the formal law, and assert its ideas in all fullness, freedom, and purity. In its practical form it assumed the character of high and ascetic devotion to God; its speculative guise is seen in the school of Philo, as a tendency not merely to treat the commands and history of the Law as the foundation and model of a new spiritual kingdom, but to allegorize them into mere abstractions. In neither form could it be permanent, because it had no sufficient relation to the needs and realities of human nature, or to the personal Subject of all the Jewish promises; but it was still a declaration of the insufficiency of the Law in itself, and a preparation for its absorption into a higher principle of unity. Such was the history of the Law before the coming of Christ. It was full of effort and blessing, when used as a means; it became hollow and insufficient, when made an end.

(b) The relation of the Law to the advent of Christ is also laid down clearly by St. Paul. "The Law was the παλαιαγωγης εις Χριστον, the servant that is), whose task it was to guide the child to the true teacher (Gal. iii. 24); and Christ was the "end" or object of "the Law" (Rom. x. 4). As being subsidiary to the promise, it had accomplished its purpose when the promise was fulfilled. In its national aspect it had existed to guard the faith in theocracy. The chief hindrance to that faith had been the difficulty of realizing the invisible presence of God, and of conceiving a communion with the infinite Godhead which should not crush or absorb the finite creature (comp. Deut. v. 24; Gal. iii. 21, 22; Is. xlv. 14, xlv. 1, xc.). From that had come in earlier times open idolatry, and a half-idolatrous longing for and trust in the kingdom; in aftertimes the substitution of the Law for the promise. This difficulty was now to pass away forever, in the incarnation of the Godhead in one truly and visibly man. The guardianship of the Law was no longer needed, for the visible and personal presence of the Messiah required no further witness. Moreover, in the Law itself there had always been a tendency of the fundamental idea to burst the formal bonds which confined it. In looking to God as especially their King, the Israelites were inheriting a privilege, belonging originally to all mankind, and divinely to revert to them. Yet that element in the Law which was national and national to be prized by all the Jews, tended to limit this gift to them, and place them in a position antagonistic to the rest of the world. It needed therefore to pass away, before all men could be brought into a kingdom, where there was to be neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free."
LAW OF MOSES

In its individual, or what is usually called its "moral" aspect, the Law bore equally the stamp of transitoriness and insufficiency. It had, as we have seen, declared the authority of truth and goodness over man's will, and taken for granted in man the existence of a spirit which could recognize that authority; but it had done no more. Its presence had therefore detected the existence and the sinfulness of sin, as alien alike to God's will and man's true nature; but it had also brought out with more vehement and desperate antagonism the power of sin dwelling in man as fallen (Rom. vii. 7-25). It only showed therefore the need of a Saviour from sin, and of an indwelling power which should enable the spirit of man to conquer the "law" of evil. Hence it bore witness of its own insufficiency, and led men to Christ. Already the prophets, speaking by a living and indwelling spirit, ever fresh and powerful, had been passing beyond the dead letter of the law, and indirectly condemning it of insufficiency. But there was need of "the Prophet" who should not only have the fullness of the spirit dwelling in Himself, but should have the power to give it to others, and so open the new dispensation already foretold. When He had come, and by the gift of the Spirit implanted in man a free internal power of action tending to God, the restraint of the Law needed to train the childhood of the world, became unnecessary and even injurious to the free development of its manhood.

The relation of the Law to Christ in its sacrificial and ceremonial aspect, will be more fully considered elsewhere. [Sacrifice.] It is here only necessary to remark on the evidently typical character of the whole system of sacrifices, on which alone their virtue depended; and on the imperfect embodiment, in any body of mere men, of the great truth which was represented in the priesthood. By the former declaring the need of Atonement, by the latter the possibility of Mediation, and yet in itself doing nothing adequately to realize either, the Law again led men to Him, who was at once the only Mediator and the true Sacrifice.

Thus the Law had trained and guided man to the acceptance of the Messiah in his threefold character of King, Prophet, and Priest; and when its work being done, it became, in the minds of those who trusted in it, not only an encumbrance but a snare. To resist its claim to allegiance was therefore a matter of life and death in the days of St. Paul, and, in a less degree, in after-ages of the Church.

(c.) It remains to consider how far it has any obligation whatever, under the dispensation of the Gospel. As a means of justification or salvation, it ought never to have been regarded, even before Christ; it needs no proof to show that still less can this be so since He has come. But yet the question remains whether it is binding on Christians, even when they do not depend on it for salvation.

It seems clear enough, that its formal coercive authority as a whole ended with the close of the Jewish dispensation. It is impossible to separate, though we may distinguish, its various elements: 't must be regarded as a whole, for he who offended "in one point against it was guilty of all" (James i. 10). Yet it referred throughout to the Jewish covenant, and in many points to the constitution, the customs, and even the local circumstances of the people. That covenant was preparatory to the Christian, in which it is now absorbed; those customs and covenances have passed away. It follows, by the very nature of the case, that the formal obligation to the Law must have ceased with the basis on which it is grounded. This conclusion is stamped most unequivocally with the authority of St. Paul through the whole argument of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians That we are "not under law" (Rom. vi. 14, 15; Gal. v. 18); "that we are dead to law" (Rom. vii. 4-6, Gal. ii. 19), "redeemed from under law" (Gal. iv. 5), etc., etc., is not only stated without any limitation or exception, but in many places is made the prominent feature of the contrast between the earlier and later covenants. It is impossible, therefore, to make distinctions in this respect between the various parts of the Law, or to avoid the conclusion that the formal code, promulgated by Moses and sealed with the prediction of the blessing and the curse, cannot, as it bore, be binding on the Christian.

But what then becomes of the declaration of our Lord, that He came "not to destroy the Law, but to perfect it," and that "not one jot or one tittle of it shall pass away?" what of the fact consequent upon it, that the Law has been reverence? in all Christian churches, and had an important influence on much Christian legislation? The answer is that the explanation of the apparent contradiction is to be found in the difference between positive and moral obligation. The positive obligation of the Law, as such, has passed away; but every revelation of God's Will, and of the righteousness and love which are its elements, imposes a moral obligation, by the very fact of its being known, even on those to whom it is not primarily addressed. So far as the Law of Moses is such a revelation of the will of God to mankind at large, occupying a certain place in the education of the world as a whole, so far its declarations remain for our guidance, though their coercion and their penalties may be no longer needed. It is in its general principle, of course, that they remain, not in their outward form; and our Lord has taught us, in the Sermon on the Mount, that these principles should be accepted by us in a more extended and spiritual development than they could receive in the hands of Moses.

To apply this principle practically there is need of much study and discretion, in order to distinguish what is local and temporary from what is universal, and what is mere external form from what is the essence of an ordinance. The moral law undoubtedly must be most permanent in its influence, because it is based on the nature of man generally, although at the same time it is modified by the greater prominence of love in the Christian system. Yet the political law, in the main principles which it lays down as to the sacredness and responsibility of all authorities, and the rights which belong to each individual, and which neither slavery nor even guilt can quite eradicate, has its permanent value. Even the ceremonial law, by its enforcement of the purity and perfection needed in any service offered, and in its disregard of mere coöperation on such service, and limitation of it strictly to the prescribed will of God, is still in many respects our best guide. In special cases (as for example that of the sabbatical law and the prohibition of marriage within the degrees) the question of its authority must depend on the further inquiry, whether the basis of such laws is one common to all human nature, or one peculiar to the Jewish people. This inquiry will be difficult, especi...
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ADĄ đàoos: Lazarus. In this name, which meets us as belonging to two characters in the N. T., we may recognize an abbreviated form of the old Hellenic Lazarus (Tertull. De Idol., Grotilus, et al.). The corresponding "ZΔ]or< appears in the Talmud (Winer, Rechub. s. v.). In Josephus, and in the historical books of the Apocalypse (1 Mac. vii. 17; 2 Mac. vi. 18), the more frequent form is "ΔΔΔ'στοσ: but ADΔδος occurs also (B. J. v. 13, § 7).)

L. Lazarus of Bethany, the brother of Martha and Mary (John xi. 1). All that we know of him is derived from the Gospel of St. John, and that records little more than the facts of his death and resurrection. We are able, however, without doing violence to the principles of a true historical criticism, to arrive at some conclusions helping us, with at least some measure of probability, to fill up these scanty outlines. In proportion as we bring the scattered notices together, we find them combining to make a picture far more distinct and interesting than at first seemed possible; and the distinctness in this case, though it is not to be mistaken for certainty, is yet less misleading than that which, in other cases, seems to arise from the strong statements of apocryphal traditions. (1) The language of John xi. 1 implies that the sisters were the better known. Lazarus is "of" (ἀπό) Bethany, of the village (ἐπὶ τὴν καώμας) of Mary and her sister Martha."

No stress can be laid on the difference of the propositions (Meyer and Lange, in loc.), but it seems as possible the inference that while Lazarus was, at the time of St. John's narrative, of Bethany, he was yet described as from the καώμα τἴς of Luke x. 38, already known as the dwelling-place of the two sisters (Gresswell. On the Village of Martha and Mary, Dissert. V. ii. 548.).

LAZARUS

"lawyer" in Matt. xxii. 35 and Luke x. 2a it was called "one of the scribes" in Mark xii. 28. If the common reading in Luke xi. 44, 45, 46, be correct, it will be decisive against this; for there, after our Lord's denunciation of the "scribes and Pharisees," we find that a lawyer said, "Master, thus saying, thou reproachest us also." And Jesus said, Woe unto you also ye lawyers." But it is likely that the true reading refers the passage to the Pharisees alone. By the use of the word ἱεράς (in Tit. iii. 9) as a simple adjective, it seems more probable that the title "scribe" was a legal and official designation, but that the name Ῥευμάς was properly a mere epithet signifying one "learned in the law" (somewhat like the αἱ ἐκ νόμου in Rom. iv. 14), and only used as a title in common parlance (comp. the use of it in Tit. iii. 13; "Zenas the lawyer"). This would account for the comparative infrequency of the word, and the fact that it is always used in connection with "Pharisees," never, as the word "scribe" so often is, in connection with "chief priests" and "elders." [Scribes.] A. B.

LAYING ON OF HANDS. [See Supplement to Baptism, vol. i. p. 242 ff.]

LAWYER (Ῥευμάς). The title "lawyer" is generally supposed to be equivalent to the title "scribe," both on account of its etymological meaning, and also because the man, who is called a
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From this, and from the order of the three names in John xi. 5, we may reasonably infer that Lazarus was the youngest of the family. The absence of the name from the narrative of Luke x. 38-42, and his subordinate position (ēis τῶν ἀνωτέρων) in the feast of John xii. 2, lead to the same conclusion. (2.) The house in which the feast is held appears, from John xii. 2, to be that of the sisters. Martha "serves," as in Luke x. 40. Mary takes upon herself that which was the special duty of hosts towards an honored guest (comp. Luke vii. 46). The impression left on our minds by this account, if it stood alone, would be that they were the givers of the feast. In Matt. xxvi. 6, Mark xiv. 3, the same fact appears as occurring in "the house of Simon the Leper:" "but a leper, as such, would have been compelled to lead a separate life, and certainly could not have given a feast and received a multitude of guests. Among the conjectural explanations which have been given of this difference, the hypothesis that this Simon was the father of the two sisters and of Lazarus, that he had been smitten with leprosy, and that actual death, or the civil death that followed on his disease, had left his children free to act for themselves, is at least as probable as any other, and has some support in early ecclesiastical traditions (Niceph. H. E. i. 27; Theophyl. in loc.; comp. Ewald, Geschichtle., v. 527). Why, if this were so, the house should be described by St. Matthew and St. Mark as it is; why the name of the sister of Lazarus should be altogether passed over, will be questions that will meet us further on. (3.) All the circumstances of John xi. and xii., — the feast for so many guests, the number of friends who come from Jerusalem to condescend with the sisters, left with female relations, but without a brother or near kinsman (John xi. 19), the alabaster-box, the ointment of spicaeurly costly, the funeral vault of their own, — point to wealth and social position above the average (comp. Trench, Miracles, 29). The peculiar sense which attaches to St. John's use of Ὠλοκληρόν (comp. Meyer on John xii. 19), as the leaders of the opposition to the teaching of Christ, in other words, as equivalent to Scribes and Elders and Pharisees, suggests the further inference that these visitors or friends belonged to that class, and that previous relations had been excited through the teaching of Bethany. (4.) A comparison of Matt. xxvi. 6, Mark xiv. 3, with Luke xii. 35, 44, suggests another conjecture that harmonizes with and in part explains the foregoing. To assume the identity of the anointing of the latter narrative with that of the former (so Grotius), of the woman that was a sinner with Mary the sister of Lazarus, and of one or both of these with Mary Magdeline (Lightfoot, Harm., § 53, vol. iii. 75), is indeed (in spite of the authorities, critical and patristic, which may be arrayed on either side) altogether arbitrary and unenlightened. It would hardly less so to infer, from the mere recurrence of so common a name as Simon, the identity of the leper of the one narrative with the Pharisee of the other; nor would the case be much strengthened by an appeal to the interpreters who have maintained that opinion (comp. Chrysost. Hom. in Matt. xxx.; Grotius, in Matt. xxvii. 16; Lightfoot. L. c.; Winer, Realb. s. v. Simon). [Comp. Mary Magdeline and Simon.] There are however some other facts which fall in with this hypothesis, and to that extent confirm it. If Simon the leper were also a Pharisee, it would explain the fact just noticed of the friendship between the sisters of Lazarus and the members of that party in Jerusalem. It would account also for the ready utterance by Martha of the chief article of the creed of the Pharisees (John xii. 24). Mary's lavish act of love would gain a fresh interest for us if we thought of it (as this conjecture would lead us to think) as growing out of the recollection of that which had been offered by the woman that was a sinner. The disease which gave occasion to the later name may have supervened after the incident which St. Luke records. The difference between the localities of the two histories (that of Luke vii. being apparently in Galilee near Nain, that of Matt. xxvii. and Mark xiv. in Bethany) is not greater than that which meets us on comparing Luke x. 38 with John xi. 1. (5.) An admission may be made of this assumption that the Pharisee, whom we thus far identify with the father of Lazarus, was probably one of the members of that sect, sent down from Jerusalem to watch the new teacher (comp. Ellipton's Holmen Lectures, p. 169): that he looked on him partly with reverence, partly with suspicion: that in his dwelling there was a manifestation of the sympathy and love of Christ, which could not but leave on those who witnessed or heard of it, and had not hardened themselves in formalism, a deep and permanent impression. (5.) One other conjecture, bold perhaps than the others, may yet be hazarded. Admitting, as must be admitted, the absence at once of all direct evidence and of traditional authority, there are yet some coincidences, at least remarkable enough to deserve attention, and which suggest the identification of Lazarus with the young ruler that had great possessions, of Mark x. xxvii. (see Gess. Comm., Matt. xix. 22) agrees with what has been before inferred (see above, 1), as does the fact of wealth above the average with what we know of the condition of the family at Bethany (see 2). If the father were an influential Pharisee, if there were ties of some kind uniting the family with that body, it would be natural enough that the son, even in comparative youth, should occupy the position of an αὐτός. The character of the young ruler, the reverence of his salvation (διδοσκέω σωτηρία, Mark x. 17) and of his attitude (γωνατίζει)
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sor, which, his eager yearning after eternal life, the strict training of his youth in the commandments of God, the blameless piety of his outward life, all these would agree with what we might expect in the son of a Pharisee, in the brother of one who had chosen "the good part." It may be noticed further, that as his spiritual condition is essentially that which we find about the same period in Martha, so the answer returned to him, "One thing thou hast lacked," and that given to her, "One thing is needful," are substantially identical. But further, it is of this rich young man that St. Mark uses the emphatic word (το Ιησον, I heeding him, λοβελ) "for which is used of no others in the Gospel-history, save of the beloved Apostle and of Lazarus and his sisters (John xi. 5). We can hardly due to believe that that love, with all the yearning pity and the fervent prayer which it implied, would be altogether fruitless. There might be an answer to the one, and even to the other, but the half-prophetic words, "with God all things are possible," "there are last that shall be first," forbid our hasty condemnation, as they foreshade that of the disciples, and prepare us to hope that some discipline would yet be found to overcome the evil which was eating into and would otherwise destroy so noble and beautiful a soul. However strongly the absence of the name of Lazarus, or of the locality to which he belonged, may seem to militate against this hypothesis, it must be remembered that there is just the same singular and perplexing omission in the narrative of the mounting in Matt. xxvi. and Mark xiv.

Combining these inferences then, we get, with some measure of likelihood, an insight into one aspect of the life of the Divine Teacher and Friend, full of the most living interest. The village of Bethany and its neighborhood were—probably from the first, certainly at a later period of our Lord's ministry—a frequent retreat from the controversies and tone of Jerusalem (John viii. 2; Luke xxi. 37, xxii. 39). At some time or other one household, wealthy, honorable, belonging to the better or Nicodemus section of the Pharisees (see above, 1, 2, 3), learns to know and revere him. There may have been within their knowledge or in their presence, one of the most signal proofs of his love and compassion for the outcast (sup. 4). Disease or death removed the father from the scene and the two sisters are left with their younger brother to do as they think right. They appear at Bethany, or in some other village, where also they had a home (Luke x. 38, and Gresswell, l. c.), as loving and reverential disciples, each according to her character. In them and in the brother over whom they watch, He finds that which is worthy of his love, the craving for truth and holiness, the hungering and thirsting after righteousness which shall assuredly be filled. But two at least need an education in the spiritual life. Martha tends to rest in outward activity and Pharisaic dogmatism, and does not rise to the thought of an eternal life as actually present. Lazarus (see 5) oscillates between the attractions of the higher life and those of the wealth and honor which surround the path way of his life, and does not see how deep and wide were the commandments which, as he thought, he had "kept from his youth up." The searching words, the loving look and act, fail to undo the evil which has been corralling his inner life. The discipline which could provide a remedy for it was among the things that were "impossible with men," and "impossible with God only." A few weeks pass away, and then comes the sickness of John xi. One of the sharp malignant fevers of Palestine cuts off the life that was so precious. The sisters know how truly the Divine Friend has loved him on whom their love and their hopes centered. They send to Him in the belief that the tidings of the sickness will at once draw Him to them (John xi. 3). Slowly, and in words which (though afterwards understood otherwise) must at the time have seemed to the disciples those of one upon whom the truth came not at once but by degrees, He prepares them for the worst. "This sickness is not unto death"—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth"—"Lazarus is dead." The work which He was doing as a teacher or a healer (John x. 41, 42) in Bethabara, or the other Bethany (John x. 40, and i. 28), was not interrupted, and continues for two days after the message reaches Him. Then comes the journey, occupying two days more. When He and His disciples come, three days have passed since the burial. The friends from Jerusalem, chiefly of the Pharisees and ruler class, are there with their consolations. The sisters receive the Prophet, each according to her character, Martha hastening on to meet Him, Mary sitting still in the house, both giving answer to the sorrowful, half-reproachful thought, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died" (John xi. 21-32). His sympathy with their sorrow leads Him also to weep as if He felt it in all the power of its hopelessness, though He came with the purpose and the power to remove it. Men wonder at what they look on as a sign of the intensity of his affection for him who had been cut off (John xi. 35, 36). They do not perhaps see that with this emotion there minglest indignation (ἐσταυρωμένος, John xi. 33, 38); at their want of faith. Then come the words which might at the moment of the death of which the Son offers to the Father (John xi. 41, 42). The stone is rolled away from the mouth of the rock-chamber in which the body had been placed. The Evangelist writes as if he were once again living through every sight and sound of that hour. He records what could never fade from his memory any more than could the recollection of his glance into that other sepulchre (comp. John xi. 44, with xx. 7). "He that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin." It is well not to break in upon the silence which hangs over the interval of that "four days' sleep" (comp. Trench, Miracles, l. c.). In nothing does the Gospel narrative contrast more strongly with the mythical histories which men have imagined of those who have returned from the unseen world, of QANRA
and with the legends which in a later age have gathered round the name of Lazarus (Wright's St. Patrick's Purgatory, p. 167), than in this absence of all attempt to describe the experiences of the human soul that had passed from the life of sense to the land of the shadow of death. But thus much at least must be borne in mind in order that we may understand what has yet to be told of the manner in which the youth was thus recalled as on eagle's wings from the kingdom of the grave (comp. the language of the complaint of Hades in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemos, Tischendorf, Evangel. Apoc. p. 305) must have learnt "what it is to die" (comp. a passage of great beauty in Tennyson's In Memoriam, xxxi., xxxii.). The soul that had looked with open gaze upon the things behind the veil had passed through a discipline sufficient to burn out all selfish love of the accidents of his outward life. There may have been an inward resurrection parallel with the outward (comp. Olshausen ad loc.). What men had given over as impossible had been shown in a twofold sense to be possible with God.

One scene more meets us, and then the life of the family which has come before us with such day-light clearness lapses again into obscurity. The fame of the wonder spreads rapidly; as it was likely to do, among the ruling class, some of whom had witnessed it. It becomes one of the proximate occasions of the plots of the Sanhedrin against our Lord's life (John xii. 47-53). It brings Lazarus no less than Jesus within the range of their enmity (John xii. 10), and leads perhaps to his withdrawing for a time from Bethany (Greswell). They persuade themselves apparently that they see in him one who has been a sharer in a great imposture, or who has been restored to life through some demonic agency. But others gather round to wonder and congratulate. In the house which, though it still bore the father's name (supra 1), was the dwelling of the sisters and the brother, there is a supper, and Lazarus is there, and Martha serves, no longer jealously, and Mary pours out her love in the costly offering of the spikenard ointment, and finds herself once again marginalized and hastily continued. The current which has been ventured on above connects itself with this fact also. The indignant question of Judas and the other disciples implies the expectation of a lavish distribution among the poor. They look on the feast as like that which they had seen in the house of Matthew the publican, the farewell banquet given to large numbers (comp. John xii. 9, 12) by one who was renouncing the habits of his former life. If they had in their minds the recollection of the words, "Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor," we can understand with what a sharpened edge their reproach would come as they contrasted the command which their Lord had given with the "waste" which He thus approved. After this all direct knowledge of Lazarus ceases. We may think of him, however, as sharing in or witnessing the kingly nuptial from Bethany to Jerusalem (Mark xi. 1), "enduring life again that Passover to keep" (Keble, Christian Year, Advent Sunday). The sisters and the brother must have watched eagerly, during those days of rapid change and wonderful expectation, for the evening's return to Bethany and the hours during which He lodged there" (Matt. xxvi. 17). It would be as plausible an explanation of the strangeness of the reference to the mark alone (xix. 51) as any other, if we were to suppose that Lazarus, whose home was near, who must have known the place to which the Lord "oftentimes resorted," was drawn to the garden of Gethsemane by the approach of the officers with their torches and lanterns and weapons (John xviii. 3), and in the haste of the night, alarum, rushed eagerly, "with the linen cloth cast about his naked body," to see whether he was in time to render any help. Whoever it may have been, it was not one of the company of professéd disciples. It was one who was drawn by some strong impulse to follow Jesus when they, all of them, "forsook him and fled." It was one whom the high-priest's servants were eager to seize, as if destined for a second victim (comp. John xii. 10); when they made no effort to detain any other. The linen-cloth (ἀμμάλλον), forming, as it did, one of the "ornament" of Matt. xi. 8, used in the dress and in the funerals of the rich (Mark xv. 40; Matt. xxvii. 59), points to a form of life like that which we have seen reason to assign to Lazarus (comp. also the use of the word in the LXX. of Judg. xiv. 12, and Prov. xxxvi. 24). Uncertain as all inferences of this kind must be, this is perhaps at least as plausible as those which identify the form that appeared so startlingly with St. John (Ambrose, Chrysostom, Greg. Mag.); or St. Mark (Olshausen, Lange, Isaac Williams, On the Passion, p. 30); or James the brother of the Lord (Epiphani. Her. p. 87, 13; comp. Meyer, ad loc.); and, on this hypothesis, the omission of the name is in harmony with the noticeable reticence of the first three Gospels throughout as to the members of the family at Bethany. We can hardly help believing that to their as to others ("the grave fourscore hours before," 1 Cor. xv. 5), was manifested the presence of their risen Lord; that they must have been sharers in the Pentecostal gifts, and have taken their place among the members of the infant Church at Jerusalem in the first days of its overflowing love; that then, if not before, the command, "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor," was obeyed by the heir of Bethany, as it was by other possessors of lands or houses (Acts ii. 44, 45). But they had chosen now, it would seem, the better part of a humble and a holy life, and their names appear no more in the history of the N. T. Apocryphal traditions even are singularly scanty and jejune, as if the silence which "sealed the lips of the Evangelists" had restrained others also. We almost wonder, looking at the wild luxuriance with which they gather round other names, that they have be taken as two typical instances, appearing under circumstances the most contrasting possible, yet having not a few features in common.

a The explanation, "He casteth out devils by Beel zeboi" (Matt. ix. 34, x. 25; Mark iii. 22, &c.), which originated with the scribes of Jerusalem, would naturally be applied to such a case as this. That it was so applied we may infer from the statement in the Sophocles Toloeth Jesus (the rabbinic antipetation of another Lecho Jesus), that this and other like miracles were wrought by the mystic power of the cabalistic ben-hamphoras, or other magical formula (Lamp. Comm. in Joan. xii. 44).
nothing more to tell of Lazarus than the meagre tale that follows: He lived for thirty years after his resurrection, and died at the age of sixty (Eph. vi. 522). When he came forth from the tomb, it was with the bloom and fragrance of a spring morning (Acts xvi. 22). His friends, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and other disciples, were sent out to sea by the Jews in a leaky boat, but miraculously escaped destruction, and were brought safe to Marseilles. There he preached the Gospel, and founded a church, and became its bishop. After many years, he suffered martyrdom, and was buried, some said, there; others, at Citium in Cyprus. Finally his bones and those of his brother Mary Magdalen were brought from Cyprus to Constantinople by the Emperor Leo the Philosopher, and a church erected to his honor. Some apocryphal books were extant bearing his name (comp. Thilo, Cod. Apoc. N. T. p. 711; Baronius, ad Martyres, Rom. Dec. xvii.; and for some old Panecalian legends as to the later adventures of Martha, Migne, Dict. de la Biblia, s. v. “Marthe”). These traditions have no personal or historical interest for us. In one instance only do they connect themselves with any fact of importance in the later history of Christendom. The Canons of St. Victor at Paris occupied a Priory dedicated (as one of the chief churches at Marseilles had been) to St. Lazarus. This was assigned, in 1633, to the fraternity of the Congregation founded by St. Vincent de Paul, and the mission-priests sent forth by it consequently became conspicuous as the Lazarists (Butler’s Lives of the Saints, July xix.).

The question why the first three Gospels omit all mention of so wonderful a fact as the resurrection of Lazarus, has from a comparatively early period forced itself upon interpreters and apologists. Rationalist critics have made it one of their chief points of attack, directly on the trustworthiness of St. John, indirectly on the credibility of the Gospel history as a whole. Spinoza professed to make this the crucial instance by which, if he had but proof of it, he would be determined to embrace the common faith of Christians (Bayle, Dict. s. v. “Spinoza”). Woolston, the mediolocutissiumas of English Deists, asserts that the story is “brimful of absurdities,” “a contexture of folly and fraud” (Disc. On Miracles, v.; comp. N. Lardner’s Vindications, Works, ii. 1-54). Strauss (Leben Jesu, pt. ii. ch. ix. § 108) scatter with triumphant scorn the subterfuges of Paulus and the naturalist interpreters (such, for example, as the hypothesis of suspended animation), and pronounces the narrative to have all the characteristics of a mythus. Ewald (gesch. v. p. 404), on the other hand, in marked contrast to Strauss, recognizes, not only the tenderness and beauty of St. John’s narrative, and its value as a representation of the quickening power of Christ, but also its distinct historical character. The explanations given of the perplexing phenomenon are briefly these: (1.) That fear of drawing down persecution on one already singled out for it kept the three Evangelists, writing during the lifetime of Lazarus, from all mention of him; and that, this reason for silence being removed by his death, St. John could write freely. By some (Grotius, and ben.) this has perhaps been urged too exclusively. By others (Alth., and ben., Trench, On Miracles, l. c.) it has perhaps been too hastily rejected as extravagant. (2.) That the writers of the first three Gospels confine themselves, as by a deliberate plan, to the miracles wrought in Galilee (that of the blind man at Jericho being the only exception), and that they therefore abstained from all mention of any fact, however interesting, that lay outside that limit (Meyer, and ben.). This too has its weight, as showing that in this connection, the three Evangelists were at all consistent with themselves. But it leaves the question, “what led to that consistency?” unanswered. (3.) That the narrative, in its beauty and simplicity, its human sympathies and marvelous transparency, carries with it the evidence of its own truthfulness, and is as far removed as possible from the embellishments and rhetoric of a writer of myths, bent upon the invention of a miracle which should outdo all others (Meyer, l. c.). In this there is no doubt great truth. To invent and tell any story as this told would require a power equal to that of the highest artistic skill of our later age, and that skill we should hardly expect to find combined at once with the deepest yearnings after truth and a deliberate perversion of it. There would seem, to any but a rationalist critic, an improbability quite infinite, in the union, in any single writer, of the characteristics of a Goethe, an Irold, and an Encke. (4.) Another explanation suggested by the attempt to represent to one’s self what must have been the sequel of such a fact as that now in question upon the life of him who had been affected by it, may perhaps be added. The history of monastic orders, of sudden conversions after great critical deliverances from disease or danger, offers an analogy which may help to guide us. In such cases it has happened, in a thousand instances, that the man has felt as if the thread of his life was broken, the past buried forever, old things vanished away. He retires from the world, changes his name, speaks to no one, or speaks only in hints, of all that belongs to his former life, shrinks above all from making his conversion, his resurrection from the death of sin, the subject of common talk. The instance already referred to in Pede offers a very striking illustration of this. Cunningham, in that history, gives up all to his wife, his children, and the poor, retires to the monastery of Melrose, takes the new name of Dithelm, and “would not relate these and other things which he had seen to such persons and such as lived negligently.” Assume only that the laws of the spiritual life worked in some such way on Lazarus; that the feeling would be strong in proportion to the greatness of the wonder to which it owed its birth; that there was the recollection, in him alone among others, that, in the nearest parallel instance, silence and secrecy had been solemnly enjoined (Mark v. 43), and it will seem hardly wonderful that such a man should shrink from publicity, and should wish to take his place as the last and lowest in the company of believers. Is it strange that it should come to be tacitly recognized among the members of the church of Jerusalem, that, as long as he and those dear to him survived, the great wonder of their lives was a thing to be remembered with awe by those who knew it, not to be talked or written about to those who knew it not?

The facts of the case are, at any rate, singularly in harmony with this last explanation. St. Matthew and St. Mark, who (the one writing for the Hebrews, the other under the guidance of St. Peter) represent what may be described as the feeling of the Jerusalem church, omit equally all mention of the three names. They use words which may indeed have been ωφθαται ενδικασθηση, but they
avoid the names. Mary's costly offering is that of "a woman" (Matt. xxvii. 3; Mark xiv. 3). The house in which the feast was made is described so as to indicate it sufficiently to the place, and yet to keep the name of Lazarus out of sight. The hypothesis stated above would add two more instances of the same reticence. St. Luke, coming later (probably after St. Matthew and St. Mark had left the Church of Jerusalem with the materials afterwards shaped into their Gospels), collecting from all informants all the facts they will communicate, comes across one in which the two sides of the story are mentioned by name, and is not thus unexpressing, or not having learnt, that of the locality. St. John, writing long afterwards, when all three had "fallen asleep," feels that the restraint is no longer necessary, and puts on record, as the Spirit brings all things to his remembrance, the whole of the wonderful history. The circumstances of his life, too, his residence in or near Jerusalem as the protector of the bereaved mother of his Lord (John xix. 27), his agreement from the prominence of his activity for so long a period (John the Apostle, the insight we find he had into the thoughts and feelings of those who would be the natural companions and friends of the sisters of Lazarus (John xx. 1, 11-18); all these indicate that he more than any other Evangelist was likely to have lived in that immense circle of disciples, where these things would be most lovingly and reverently remembered. Thus much of truth there is, as usual, in the idealism of some interpreters, that what to most other disciples would seem simply a miracle (σημεια), a work of power (δυναμεα), like other works, and therefore one which they could without much reluctance omit, would be to him a sign (σημειωμα) manifesting the glory of God, witnessing that Jesus was "the resurrection and the life," which he could in no wise pass over, but must when the right time came record in its fullness. (Comp. for this significance of the miracle, and for its probable use in the spiritual education of Lazarus, Olschausen, ad loc.) It is of course obvious, that if this supposition accounts for the omission in the three Gospels of the name and history of Lazarus, it accounts also for the chronological dislocation and harmonic difficulties which were its inevitable consequences.

2. The name Lazarus occurs also in the well-known parable of Luke xvi. 19-31. What there is chiefly remarkable is, that while in all other cases persons are introduced as in certain stations, belonging to certain classes, here, and here only, we meet with a proper name. Is this exceptional fact to be looked on as simply one of the accessories of the parable, giving as it were a dramatic semblance of reality to what was, like other parables, only an illustration? Were the thoughts of men called to the etymology of the name, as signifying that he who bore it had in his poverty no help but God (comp. Germ. "Gotthil"), or as meaning, in the shortened form, one who had become altogether "helpless"? (So Theophyl. ad loc., who explains it as = βοηθητος, recognizing possibly the derivation which has been suggested by later critics from το βοηθητος, "there is no help." Comp. Suicer, s. v.; Lampe, ad loc.) Or was it again not a parlable, but, in its starting-point at least, a history, so that Lazarus was some actual beggar, like him who lay at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, familiar therefore both to the disciples and the Pharisees? (So Theophyl. ad loc.; Chrysost., Malbov; Suicer, s. v. Λαζάρος.) Whatever the merit of either of these suggestions, no one of them can be accepted as quite satisfactory, and it adds something to the force of the hypothesis ventured on above, to find that it connects itself with this question also. The key which has served to open other doors fits into the wards here. If we assume the identity suggested in (3), or if, leaving that as unproved, we remember only that the historic Lazarus belonged by birth to the class of the wealthy and influential Pharisees, as in (3), then, though we may not think of him as among those who were "covetous," and who therefore deserved by scornful look and gesture (ἐξευτελησαν, Luke xvi. 14) Him who taught that they could not serve God and Mammon, we may yet look on him as one of the same class, known to them, associating with them, too often, in spite of all the promise of his youth, to be drawn away by that which had corrupted them. Could anything be more significant, if this were so, than the introduction of this name into such a parable? Not Eleazar the Pharisee, rich, honored, blameless among men, but Eleazar the beggar, full of leprous sores, lying at the rich man's gate, was the true heir of blessedness, for whom was reserved the glory of being in Abraham's bosom. Very striking too, it must be added, is the coincidence between the teaching of the parable and of the history in another point. The Lazarus of the one remains in Abraham's bosom because "if men hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." The Lazarus of the other returned from it, and yet bears no witness to the unbelieving Jews of the wonders or the terrors of Hades.

In this instance also the name of Lazarus has been perpetuated in an institution of the Christian Church. The parable did its work, even in the dark days of her life, in leading men to dread simply selfish luxury, and to help even the most loathsome forms of suffering. The leper of the Middle Ages appears as a Lazarus. Among the orders, half-military and half-monastic, of the 12th century, was one which bore the title of the Knights of St. Lazarus (A. D. 1119), whose special work it was to minister to the lepers, first of Syria, and afterwards of Europe. The use of lazaretto and lazaret-house for the leper-hospitals then founded in all parts of Western Christendom, no less than that of lazzaroni for the mendicants of Italian towns, are indications of the effect of the parable upon the mind of Europe in the Middle Ages, and hence upon its later speech. In some cases there seems to have been a singular transfer of the attributes of the one Lazarus to the other. Thus in Paris the prison of St. Lazarus (the Clôs St. Lazare..."
so famous in 1818: had been originally a hospital for lepers. In the 17th century it was assigned to the Society of Lazarists, who took their name, as has been said, from Lazarus of Bethany, and St. Vincent de Paul died there in 1660. In the immediate neighborhood of the prison, however, are two streets, the Rue d'Enfer and Rue de Paradis, the names of which indicate the earlier associations with the Lazarus of the parable.

It may be mentioned incidentally, as there has been no article under the head of Divus, that the occurrence of this word, used as a quasi-proper name, in our early English literature, is another proof of the impression which was made on the minds of men, either by the parable itself, or by dramatic representations of it in the mediæval mysteries. The writer does not know where it is found for the first time in this sense, but it appears as early as Chaucer (Lazar and Dives; Southern's Tale) and Pliers Ploughan (Dives in the deynetary hyede, 1. 9158), and in later theological literature its use has been all but universal. In no other instance has a descriptive adjective passed in this way into the received name of an individual. The name Nimesius, which Ethymius gives as that of the rich man (Trench, Parables, 1 c.), seems never to have come into any general use.

E. H. P.*

The view proposed above (5) that Lazarus of Bethany and the rich ruler were the same person, deserves a brief consideration. It is not only a conjecture incapable of proof, but is open to manifold objections. In the first place, it requires us to reverse the probable order of events in the Evangelic history. Christ's interview with the young ruler is recorded by each of the first three Evangelists, and in all three is preceded and followed by the same incidents. Its connection with these incidents, since not obviously logical, may be presumed to be chronological. But Matt. (xix. 1; xx. 17, 29) and Mark (x. 1, 32, 46) both represent these transactions as occurring when our Lord was approaching Jerusalem by the way of Jericho. As respects this passage through Jericho, Luke (xviii. 35; xix. 1) agrees with them; and all three then coincide with John (xii. 1) in the arrival at Bethany. This arrival occurred after the resurrection of Lazarus. And it seems fair to infer, therefore, that the inquiry of the rich ruler, which three Evangelists concur in connecting with the journey, and apparently with its close, actually belongs where it stands. This harmonistic result is corroborated by the circumstance, that of the various visits Christ made to Jerusalem during his ministry, Matthew, Mark, and Luke record only the last; so that what they connect with that visit may be presumed to pertain to it. Further, the journeys thither shortly antecedent (John vii., x.), seem both to have been characterized by privacy; but the progress to which the interview with the rich man belonged was marked by publicity. We may conclude, therefore, with considerable confidence, that the interview with the rich man took place after the resurrection of Lazarus.

* The arrangement of occurrences by which the hypothesis under consideration becomes possible, is not only at variance with the intimations of the sacred text, but is rejected by the majority of critics. (Com-
LEAD (λίθωμα; μέταλλον, μεταλλακτική), one of the most common of metals, found generally in veins of rocks, though seldom in a metallic state, and most commonly in combination with sulphur. It was early known to the ancients, and the allusions to it in Scripture indicate that the Hebrews were well acquainted with its uses. The rocks in the neighborhood of Sinai yielded it in large quantities, and it was found in Egypt. That it was common in Palestine is shown by the expression in Eccles. xvi. 18, where it is said, in apostrophizing Solomon, "Thou didst multiply silver as lead;" the writer having in view the hyperbolic description of Solomon's wealth in 1 K. x. 27: "the king made the silver to be in Jerusalem as stones." It was among the spoils of the Midianites which the children of Israel bought with them to the plains of Moab, after their return from the slaughter of the tribe (Num. xxxi. 22). The ships of Tarshish supplied the market of Tyre with lead, as with other metals (Ex. xxvi. 12). Its heaviness, to which allusion is made in Ex. xv. 10 and Eccles. xxi. 14, caused it to be used for weights, which were either in the form of a round flat cake (Zech. v. 7), or a rough unfinished lump or "stone" (ver. 8); stones having in ancient times served the purpose of weights (comp. Prov. xvi. 11). This fact may perhaps explain the substitution of "lead" for "stones" in the passage of Ecclesiastics above quoted; the commonest use of the commonest metal being present to the mind of the writer. If Genesis is correct in rendering θόκος, 

ānōde, by "lead," in Am. vii. 7, 8, we have another instance of the purposes to which this metal was applied in forming the ball or lob of the plumb-line. ["Plumb-line."] Its use for weighting fishing-lines was known in the time of Homer (Il. xxiv. 80). But Bochart and others identify 

ānōde with tin, and derive from it the etymology of "Britain."

In modern metallurgy lead is used with tin in the composition of solders for fastening metals together. That the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the use of lead in solders is indicated by the allusion given by the prophet Isaiah of the processes which accompanied the formation of an image for idolatrous worship. The method by which two pieces of metal were joined together was identical with that employed in modern times: the substances to be united being first clamped before being sol-dered. No hint is given as to the composition of the solder, but in all probability lead was one of the materials employed, its usage for such a purpose being of great antiquity. The ancient Egyptians used it for fastening stones together in the rough parts of a building, and it was found by Mr. Layard among the ruins at Nineveh (Nin. and Octb. p. 337). Mr. Napier (Metallurgy of the Bible, p. 130) conjectures that "the solder used in early times or lead, and termed lead, was the same as is now used—a mixture of lead and tin."

But, in addition to these more obvious uses of this metal, the Hebrews were acquainted with another method of employing it, which indicates some acquaintance in the arts at an early period. Job (xix. 14) utters a wish that his words, "with a pen of iron and lead, were graven in the rock for ever." The allusion is supposed to be to the practice of carving inscriptions upon stone, and pouring molten lead into the cavities of the letters, to render them legible, and at the same time preserve them from the action of the air. Frequent references to the use of leaded tablets for inscriptions are found in ancient writers. Panainoss (ix. 31) saw Hesiod's Works and Days graven on lead, but almost illegible with age. Public proclamations, according to Pliny (xiii. 21), were written on lead, and the name of Germanicus was carved on leaden tablets (Tac. Ann. li. 60). Envyarius (Ann. A.D. x. p. 390) relates that the history of the Seven Sleepers was engraved on lead by the Cadi.

Oxide of lead is employed largely in modern pottery for the formation of glazes, and its presence has been discovered in analyzing the articles of earthenware found in Egypt and Nineveh, proving that the ancients were acquainted with its use for the same purpose. The A. V. of Eccles. xxviii. 30 assumes that the usage was known to the Hebrews, though the original is not explicit upon the point. Speaking of the potter's art in finishing off his work, "he applieth himself to lead it over," is the rendering of what in the Greek is simply "he giveth his heart to complete the smearing," the material employed for the purpose not being indicated.

In modern metallurgy lead is employed for the purpose of purifying silver from other mineral products. The alloy is mixed with lead, exposed to fusion upon an earthen vessel, and submitted to a blast of air. By this means the dross is consumed. This process is called the expelling operation, with which the description in Ex. xxiii. 18-20, in the opinion of Mr. Napier (Met. of Bible, pp. 20-24), accurately coincides. "The vessel containing the alloy is surrounded by the fire, or placed in the midst of it, and the blowing is not applied to the fire, but to the fused metals. . . . And when this is done, nothing but the perfect metals, gold and silver, can resist the scourifying influence." And in support of his conclusion he quotes Jer. vi. 28-30, adding: "This description is perfect. If we take silver having the impurities in it described in the text, namely, iron, copper, and tin, and mix it with lead, and place it in the fire upon a cupel, it soon melts; the lead will oxidize and form a thick coarse crust upon the surface, and thus consume away, but effecting no purifying influence. The alloy remains, if anything, worse than before. . . . The silver is not refined, because the bellows were burned —there existed nothing to blow upon it. Lead is the purifier, but only so in connection with a blast blowing upon the precious metals." An allusion to this use of lead is to be found in Theognis (Gnom. 1127, 28; ed. Wecker), and it is mentioned by Pliny (xxxiii. 31) as indispensable to the purifica-tion of silver from alloy.

W. A. W.
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LEAH

(2) Leaves of the oaks of the Temple. (3) Leaves of the roll of a book.

1. LEAF (תֵּפָּר, ṣîḇ; תֵּפָּח, ṣîḇ; תֵּפִּיה, ṣîḇ): φυλλον, στεφάνιος; κέρας: φύλλον, κέρας, κέρατον. The olive-leaf is mentioned in Gen. viii. 11. Fig-leaves formed the first covering of our parents in Eden. The barren fig-tree (Matt. xxii. 13; Mark xi. 13) on the road between Bethan and Jerusalem "had on it nothing but leaves." The fig-leaf is alluded to by our Lord (Matt. xxiv. 32; Mark xiii. 28); "When his branch is yet tender, and pitheth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh." The oak-leaf is mentioned in Isa. i. 30, and vii. 13. The righteous are often compared to green leaves (Jer. xvii. 8), "her leaf shall be green" — to leaves that fade not (Ps. i. 3), "his leaf also shall not wither." The ungodly on the other hand are as "an oak whose leaf faileth" (Is. i. 30); as a tree which "shall wither in all the leaves of her spring" (Ez. xvii. 9); the "soul of a saken lot shall cease them" (Lev. xxvi. 39). In Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters, the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom are spoken of under the image of trees growing on a river's bank: there "shall grow all trees for food, whose leaf shall not fade" (Ez. xiii. 12). In this passage it is said that "the fruit of these trees shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine" (margin, for branches and leaves). With this compare (Rev. xxi. i, 2) St. John's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem. "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life . . . and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." There is probably here an allusion to some tree whose leaves were used by the Jews as a medicine or ointment; indeed, it is very likely that many plants and leaves were thus made use of by them, as by the old English herbalists.

2. LEAVES OF DOORS (תֵּפָּקָה, tēḇâḵ; תֵּפָּח, ṣîḇ; תֵּפִּיה, ṣîḇ): τοπιάξι, βήπακα: ostium, ostium). The Hebrew word, which occurs very many times in the Bible, and which in 1 K. vi. 32 (margin) and 34 is translated "leaves" in the A.V., signifies šefer, shafer, shafera, shaferet. In Ez. xxvi. 24: And the doors had two leaves apiece." The Hebrew word deloth is the representative of both doors and leaves. By the expression two-leaved doors, we are no doubt to understand what we term folding-doors.

3. LEAVES OF A BOOK OR ROLL (תֵּפָּח, ṣîḇ; תֵּפִּיה, ṣîḇ): σκόλις: petgella occurs in this sense only in Jer. xxxi. 22. The Hebrew word (literally doors) would perhaps be more correctly translated columns. The Latin column, and the English column, as applied to a book, are probably derived from resemblance to a column of a building.

LEATHER (חַלְָכִּית, chal kiít; חַלֵּכָה, chal kāh; חַלַּכָה, chal kāh): Aloa, Aia: Liv. The elder daughter of Laban (Gen. xxix. 16). The dullness or weakness of her eyes was so notable, that it is mentioned as a contrast to the beautiful form and appearance of her younger sister Rachel. Her father took advantage of the opportunity which the local marriage-rite afforded to pass her off in her sister's stead as the unconscious bridegroom, and expressed his own application to Jacob by alleging the custom of the country forbade the younger sister to be given first in marriage. Rosenmuller cites instances of these customs prevailing to this day in some parts of the East. Jacob's preference of Rachel grew into hatred of Leah, after he had married both sisters. Leah, however, bore to him in quick succession Reuben, Simon, Levi, Judah, then Issachar, Zebulun, and Dinah, before Rachel had a child. Leah was conscious and respectful (ch. xxxv.) of the smaller share she possessed in her husband's affections; yet in Jacob's differences with his father-in-law, his two wives appear to be attached to him with equal fidelity. In the critical moment when he expected an attack from Esau, his discriminate regard for the several members of his family was shown by his placing Rachel and her child hindermost, in the least exposed situation, Leah and her children next, attempting to handmaidens with their children in the front. Leah probably lived to witness the dishonor of her daughter (ch. xxxiv.), so cruelly avenged by two of her sons: and the subsequent deaths of Deborah at Bethel, and of Rachel near Bethlehem. She died some time after Jacob reached the south country in which his father Isaac lived. Her name is not mentioned in the list of Jacob's family (ch. xvi. 8) when they went down into Egypt. She was buried in the family grave in Machpelah (ch. xlix. 31).

W. T. B.

LEASING, "falsehood." This word is retained in the A. V. of Ps. iv. 2, v. 6, from the older English versions; but the Hebrew word of which it is the rendering is elsewhere almost uniformly translated "lies" (Ps. x. 4, liii. 3, &c.). It is derived from the Anglo-Saxon haxos, "false," whence leasung, "leasing," "falsehood," and is of frequent occurrence in old English writers. So in Piers Ploughman's Vision, 21:3:

"Tell me no tales, No leasung to bring upon me.
And in Wiclef's New Testament, John viii. 44, "Whanne he spekith a leasung, he spekith of his owne thinges, for he is a lyere, and falsit of it." It is used both by Spencer and Shakespeare.

W. A. W.

LEATHER (חַלְָכִּית, chal kiít; חַלֵּכָה, chal kāh; חַלַּכָה, chal kāh): Aloa, Aia: Liv. The notices of leather in the Bible are singularly few; indeed the word occurs but twice in the A. V., and in each instance in reference to the same object, a girdle (2 K. i. 8; Matt. iii. 4). There are, however, other instances in which the word "leather" might with propriety be substituted for "skin," as in the passages in which vessels (Lev. xii. 32; Num. xxxi. 20) or raiment (Lev. xiii. 49) are spoken of; for in these cases the skins must have been prepared. Though the material itself is seldom noticed, yet we cannot doubt that it was extensively used by the Jews: shoes, botelles, thongs, garments, tending-toughs, ropes, and other articles, were made of it. For the mode of preparing it see TANNER [Amer. ed.].

W. L. B.

Comp. the s. r. ṣîḇ, folium, from ṣîḇ: strike off (Cassell. Lex. Hept. a. v.)

c From the unused root ṣîḇ, ṣîḇ, to lower, by ṣîḇ: Arab. ṣōbāʿ.
LEAVEN (*ἐπιρρέω, see: ξύππον: fermentum*). The Hebrew word *seor* has the radical sense of 'affluence or fermentation,' and therefore corresponds in point of etymology to the Greek *ξύππος* (from *ξύππον*, the Latin *fermentum* (from *ferreo*), and the English *leaven* (from *levere*). It occurs only five times in the Bible (Ex. xii. 13, 19, xiii. 7; Lev. ii. 11; Deut. xvi. 4), and is translated "leaven" in the first four of the passages quoted, and "leavened bread" in the last. In connection with it, we must notice the terms *chametz* and *matzoth*; the former signifying "fermented" or "leavened," literally "sharpened," bread; the latter "unleavened," the radical force of the word being variously understood to signify *sweetness or purity.*

The three words appear in juxtaposition in Ex. xiii. 7: "Unleavened bread (matzoth) shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread (chametz) be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven (seor) seen with thee in all thy quarters."

Various substances were known to have fermenting qualities; but the ordinary leaven consisted of a lump of old dough in a high state of fermentation, which was inserted into the mass of dough prepared for baking. [Bread.] As the process of producing the leaven itself, or even of leavening bread when the substance was at hand, required some time, unleavened cakes were more usually produced in sudden emergencies (Gen. xvi. 6; Judg. vi. 19). The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in all offerings made to the Lord by fire; as in the case of the meat-offering (Lev. ii. 11), the trespass-offering, (Lev. vii. 12), the consecration-offering (Ex. xxix. 2; Lev. viii. 2), the Nazarite-offering (Num. vi. 15), and more particularly in regard to the feast of the Passover, when the Israelites were not only prohibited on pain of death from eating leavened bread, but even from having any leaven in their houses (Ex. xii. 15, 19) or in their land (Ex. xiii. 7; Deut. xvi. 4) during seven days commencing with the 14th of Nisan. It is in reference to these prohibitions that Amos (i. 5) irascibly bids the Jews of his day to "offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven;" and hence even the earliest case was prohibited which Lev. xvi. 13 speaks of its occasionally producing fermentation. In other instances, where the offering was to be consumed by the priests, and not on the altar, leaven might be used, as in the case of the peace-offering (Lev. vii. 13), and the Pentecostal loaves (Lev. xxiii. 17). Various ideas were associated with the prohibition of leaven in the instances above quoted; in the feast of the Passover it served to remind the Israelites of the haste with which they fled out of Egypt (Ex. xii. 39), and of the sufferings that they had undergone in that land, the insipidity of unleavened bread rendering it a not inapt emblem of affliction (Deut. xvi. 3). But the most prominent idea, and the one which applies equally to all the cases of prohibition, is connected with the corruption which leaven itself had undergone, and which it communicated to bread in the process of fermentation. It is to this property of leaven that our Saviour points when he speaks of the "leaven" (i.e. the corrupt doctrine) of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees* (Matt. xvi. 6); and St. Paul, when he speaks of the "old leaven" (1 Cor. v. 7). This association of ideas was not peculiar to the Jews, it was familiar to the Romans, who forbade the priest of Jupiter to touch flour mixed with leaven (Gell. x. 15, 19), and who occasionally used the word *fermentum* as "corruption" (Pers. Sat. i. 24). Plutarch's explanation is very much to the point: "The leaven itself is born from corruption, and corrupts the mass with which it is mixed" (Quast. Rom. 109). Another quality in leaven is noticed in the Bible, namely, its *secretly penetrating and diffusing* power; hence the proverbial saying, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. v. 6; Gal. v. 9). In this respect it was emblematic of moral influence generally, whether good or bad, and hence our Saviour adopts it as illustrating the growth of the kingdom of heaven in the individual heart and in the world at large (Matt. xiii. 33).

W. L. B.

LEBANON (in prose with the art. *المَّبَايِن*, I. k. v. 6 (Heb. 20); in poetry without the art. *المَّبَايِن*: Ps. xiii. 6; *Διαβάρος: Libanus*), a mountain range in the north of Palestine. The name *Lebanon* signifies "white," and was applied either on account of the snow, which, during a great part of the year, covers its whole summit,* or on account of the white color of its limestone cliffs and peaks. It is the "white mountain" — the *Mont Blanc* of Palestine; an appellation which seems to be given, in one form or another, to the highest mountains in all the countries of the old world. Lebanon is represented in Scripture as lying upon the northern border of the land of Israel (Deut. i. 7, xi. 24; Josh. i. 4). Two distinct ranges bear this name. They both begin in lat. 33° 20', and run in parallel lines from S. W. to N. E. for about 90 Geo. miles, enclosing between them a long fertile valley from 5 to 8 miles wide, anciently called *Cedia-Syrira*. The modern name is *el-Bâdis*, and the valley is correspondingly limited to "the valley of Lebanon" (Gen. xvi. 17). It is a northern prolongation of the Jordan valley, and likewise a southern prolongation of that of the Orontes (Porter's *Handbook*, p. xvi.). The western range is the "Libanus" of the old geographers, and the Lebanon of Scripture where Solomon got timber for the Temple (I. K. v. 9, 40), and where the Hivites and Gidrites dwelt (Judg. iii. 9; Josh. xiii. 5). The eastern range was called "Anti-Libanus" by geographers, and "Lebanon toward the sun-rising" by the sacred writers (Josh. xiii. 5). Strabo describes (xvi. p. 754) the two as commencing near the Mediterranean — the former at Tripolis, and the latter at Sidon — and running in parallel lines toward Damascus; and strange to say, this error has, in
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* Notes:
  - *Another form of the same root, *chomets* (*才华*), is applied to sharpened or sour wine.*
  - *So Tacitus (Hist. v. 6): "Praecipuum monitum *monumentum erigit, nirum dictum, tautos tuerat arbores pacum filiumque avibus."*
LEBANON

part at least, been followed by most modern writers, who represent the mountain-range between Tyre and the lake of Meron as a branch of Anti-Libanus (Winer, *Reedits.,* s. v. "Anti-Libanus;" Robinson, 1st ed. iii. 346; but see the corrections in the new edition). The topography of Anti-Libanus was first clearly described by Ptolemy's *Diomnusios* (v. 227, &c., iii. 399, &c.). A deep valley called *Wadi el-Khāsa* separates the southern section of Anti-Libanus from both Lebanon and the hills of Galilee. Lebanon—the western range—commences on the south at the deep ravine of the Litān, the ancient river Leontes, which drains the valley of Cæle-Syria, and falls into the Mediterranean five miles north of Tyre. It runs N. E. in a straight line parallel to the coast, to the opening from the Mediterranean into the plain of Emesa, called in Scripture the "Entrance of Hamath" (Num. xxiv. 8). Here Nuhel el-Khāsa—the ancient river Leontes—sweps round its northern end, as the Leontes does round its southern. The average elevation of the range is from 6000 to 8000 f.; but two peaks rise considerably higher. One of these is Samnaus, nearly on the parallel of Bayrut, which is more than 9000 f.; the other is Jobel Machra, which was measured in September, 1800, by the hydrographer, to be nearly 10,200 feet high (Not. Hist. Res., XI. V. p. 11). It is the highest mountain in Syria. On the summits of both these peaks the snow remains in patches during the whole summer.

The central ridge or backbone of Lebanon has smooth, barren sides, and gray rounded summits. It is entirely destitute of verdure, and is covered with small fragments of limestone, from which white crowns and jagged points of naked rock shoot up at intervals. Here and there a few stunted pine-trees or dwarf oaks are met with. The line of cultivation runs along at the height of about 8000 f.; and below this the features of the western slopes are entirely different. The descent is gradual; but is everywhere broken by precipices and towering rocks which time and the elements have chiseled into strange, fantastic shapes. Ravines of singular wildness and grandeur furnish the whole mountain side, looking in many places like huge rents. Here and there, too, bold promontories shoot out, and dip perpendicularly into the bosom of the Mediterranean. Smaller mountain-strewn limestone hills are scantily clothed with the evergreen oak, and the sandstone with pines; while every available spot is carefully cultivated. The cultivation is wonderful, and shows what all Syria might be if under a good government. Minor fields of grain are often seen where one would suppose the eagles alone, which hover round them, could have planted the seed. Figs cling to the naked rock; vines are trained along narrow ledges; long ranges of mulberries, terraces like steps of stairs, cover the more gentle declivities; and dense groves of olives fill up the bosoms of the glens. Hundreds of villages are seen—here built amid labyrinth of rocks; there rearing like swallow's nests to the sides of cliffs; while covents, no less numerous, are perched on the top of every peak. When viewed from the sea on a morning in early spring, Lebanon presents a picture which, once seen, is never forgotten; but deeper still is the impression left on the mind when one looks down over its terraced slopes clothed in their gorgeous foliage, and through the vistas of its immeasurable ranges, the distant Anti-Libanus.

How beautifully do these noble features illustrate the words of the prophet: "Israel shall grow as the lily, and strike forth his roots as Lebanon" (Hos. xiv. 5). And the fresh mountain breezes, filled in early summer with the fragrance of the budding vines, and throughout the year with the rich odors of numerous aromatic shrubs, call to mind the words of Solomon—"The smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon" (Cant. iv. 11; see also Hos. xiv. 6). When the plains of Palestine are burned up with the scorching sun, and when the air in them is like the breath of a furnace, the snowy tops and ice-cold streams of Lebanon temper the breezes, and make the mountain-range a pleasant and luxurious retreat, —

Shall a man leave the snow of Lebanon . . . or shall the cold-flowing waters be forsaken?" (Jer. xviii. 14). The vine is still largely cultivated in every part of the mountain; and the wine is excellent, notwithstanding the clumsy apparatus and unskilful workmen employed in its manufacture (Hos. xiv. 7). Lebanon also abounds in olives, figs, and mulberries; while some remnants exist of the forests of pine, oak, and cedar, which formerly covered it (1 K. v. 6; Ps. xxix. 5; Is. xiv. 8; Ezr. iii. 7; Diod. Sic. xix. 58). Considerable numbers of wild beasts still inhabit its retired glens and higher peaks: the writer has seen jackals, hyenas, wolves, bears, and panthers (2 K. xiv. 9; Cant. iv. 8; Hab. i. 17).

Some noble streams of Cæsælīea celebrity have their sources high up in Lebanon, and rush down in sheets of foam through sublime gorges, to stain with their ruby waters the transparent bosom of the Mediterranean. The Leontes is on the south. Next comes Nahr el-Mordy—the "gracious BBTN" of Diodorus Siculi (905). Then follows the Dünarun—the "Elamurus" of Strabo (xvi. p. 726), and the "Dunumrus" of Polybius (v. 68). Next, just on the north side of Beyrut, Nahr Beyrut, the "Magorius" of Pliny (v. 20). A few miles beyond it is Nahr el-Kibh, the "Lycus fluminis" of the old geographers (Plin. v. 20). At its mouth is the celebrated pass where Egyptian, Assyrian, and Roman conquerors have left, on tables of stone, records of their routes and their victories (Porter's *Handbook,* p. 107). Nahr Ibnbain, the classic river Adonis," follows, bursting from a cave beneath the lofty brow of Simnain, beside the ruins of Aphrodis. From its native rock it runs "Paralle to the sea, supposed with blood of Thannan, yearly wounded." —Lucrius *s. o., * Dea, 6-8; Strab. xvi. 755; Plin. v. 17; Porter's *Handbook,* ii. 205.) Lastly, we have the "sacred river," Kudshah—descending

* Pliny was more accurate than Strabo. He says, (v. 24) "A large Lebanon, much Lebanon teens, mili quingentis stadiis Syriam usque peritgitur, qua Cœle-Syria communiter. Hie pura interjecte radile morte adversus obtinentur, muro conjugato."

* Prokynus v. 15 follows Strabo; but Eusebius (*Onom. gr. v. 4, Antyllianus*) says, "Διαφορ συνοικίας, παρ' αυτού τον Ἀδαμον προς ἀνατολάδα, παρ' Δαμασκίνοις γεφυραν.*
from the side of the loftiest peak in the whole range, through a gorge of surpassing grandeur. Upon its banks, in a notch of a towering cliff, is perched the great convent of *Koubin*, the residence of the Maronite patriarch.

The situation of the little group of cedars—the last remnant of that noble forest, once the glory of Lebanon—is very remarkable. Round the head of the sublime Valley of the Kadisha sweep the highest summits of Lebanon in the form of a semicircle. Their sides rise up, bare, smooth, majestic, to the rounded snow-capped heads. In the centre of this vast recess, far removed from all other foliage and verdure, stand, in strange solitude, the cedars of Lebanon, as if they scorned to mingle their giant arms, and graceful fan-like branches, with the degenerate trees of a later age.

Along the base of Lebanon runs the irregular plain of Phoenicia; nowhere more than two miles wide, and often interrupted by bold rocky spurs, that dip into the sea.

The eastern slopes of Lebanon are much less imposing and less fertile than the western. In the southern half of the range there is an abrupt descent from the summit into the plain of Coele-Syria, which has an elevation of about 2,500 ft. Along the proper base of the northern half runs a low side ridge partially covered with dwarf oaks.

The northern half of the mountain-range is peopled almost exclusively by Maronite Christians—a brave, industrious, and hardy race; but sadly oppressed by an ignorant set of priests. In the southern half the Berunes predominate, who, though they number only some 26,000 fighting men, form one of the most powerful parties in Syria.

The main ridge of Lebanon is composed of *Jura* limestone, and abounds in fossils. Long belts of more recent sandstone run along the western slopes.

The whole mountain range was assigned to the Israelites, but was never conquered by them (Josh. xvii. 2-6; Judg. iii. 1-3). During the Jewish monarchy it appears to have been subject to the Phoenicians (1 K. v. 2-6; Ezr. iii. 7). From the Greek conquest until modern times Lebanon had no separate history.

**Anti-Libanus.**—The main chain of Anti-Libanus commences in the plateau of Bashan, near the parallel of Caesarea-Philippi, runs north to Hermon, and then northeast in a straight line till it sinks down into the great plain of Emesa, not far from the site of Riblah. **HERMON** is the loftiest peak, and has already been described; the next highest is a few miles north of the site of *Adala*, beside the village of *Blukan*, and has an elevation of about
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*The grand range of Lebanon.*
7,000 ft. The rest of the ridge averages about 5,000 ft.; it is in general bleak and barren, with shelving gray declivities, gray cliffs, and gray rounded summits. Here and there we meet with thin forests of dwarf oak and juniper. The western slopes descend abruptly into the Bekâ‘a; but the features of the eastern are entirely different. Three side-ridges here radiate from Hermon, like the ribs of an open fan, and form the supporting walls of three great terraces. The last and lowest of these terraces takes a course nearly due east, bounding the plain of Damascus, and running out into the desert as far as Palmyra. The greater part of the terraces thus formed are parched flatly deserts, though here and there are sections with a rich soil. Anti-Libanus can only boast of two streams — the Harbar, now Nahr c‘I‘ayrj, which rises high up on the side of Hermon; and the Alana, now called Borâ‘el. The fountain of the latter is in the beautiful little plain of Zelbâ‘yeh, on the western side of the main chain, through which it eats in a sublime gorge, and then divides successively each of the side-ridges in its course to Damascus. A small streamlet flows down the Valley of Helben parallel to the Alana.

Anti-Libanus is more thinly peopled than its sister range; and it is more abundantly stocked with wild beasts. Eagles, vultures, and other birds of prey, may be seen day after day sweeping in circles round the keel-cliffs. Wild swine are numerous; and vast herds of gazelles roam over the bleak eastern steppes.

Anti-Libanus is only once distinctly mentioned in Scripture, where it is accurately described as "Lebanon toward the sun-rising" (Josh. viii. 5); but the southern section of the chain is frequently referred to under other names. [See Hermon.] The words of Solomon in Cant. iv. 8 are very striking — "Look from the top of Amana, from the top of Shenir and Hermon, from the lions’ den, from the mountains of the leopards." The reference is, in all probability, to the highest peaks of Anti-Libanus. — Hermon, and that near the fountain of the Alana; and in both places panthers still exist. "The tower of Lebanon, which looketh toward Damascus" (Cant. vii. 4) is doubtless Hermon, which forms the most striking feature in the whole panorama round that city. Josephus mentions Lebanon as lying near Ban and the fountains of the Jordan (Ant. v. 3, § 1); and as bounding the province of Gabbinitus on the north (B. J. iii. 5, § 5); he of course means Anti-Libanus.

The old city of Abila stood in one of the wildest gles of Anti-Libanus, on the banks of the Alana, and its territory embraced a large section of the range. [Ambiente.] Damascus owns its existence to these mountains: so did the once great and splendid city of Heliopolis; and its chief sources of both the Leontes and Orontes lie along their western base (Porter’s Handbook, pp. xviii., xix.).

* For a long time it was contended that the cedar was not found in any part of Lebanon except the famous grove near Betheryck, and that no trees resembling it in other localities were only cognate species, but not the true *Larix cedrus.* I have, however, settled this point by a laborious search and botanical examination. There are certainly in existence the following groves:

1. An extensive one near c‘I‘ainel, described by previous authors, consisting of many thousand small trees.

2. A small grove was in existence up to October 1866, east of ‘Ain Zulatta, on the crest of the ridge overlooking the Bekâ‘a. I visited the same grove in company with Rev. H. H. Jesup, D. D., in October 1865, and at that time we counted about twenty trees, some of them of considerable size. One isolated from the grove, distant a mile, would have measured twenty feet in circumference. This grove was felled when I visited it in 1866, and the last timbers were being sawn for roofing purposes.

3. A large grove of very young trees east of ‘Ain Zulatta, in the valleys and on the western slopes of Lebanon. I estimated the number at 10,000 trees. This grove a few years since consisted of very large trees, many of them from 6 to 13 feet in diameter. But a few years ago they were sold to a company of pitch-burners from Bostâ‘el for the pulpary sum of 30,000 piastres, and all cut down, and consumed in making rosin and tar. The new sprouts are now beginning to re-clothe the hill-sides and valleys, and in a couple of centuries may claim the name of a forest.

4. A grove beginning above Bribek and stretching southward two or three miles, terminating in a cluster of noble trees overhanging the village of Helbin, lying near the grove at Bribek in magnitude and beauty. The northernmost end of this grove above Bribek has a few score of large trees, one or two of which are gigantic. The central portion, clothing the western slope of the mountain, consists of large trees, but so miserably hacked and burned by the wood-cutters, that most of its trees are dead or dying. They may number 20,000 to 30,000 in all, small and large. The southernmost portion is a grand collection of about two hundred and fifty trees. One measures 27 feet in circumference, another 23, and many from 15 to 20. Some of them spread widely their horizontal branches, and bear numerous cones. The granduer of their situation on the declivity of a deep gorge enhances the interest which always attends the sight of this venerable tree.

It will be seen by these remarks, that, were the groves mentioned protected from spoliation, and allowed to increase, Mount Lebanon might be again covered with lofty forests of its royal tree.

A word on the value of the cedar for building purposes. In Syria, where the woods so soon destroy the softer woods, and where the long soaking to which roof timbers are subjected, owing to the cooing of water from the earth-roofs during the rainy season, causes the timbers to rot, a resinos
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indestructible wood like the cedar is invaluable for the rafters which are universally used as supports for the roofs throughout the Lebanon. It is true that the timber as now found cannot be worked into very long straight columns, as it is gnarled and twisted like the oak, but for most of the purposes for which timber is used here it would be invaluable. What might be its character, were the trees allowed to grow naturally, without being lopped and mutilated, cannot be positively ascertained. I am of opinion, however, from the symmetry of some of the older trees, that much of the disarrangement which has been used in speaking of this wood is due to the deformity and disease inflicted on the tree by the careless hand of man, and I can readily believe that Solomon found all that he desired for the stately columns and beams and rafters of his Temple and palace in the uninjured primeval forests of which we see a faint type near Bethrech and el-Mornit.

Since the massacres of 1860, Lebanon has constituted a separate government, tributary to the Turkish Sultan, but in many important respects independent. Its governor, Daud Pacha, is a Christian, of the American Catholic sect. He was nominated by the Porte, subject to the ratification of the Five Powers. He governs the mountains with the aid of a police force enrolled by volunteer enlistments from among the various populations of the mountains—Druze, Maronite, Greek, and Greek Catholic. No Turkish troops are stationed in his district, which includes all of both slopes of Lebanon, and a part of the Jubeil. He is a man of enlightened judgment and views, and has succeeded in establishing a government which is an honor to himself and the great powers to which he is responsible, and an unspoilable relief to the country after the centuries of misrule and anarchy which have desolated it. He has even introduced the franchise, and has organized local governments, elective by the people. He is not under the jurisdiction of the governor-general of Syria, but is answerable directly to the Sublime Porte, and the representatives of England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Under his benign administration the fruitful mountains, now visibly covered by native pine and cedar beauty, and the thrifty aspect of its villages bears testimony to the sense of security which is so sadly wanting in the neighboring plains and mountains.

G. E. P.

LEB^OOTH (777177] [Irons]: Lebass; Alex. Abbath: Lebath), a town which forms one of the last group of the cities of “the South” in the enumeration of the possessions of Judah (Josh. xv. 32). It is named between Sansannah and Shilhim; and is very probably identical with Beth-Lebath, elsewhere called Beth-Meill. No trace of any names answering to these appears to have been yet discovered. If we may adopt the Hebrew signification of the name (“houseless”), it furnishes an indication of the existence of wild animals in the south of Palestine.

LEBREUS (Lebassios). This name occurs in Matt. x. 3, according to Codex D (Rezeit Cantabrigiensis) of the sixth century [and most other MSS.], and in the Received Text. In Matt. xii. 18 it is substituted in a few unimportant MSS. for Thaddaeus. The words “Lebassios who is called” (Matt. x. 3) are not found in the Vatican MS. [B] nor the Sinaitic, and Lachmann rejects them as, in his opinion, not received by the most ancient Eastern churches. [So also Tregelles.] The Vulgate omits them; but Jerome (Comm. in Matt.) says that Thaddeus, or Judas the brother of James, is elsewhere called Lebasseus; and he concludes that this Apostle had three names. It is much easier to suppose that a strange name has been omitted than that it has been inserted by later transcribers. [Lebasseus is retained in Tischendorf's 8th critical edition of the Greek Testament, but he omits ως ἐπεξεργάτης Θαδαθαοί.—A.] It is admitted into the authorised version of the text in 1881, and in the English versions (except the Rhemish) since Tyndale's in 1534. For the signification of the name, and for the life of the Apostle, see Jude, p. 1584.

W. T. B.

LEBO'NNAH (7777777] [frankincense, and in that sense also 7777777] τῆς Λεβωναίας; Alex. τοῦ Λεβωνοῦ τῆς Λεβωναίας: Lebourn], a place named in Judges xxii. 19 only; and there but as a landmark to determine the position of Shiloh, which is stated to have lain south of it. Lebanon has survived to our times under the almost identical form of el-Lubboun. It lies to the west of, and close to, the Nobâas road, about eight miles north of Beitin (Bethel), and two from Selation (Shiloh), in relation to which it stands, however, nearer W. than N. The village is on the northern acclivity of the wady to which it gives its name. Its appearance is ancient; and in the rocks above it are excavated sepulchres (Rob. ii. 272). To Eusebius and Jerome it does not appear to have been known. The earliest mention of it yet met with is in the itinerary of the Jewish traveller hap-harch (A. p. c. 1320), who describes it under the name of Lobin, and refers especially to its correspondence with the passages in Judges (see Asher's Benj. of Tudeh, ii. 435). It was visited by Mannriell (March 24, 25), who mentions the identification with Lebanon, but in such terms as may imply that he was only repeating a tradition. Since then it has been passed and noticed by most travellers to the Holy Land (Rob. ii. 372; Wilson, ii. 292, 293; Donor, 363; Mislin, iii. 319, &c., &c.).

G.

LECAH (77777777) [walking, course]: [Rom. Anax; Vat.] Anco: Alex. Anco: Lecce], a name mentioned in the genealogies of Judah (1 Chr. iv. 21) only, as one of the descendants of Shelah, the third son of Judah by the Canaanitis Batsh. The immediate progenitor of Lecce was Ete. Many of the names in this genealogy, especially when the word “father” is attached, are towns (comp. Eshtemoa, Keilah, Marshesh, &c.), but this, though probably the case with Lecce, is not certain, because it is not mentioned again, either in the Bible or the Onomasticon, nor have any traces of it been since discovered.

G.

* LEDGES (77777777), 1 K. vii. 28 35, 36. [Laver, K.]

LEECOH. [HORSE-LEECOH.]

LEEXS (77777777), châhîv: 5á prâța, Btûrîn xâhrî, xâhôrô, xâharô: herba, porro, fenum, prutrum). The word cähîv, which in Num. x. 5 is translated leeks, occurs twenty times in the Hebrew text. In 1 K. xviii. 5; Job x1. 15; Ps. civ. 14, civii. 8, cxxix. 6, cxxvii. 2, x. 5, cii. 15; Is. xxxvi. 27, xl. 6, 7, 8, xiv. 4, li. 12, it is rendered gross; in Job xiii. 12, it is rendered herb; in Prov. xxv. 25, Is. x. 6, it is erroneously translated
of it are eaten by the people. Forskål mentions the *Trigonella* as being grown in the gardens at Cairo; its native name is *Halbech* (*Flor. Aegypt.*, p. 81).

Sonnini (Voyage, i. 373) says, “In this fertile country, the Egyptians themselves eat the *fenn-grec* so largely, that it may be properly called the food of man. In the month of November they eat ‘green halbech for sale!’ in the streets of the town; it is tied up in large bunches, which the inhabitants purchase at a low price, and which they eat with incredible greediness without any kind of seasoning.”

The seeds of this plant, which is also cultivated in Greece, are often used; they are eaten boiled or raw, mixed with honey. Forskål includes it in the *Materia Medica of Egypt* (*MOTT. Med. Kohir*, p. 156). However plausibly may be this theory of Hengstenberg, there does not appear sufficient reason for ignoring the old versions, which seem all agreed that the *leck* is the plant denoted by *chaldis*, a vegetable from the earliest times a great favorite with the Egyptians, as both a nourishing and savory food. Some have objected that, as the Egyptians held the *leck*, onion, etc., sacred, they would abstain from eating these vegetables themselves, and would not allow the Israelites to use them. We have, however, the testimony of Herodotus (ii. 125) to show that onions were eaten by the Egyptian poor, for he says that on one of the pyramids is shown an inscription, which was explained to him by an interpreter, showing how much money was spent in providing onions, garlic, and garlic, for the workmen. The priests were not allowed to eat these things, and Plutarch (*De Is. et Osir. lii*, p. 373) tells us the reasons. The Welshman reverences his leek, and wears one on St. David’s Day — he eats the *leck* nevertheless; and doubtless

---

33. *chaldis* (hbarsat), which is the fold or pen of sheep. [R. E. P.]
the Egyptians were not over-scrupulous (Scip. Herod., p. 230). The "look" is too well known to need description. Its botanical name is "Allium porrum"; it belongs to the order Liliaceae. W. H.

LEES (לְיָאָשׁ) [πορφυρᾶς: facies]. The Hebrew word bears the radical sense of preservation, and was applied to "lees" from the custom of allowing the wine to stand on the lees in order that its color and body might be better preserved. Hence the expression "wine on the lees," as meaning a generous, full-bodied liquor (I. Sam. xxv. 6). The wine in this state remained, of course, unadulterated in its essence, and became thick and syrupy; hence the proverb, "to settle upon one's lees," to express the sloth, indolence, and gross stupidity of the ungodly (Jer. xlvii. 10; Zeph. i. 12). Before the wine was consumed, it was necessary to strain off the lees; such wine was then termed "well refined" (Is. xxxv. 6). To drink the lees, or "dregs," was an expression for the endurance of extreme punishment (Ps. Ixxxv. 3). W. L. B.

LEGION (legate): [Tisch. 8th ed.; Legeth.] Legio, the chief subdivision of the Roman army, containing about 6,000 infantry, with a contingent of cavalry. The term does not occur in the Bible in its primary sense, but has been adopted in order to express any large number, with the necessary idea of order and subordination. Thus it is applied by our Lord to the angels (Matt. xxvi. 53), and in this sense it answers to the "hosts" of the Old Testament (Gen. xxxiii. 2; Ps. cxlviii. 2). It is again the name which the demoniac assumes, "My name is Legion (Legeth); for we are many" (Mark v. 9), implying the presence of a spirit of superior power in addition to subordinate ones. W. L. B.

LEHABIM (לְהָבֵים) [perh. fiery, flaming]: Lebens; [in 1 Chr., Rom. xvi. 14, Alex. "Leavos"]; Ljudaim, occurring only in Gen. x. 13 and 1 Chr. i. 11, the name of a Mizrite people or tribe, supposed to be the same as the Lubim, mentioned in several places in the Scriptures as mercenaries or allies of the Egyptians. There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the Rebu or Lebu of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from them Libya and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is, from the tip of Mesopotamia, n. c. cir. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B. C., and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B. C., to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the west of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under LUBIM. Phillographically, the interchanges of these middle letter of a root into a quiescent, is frequent, although it is important to remark that Gesenius considers the form with Π to be more common in the later dialects, as the Semitic languages are now found (Thes. art. 77). There seems, however, to be strong reason for considering many of these lower reconstructions to primitive forms. Geographically, the position of the Libdibim in the enumeration of the Mizrdates immediately before the Naphtalim, suggests that they at first settled to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them (Mizraim). Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the Rebu and Libyans with Egypt and its people suggests the resemblance shown with the Egyptians (Lubim). On these grounds there can be no reasonable doubt of the identity of the Libdibim and Lubim. I. S. P.

LEHI (with the def. article, לֶהַי) except in ver. 14 [the javelion]; in ver. 9, [Rom. Λέχη, Vat.] Aevius, Alex. Aevus; [in vv. 14, 19.] Lechû, id est mazilus, a place in Judah, probably on the confines of the Philistia, between it and the cliff Etam; the scene of Samson's well-known exploit with the javelin (Judg. xv. 9, 14, 19). It contained an eminence — Ramath-lehi, and a spring of great and lasting repute — En-hak-ker. Whether the name existed before the exploit or the exploit originated the name cannot now be determined from the narrative. On the one hand, in vv. 9 and 19, Lehi is named as if existing before this occurrence, while on the other the play of the story and the statement of the bestowal of the name Ramath-lehi look as if the reverse were intended. The analogy of similar names in other countries is in favor of its having existed previously. Even taken as a Hebrew word, "Lehi" has another meaning besides a javelin; and after all there is throughout a difference between the two words, while, though similar, their forms to us, would be much more marked to those of a Hebrew, and which so far betrays the accommodation. A similar discrepancy in the case of Beer Lahai-
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LEMUEL, and a great similarity between the two names in the original (Ges. Thes. 175 b), has led to the supposition that that place was the same as Lehi. But the situations do not suit. The well Ladnai-roi was below Kadesh, very far from the locality to which Samson’s adventures seem to have been confined. The same consideration would also appear fatal to the identification proposed by M. Van de Velde (Memoire, p. 344) at Tell el-Lekheiah, in the extreme south of Palestine, only four miles above Kerk-sheh, a distance to which we have no authority for believing that either Samson’s achievements or the possession of the Philistines (at least in those days) extended. As far as the name goes, a more feasible suggestion would be Brat-Likheyah, a village in the northern slopes of the great Wady Sukkam, about two miles below the upper Beth-horon (see Tolev, loc. Wunderung). Here is a position at once on the borders of both Judah and the Philistines, and within reasonable proximity to Zerah, Eshcol, Timnah, and other places familiar to the history of the great Danite hero. On this, however, we must await further investigation; and in the mean time it should not be overlooked that there are reasons for placing the cliff Etam—which seems to have been near Lehi—in the neighborhood of Bethlehem. [ETAM, THE ROCK.]

The spring of En hak-kore is mentioned by Jerome (Epitaph. Pauly, § 14) in such terms as to imply that it was then known, and that it was near Morasthi, the native place of the prophet Micah, which he elsewhere (Onom. a. v.: Prof. ad Med.) mentions as east of Elothepolis (Bid. Biblia).

Lehi is possibly mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiii. 11— the relation of another encounter by the Philistines hardly less disastrous than that of Samson. The word rendered in the A. V., “into a troop,” by alteration of the vowel-points becomes “to Lehi,” which gives a new and certainly an appropriate sense. This reading first appears in Josephus (Ant. vii. 12, § 4), who gives it “a place called Slagona”—the jaw—the word which he employs in the story of Samson (Ant. v. 8, § 9). It is also given in the Complutensian LXX., and among modern interpreters by Bechtart (Hieroz. ii. 2, ch. 13), Kennicott (Disser. 140), J. D. Michaelis (Ethos für Ungeltilted), Ewald (Geschichte, iii. 180, note). G.

Lentile (λέντιλλα), and لينتل: Lentiel, the name of an unknown king to whom his mother addressed the prudential maxims contained in Prov. xxxi. 1–9. The version of this chapter in the LXX. is so obscure that it is difficult to discover what text they could have had before them. In the rendering of Lentiel by יסוי, in Prov. xxxi. 1, none of the traces of the original are discernible, but in v. 4 it is entirely lost. The rabbinical commentators identify Lentiel with Solomon, and tell a strange tale how that when he married the daughter of Pharaoh, on the day of the dedication of the Temple, he assembled musicians of all kinds, and passed the night awake. On the morrow he slept till the fourth hour, with the keys of the Temple beneath his pillow, when his mother entered the room, and finding him in the words of Prov. xxxi. 2–3, Grosch, adopting a fanciful etym olory from the Arabic, makes Lentiel the same as Hezekiah. Hitzig and others regard him as king or chief of an Arab tribe dwelling on the borders of Palestine, and elder brother of Agur, whose name stands at the head of Prov. xxx. [See JAROSL.] According to this view מַעְלֶא (A. V., “the prophecy”) is Massa in Arabia; a region mentioned twice in close connection with Danah, and peopled by the descendants of Ishmael. In the reign of Hezekiah a roving band of Simeonites drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir and settled in their stead (1 Chr. iv. 38–44), and from these exiles of Israelitish origin Hitzig conjectures that Lentiel and Agur were descended, the former having been born in the land of Israel; and that the name Lentiel is an older form of Nenem, the first-born of Simon (Dit. Sprachleben, pp. 310–314). But it is more probable, as Eichhorn and Ewald suggest, that Lentiel is a poetical appellation, selected by the author of these maxims for the guidance of a king, for the purpose of putting in a striking form the lessons which they conveyed. Signifying as it does “to God,” i.e. dedicated or devoted to God, like the similar word Lael, it is in keeping with the whole sense of the passage, which contains the portrait of a virtuous and righteous king, and belongs to the latest period of the proverbial literature of the Hebrews.

W. A. W.

LEND, LENDER. [LOAN.]

LENTILES (λέντιλλα, adhæsin: fæcilis: levis). There cannot be the least doubt that the A. V. is correct in its translation of the Hebrew word which occurs in the four following passages: Gen. xxxiv. 34, 2 Sam. xvii. 28, 2 Sam. xiii. 11, and Ez. iv. 9; from which last we learn that in times of scarcity lentiles were sometimes used in making bread. There are three or four kinds of lentils, all of which are still much esteemed in those countries where they are grown, namely, the South of Europe, Asia, and North Africa: the red lentile is still a favorite article of food in the East; it is a small kind, the seeds of which after being decorticated, are commonly sold in the bazaars of India. The modern Arabic name of this plant is identical with the Hebrew; it is known in Egypt and Arabia, Syria, etc., by the name أَدَسَعِ, as we learn from the testimony of several travellers. When Dr. Robinson was staying at the castle of Al-Kibeh, he partook of lentiles, which he says he "found very palatable, and could well conceive that rendered "troop." In the parallel narrative of 1 Chronicles (xi. 15), the word לְנֵלָל, a "camp," is substituted.

H.

 eléin (Judges, p. 416 b, Eng. transl.). See also Studer, Richter, p. 320. The version of the Société biblique provoqante de Paris (1899) follows this interpretation.

^ Hebrew נלָל, as if נלָל, from the root נל (Gen. T. p. 470). In this sense the word very rarely occurs (see A. V. of Ps. lixii. 10, 39, lxiv. 19). It elsewhere has the sense of "living," and thence of wild animals, which is adopted by the LXX. in this place as remarked above. In ver. 13 it is again rendered "troop." In the parallel narrative of 1 Chronicles (xi. 15), the word נלָל, a "camp," is substituted.

b The Vatican and Alex. MS. read sic ἐνάπα (ἐνάπα), as if the Philistines had come on a hunting expedition.

C See also Catalogue's Arabic Dictionary, "Lentiles, لنتيل"
Lentiles

The lentile, *Ervum lens,* is much used in Arab cuisine, particularly among the Bedouin tribes of the desert, where it is a staple of the diet. It is a small, round bean that is easy to cook and is rich in protein and other nutrients. The lentile is often used to make soups and stews, and it is a common ingredient in many traditional Arab dishes.

The word "lentile" is derived from the Arabic word "أَلْنَسْ" (*al-nas*), which is related to the Hebrew word "לנטילו" (*lentilu*), which means "to make heavy" or "to add weight." This reflects the lentile's starchy nature and its ability to add body to dishes.

The leopard, *Leopardus pardus,* is a large cat species that is widespread in the Americas. It is known for its distinctive black rosette markings on a golden-brown background and its powerful limbs. The leopard is an apex predator and plays a crucial role in maintaining the balance of ecosystems.

The leopard is named *Leopardus pardus* in Latin, which means "leopard." This reflects the animal's distinctive rosette markings, which are a common characteristic of the genus *Leopardus.*

The name "leopard" itself comes from the Latin word "leopardus,* which is derived from the Latin word "lapis," meaning "stone" or "precious stone." This reflects the leopard's association with precious stones and gemstones in ancient cultures.

In modern Arabic, the word for leopard is "نَابِض" (*nabīs*), which is derived from the root "بِيْسَ" (*besa*), meaning "to vomit." This reflects the leopard's association with sickness and disease in some cultures.
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LEPER, LEPROSY

 mentions that leopards have sometimes been killed in "the low and rocky chain of the Bichel mountain," but he calls them onouces (Baruc. Syr. i, p. 152). In another passage (p. 335) he says, "in the wooded part of Mount Faber are wild bears and onouces." Mariti says that the "groottes at Kedron cannot be entered at all seasons without danger, for in the middle of summer it is frequented by tigers, who retire hither to shun the heat." (Mariti, Trans., iii, 28). By "tigers" he undoubtedly means leopards, for the tiger does not occur in Palestine. Under the name Saimar, which means "sported," it is not improbable that another animal, namely, the cheetah (Acinonyx jubata), may be included; which is named by the Mohammedans of Syria, who employ it in hunting the gazelle. These animals are represented on the Egyptian monuments; they were chased as an amusement for the sake of their skins, which were worn by the priests during their ceremonies, or they were hunted as enemies of the farnyard (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, ch. viii. 20).

Sir G. Wilkinson also draws attention to the fact that there is no appearance of the leopard (cheetah) having been employed for the purpose of the chase, on the monuments of Egypt; nor is it now used by any of the African races for hunting. The natives of Africa seem in some way to connect the leopard skin with the idea of royalty, and to lock upon it as part of the insignia of majesty (Wood's Nat. Hist. i. 160). The leopard (Leopardus vivus) belongs to the family Felida, sub-order Digitigrade, order Carniva. The panther is now considered to be only a variety of the same animal.

The leopard is still found in Syria. It has been seen, a fine specimen from near Jerzien. One was killed near Albe in the winter of 1866-67, after it had killed about 60 goats. A young one was taken near Banie in Akkar the same winter. They are not rare in the neighborhood of the castle of el-Sharaf, opposite Deir Minas. They work much mischief by their sandgum attacks on the herds of goats and sheep which pasture in that vicinity. The shepherds invariably keep up a loud shouting to keep them off, when their fleeces are ascending by the mountain side from the Valley of the Litany, at dusk or at dawn, returning from the water. Native authorities profess to find a difference between the and the , the former standing for the leopard, and the latter for the panther. It is more probable that the trivial difference in color, and the arrangement of the spots, are only such mark varieties, not distinct species.

G. E. P.

LEPER, LEPROSY. The Egyptian and Syrian climates, but especially the rainless atmosphere of the former, are very prolific in skin-diseases; including, in an exaggerated form, some which are common in the cooler regions of western Europe. The heat and drought acting for long periods upon the skin, and the exposure of a large surface of the latter to their influence, combine to predispose it to such affections. Even the modified forms known to our western hospitals show a perplexing variety and at times a wide departure from the best-known and recorded types; much more then may we expect departure from any routine of symptoms amidst the fatal fecundity of the Levant in this class of disorders (Good's Study of Medicine, vol. iv. p. 445, &c., 4th ed.). It seems likely that diseases also tend to exhaust their old types, and to reappear under new modifications. [MEDICINE]

This special report, however, exhibiting in wide variety that class of maladies which disfigures the person and makes the presence horrible to the beholder, it is no wonder that notice was early drawn to their more popular symptoms. The Greek imagination dwelt on them as the proper scourge of an offended deity, and perhaps foreign forms of disease may be implied by the expressions used (Eschyl. Chor. 271, &c.), or such as an intercourse with Persia and Egypt would introduce to the Greeks. But, whatever the variety of form, there seems strong general testimony to the cause of all alike, as being to be sought in hard labor in a heated atmosphere, amongst dry or powdery substances, rendering the proper care of the skin difficult or impossible. This would be aggravated by unwholesome or injurious diet, want of personal cleanliness, of clean garments, etc. Thus a of a leopard's skin and a bricklayer's tith, are recorded by the faculty (Butenhan, On Skin Diseases, Phthisis; Good's Study of Med., lib. pp. 450 and 484).

The predominant and characteristic form of leprosy in Scripture is a white variety, covering either the entire body or a large tract of its surface; which has obtained the name of leper Monica. Such were the cases of Moses, Mirian, Naaman, and Gehazi (Ex. iv. 6; Num. xiii. 10; 2 K. v. 1, 27; comp. Lev. xvii. 13). But, remarkably enough, in the Mosaic ritual-diagnosis of the disease (Lev. xiii., xiv.), this kind, when overspreading the whole surface, appears to be regarded as a clean (xiii. 12, 13, 16, 17). The first question which occurs as we read the entire passage is, have we any right to assume one disease as spoken of throughout? or rather— for the point of view in the whole passage is essential reason—that is not made clear of certain symptoms, marking the afflicted person as under a Divine judgment, all that is meant, without raising the question of a plurality of diseases? But beyond this preliminary question, and supposing the symptoms ascertained, there are circumstances which, only weighted, will prevent us expecting the identity of these with modern symptoms in the same class of maladies. The Egyptian bondage, with its studied degradations and privations, and especially the work of the kid under an Egyptian sun, must have had a frightful tendency to generate this class of disorders; hence Manetho (Joseph. Cont. Apis. i. 26) asserts that the Egyptians drove out the Israelites as infected with leprosy—a strange reflex, perhaps, of the Mosaic narrative of the plagues of Egypt, yet probably also containing a truth. The wide recorded total change of food, air, dwelling, and mode of life, caused by the Exod. to this nation of newly-
enunciated slaves, may possibly have had a further tendency to skin-disorders, and now and severe regressive measures may have been required in the desert-moving camp to secure the public health, or to allay the panic of infection. Hence it is possible that many, perhaps most, of this repertory of symptoms may have disappeared with the period of the Exodus, and the snow-white form, which had pre-existed, may alone have ordinarily continued in a later age. But it is observable that, amongst these prevalent symptoms, the scaling, or peeling off of the surface, is nowhere mentioned, nor is there any expression in the Hebrew text which points to exfoliation of the cuticle. a The principalorpitudi features are a rising or swelling, c a scan baldness; and a bright or white d spot of the body. [Balsam.] But especially a white swelling in the skin, with a change of the hair of the part from the natural black to white or yellow (3, 10, 4, 20, 25, 30), or an appearance of a faint going "deeper than the skin," or again, "raw flesh," appearing in the swelling (10, 14, 15), were critical signs of pollution. The mere swelling, or scan, or bright spot, was remedied for a week as doubtful (4, 21, 26, 31), and for a second such period, if it had not yet pronounced (5). If it then spread (7, 22, 27, 35), it was decided as polluting. But if after the second period of quarantine the trace died away and showed no symptom of spreading, it was a mere scan, and he was adjudged clean (6, 23, 34). This tendency to spread seems especially to have been relied on. A spot most innocent in all other respects, if it "spread much abroad," was unclean; whereas, as before remarked, the man so wholly overspread with the evil that it could find no further range, was on the contrary "clean" (12, 13). These two opposite criteria seem to show, that whilst the disease manifested activity, the Mosaic law imputed pollution to and imposed segregation on the sufferer, but that the point at which it might be viewed as having run its course was the signal for his readmission to communion. The question then arises, supposing contagion were dreaded, and the sufferer on that account suspended from human society, would not one who offered the whole area of his body as a means of propagating the pest be more shunned than the partially afflicted? This leads us to regard the disease in its sacred character as being perhaps most vividly impressed upon the mind of the people, that it was of God's peculiar people. His time, his food and raiment, his head and beard, his field and fruit-tree, all were touched by the finger of ceremonial; nor was his bodily condition exempt. Disease itself had its sacred relations arbitrarily imposed. Certainly contagion need not be the basis of our views in tracing these relations. In the contact of a dead body there was not contagion, for the body the moment life was extinct was as much externally unclean as in a state of decay. Many of the unclean of beasts, etc., are as wholesome as the clean. Why then in leprosy must we have recourse to a theory of contagion? To cherish an undefined horror in the mind was perhaps the primary object; such horror, however, always tends to some definite dread, in this case most naturally to the dread of contagion. Thus religious awe would ally itself with and rest upon a lower motive, and there would thus be a motive to weigh with carnal and spiritual natures alike. It would perhaps be nearer the truth to say, that uncleanness was imputed, rather to inspire the dread of contagion, than in order to check contamination as an actual process. Thus this disease was a living plague set in the man by the finger of God whilst it showed its life by activity—he "spread"; but when no more showing signs of life, it lost its character as a curse from him. Such as dreaded contagion—and the immense majority in every country have an exaggerated alarm of it—would feel on the safe side through the Levitical ordinance; if any did not fear, the loathsomeness of the aspect of the malady would prevent them from wishing to infringe the ordinance.

It is not our purpose to enter into the question whether the contagion existed, nor is there perhaps any more vexed question in pathology than how to fix a rule of contagiousness; but whatever was currently believed, unless opposed to morals or humanity, would have been a sufficient basis for the lawgiver on this subject. The panic of infection is often as distressing, or rather far more so, in proportion as it is far more widely diffused, than actual disease. Nor need we exclude popular notions, so far as they do not conflict with higher views of the Mosaic economy. A degree of deference to them is perhaps apparent in the special reference to the "head" and "beard" as the seat of some form of polluting disorder. The sanctity and honor attaching to the head and beard (1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, see also Brædley) made a scan thereon seem a heinous disfigurement, and even baldness, though not unclean, yet was unusual and provoked reproach (2 K. ii. 23), and when a diseased appearance arose "out of a baldness," even without "spreading abroad," it was at once adjudged "unclean." On the whole, though we decline to rest leprous definitions merely on popular notions of uncleanliness, yet a deference to them may be admitted to have been shown, especially at the time when the people were, from previous habit and associations, up to the moment of the actual Exodus, most strongly imbued with the scrupulous purity and refined ceremonial example of the Egyptians on these subjects.

To trace the symptoms, so far as they are recorded, is a simple task, if we keep merely to the text of Levitical, and do not insist on finding new definitions in the broad and simple language of an

---

a The raw flesh of xil. 10 might be discovered in this way, or by the skin merely cracking, an abscess forming, or the like. Or—what is more probable—"raw flesh" means granulations forming on patches where the surface had become excoriated. These transgressions would form into a fungous flesh which might be aptly called "raw flesh." b לְעַנֵּי. c לְעַנֵּי, לְעַנֵּי. Gesenius, s. v., says, "strictly a bald place on the head occasioned by the wuh or itch." d לָעַנֵּי. The root appears to be לָעַנֵּי, which in Chaldee and Arabic means "to be white, or shining." (Gen. s. v.) e The word in the Heb. is לָעַנֵּי, which means a languish or fade away; hence the A. V. hardly conveys the sense adequately by "be somewhat dark." Perhaps the expressions of Hippocrates, who speaks of a leper κατά συμπληρώματα, and of Celsius, who mentions one υἱὸν συμπληρώματος, may have led our translators to endeavor to find equivalents for them in the Hebrew.
early period. It appears that not only the before-
mentioned appearances, but any open sore which
exposed raw flesh was to be judged by its effect on
the hair, by its being in sight lower than the skin,
by its tendency to spread; and that any one of
these symptoms would argue uncleanness. It seems
also that from a boil and from the effects of a burn
a similar disease might be developed. Nor does
modern pathology lead us to doubt that, given a
constitutional tendency, such causes of indubia-
tion may result in various disorders of the skin or
tissues. Cicatrices after burns are known some-
times to assume a peculiar tuberculated appear-
ance thickened and raised above the level of the
surrounding skin — the keloid tumor, which, how-
ever, may also appear independently of a burn.

The language into which the I.LX. has ren-
dered the simple phrases of the Hebrew text shows
 traces of a later school of medicine, and suggests
an acquaintance with the terminology of Hippoc-
rates. This has given a hint, on which, apparently
wishing to reconcile early Biblical notices with the
results of later observation, Dr. Mason Good and
some other professional expositors of leprosy have
drawn out a comparative table of parallel terms.  

It is clear then that the leprosy of Lev. xiii., xiv.
means any severe disease spreading on the surface
of the body in the way described, and so shadowing
of aspect, or so generally suspected of infection,
that public feeling called for separation. No doubt
such diseases as syphilis, elephantiasis, cancer, and
all others which not merely have their seat in the
skin, but which invade and disorganize the underly-
ing and deeper-seated tissues, would have been
classed levitically as "leprosy," had they been so
generally prevalent as to require notice.

It is not astounding that the "leprosy" of mod-
er Syria, and which has a wide range in Spain,
Greece, and Norway, is the Elephantiasis Greco-
rum. The Arabian physicians perhaps caused the
confusion of terms, who, when they translated the

Greek of Hippocrates, rendered his elephantiasis by
leprosy, there being another disease to which they
gave a name derived from the elephant, and which
is now known as Elephantiasis Arabum, — the
"Baradoss leg," Bouchaud Tropie. The Ele-
phantiasis Greco-rum is said to have been brought
home by the crusaders into the various countries of
Western and Northern Europe. Thus an article on
"Leprosy," in the Proceedings of the Royal
Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, Jan., 1830,
vol. iii. p. 164, &c., by Dr. Webster, describes
what is evidently this disease. Thus Michaelis
(Smith's translation, vol. iii. p. 283, Art. cex.)
speaks of what he calls lepra Arubum, the symp-
toms of which are plainly elephantiasic. For a
discussion of the question whether this disease was
known in the early Biblical period, see Medicine.
It certainly was not that distinctive white leprosy
of which we are now speaking, nor do any of the
described symptoms in Lev. xiii. point to elephanti-
sis. "White as snow" (2 K. v. 27) would be
as inapplicable to elephantiasis as to small-pox.
Further, the most striking and fearful results of
this modern so-called "leprosy" are wanting in the
Mosaic description — the transformation of the
features to a leonine expression, and the corrosion
of the joints, so that the fingers drop piecemeal,
from which the Arabic name, مَالِكٌ, dudam,
i. e. mutilation, seems derived. b Yet before we
question the affinity of this disease with Mosaic leprosy, a description of Rayner's
(Tract Theorique, etc., des Maladies de la Peau,
s. v. Elephantiasis) is worth quoting. He men-
tions two characteristic species, the one tubercu-
lated, probably the commoner kind at present (to
judge from the concurrence of modern authorities
in describing this type), the other characterized
by des plaques fawtes, larges, etendues, fétides, ri-
des, insensibles, accompagnées d'une légère desqua-
mation et d'une déformation particulière des pieds et
to fix modern specific meanings on the general terms of
Lev. xiii.: e. g. ἄλογος, leper, orletter; ἀγοραστής, "blow" or "bruise," etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lev. compre</th>
<th>Hipp. compre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) ἄλογος</td>
<td>(1) ἀλόγος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) λεύκης</td>
<td>(2) λεύκης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) μέλας</td>
<td>(3) μέλας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the Hebrew of (1) is in Lev. xiii. 39 predicated of
a subject compounded of the phraseology of (2) and
(3), whereas those (1), (2), and 3 of Hipp. and of Celsius
are respectively distinct and mutually exclusive of one
another. Further, the word ἄλογος appears sub-trans-
lated by "black" or "dark," meaning rather "lun-
etic," "tanned," or "dim," as an old man's eyes, an expiring
and feeble flame, etc. Now it is remarkable that the
Hippocratic terms ἄλογος and λεύκης are found in the LXX.
The phraseology of the latter is also more specific than

will adequately represent the Hebrew, suggesting
shades of meaning. a where this has a wide general
word, or substituting a word denoting one symptom
as ἄλογος, "crust," formed probably by humor cor-
ning, for ἄλογος, "expansion." 

This is clearly and forcibly pointed out in an arti-
tle by Dr. Robert Smith in the Medical Times, April 14, 1830, whose long hospital experience in Jerusalem
entitles his remarks to great weight.

a Thus the expression ἅρπαξ ἄλογος μᾶλλον, "deeper
than the skin of the flesh," is rendered in ver. 8 by τασπίζω
ἀότῳ τῷ διάφραστα; in ver. 10 by ἐκαλοπίνη τῷ διάφραστας,

b So Dr. M. Good, who improves on the ἀμφιφύλια by ἀμ-
φιπόνων, "supposition," wishing to substitute modest scale for
the "dry scale" of the A. V., which letter is no doubt meant
the mark.
elephantiasis itself has also passed current under the name of the "black leprosy." It is possible that the "freckled spot" of the A. V. Lev. xvii. 39. e may correspond with the harmless L. alpholoe, since it is noted as "clean." "The ed. of Paulus Egin. by the Sydenham Society (vol. ii. p. 17 if.) gives the following summary of the opinions of classical medicine on this subject: "Galen is very deficient on the subject of lepra, having nowhere given a complete description of it, though he notices it incidentally in many parts of his works. In one place he calls elephans, leuce, and alphos cutaneous affections. Alphos, he says, is much more superficial than leuce. Lepra is said to participate more of the nature of ulceration. According to Oribasius, lepra affects mostly the deep-seated parts, and psora the superficial. Actius states that lepra is next to elephantia in malignity, and that it is distinguished from psora by spreading deeper and having scales of a circular shape like those of fishes. Leuce holds the same place to that psora does to lepra. In other words, says he, leuce is more deep-seated and affects the color of the hair, while alphos is more superficial, and the hair in general is unchanged. . . . Alexander Aphrodiasienis mentions psora among the contagious diseases, but says that lepra and leuce are not contagious. Chrysostom alludes to the common opinion that psora was among the contagious diseases. . . . Celsus describes alphos, melas, and leuce, very intelligently, connecting them together by the generic term of vitiligo." There is a remarkable concurrence between the Elychian description of the disease which was to produce "lichen"趁着 over the flesh, eroding with fierce voracity the former natural structure, and white hairs shooting up over the part diseased, and some of the Mosaic symptoms; the spreading energy of the evil is dwelt upon both by Moses and by Elychus, as vindicating its character as a scourge of God. But the symptoms of "white hairs" is a curious and exact confirmation of the genuineness of the detail in the Mosaic account, especially as the poet's language would rather imply that the disease spoken of was not then domesticated in Greece, but the strange horror of some other land. Still, nothing very remote from our own experience is implied in the more changed color of the hair: it is common to see horses with galled backs, etc., in which the hair has turned white through the destruction of those follicles which, secrete the coloring matter.

There remains a curious question, before we quit Leviticus, as regards the leprosy of garments and houses. Some have thought garments worn by leprous patients intended. The discharges of the diseased skin absorbed into the apparel would, if infection was possible, probably convey disease; and it is known to be highly dangerous in some cases to allow clothes which have so imbued the discharges of an ulcer to be worn again. . . . And the words of

e On the question how far elephantiasis may probably have been mixed up with the leprosy of the Jews, see Paul. Egin. vol. ii. pp. 68 and 32, 33, ed. Sped. Soc.

f Still it is known that black secretions, sometimes carried to the extent of negro blackness, have been produced under the skin, as in the nata murusum of the African. See Meso-Chirurgical Rec., New Series, vol. v. p. 215, January, 1847.

h Heb. תדמור, Arabo بـ دـمـوـر.
Jude 23 may seem to countenance this, a - hating even the garment spotted by the flesh. But 1st. no mention of infection occurs: 2dly, no connection of the garment with leprosy; human wearers is hinted at; 3dly, this would not help us to account for a leprosy of stone-walls and plaster. Thus Dr. Mead (ut sup.) speaks at any rate plausibly of the leprosy of garments, but becomes unreasonable when he extends his explanation to that of walls. Michaelis thought that wool from sheep which had died of a particular disease might fret into holes, and exhibit an appearance like that described, I. ev. xxi. 32-35 (Michaelis, art. exi. iii. 290-291). But woolen cloth is far from being the only material mentionable; nay, there is even some reason to think that the words rendered in the A. V. "warp" and "woof," are not those distinct parts of the texture, but distinct materials. Linen, however, and leather are distinctly particularized, and the latter not only as regards garments, but "any thing (lit. vessel) made of skin," for instance, bottles. This classing of garments and house-walls with the human epidermis, as leprosy, has moved the nirth of some, and the wonder of others. Yet modern science has established what goes far to vindicate the Mosaic classification as more philosophical than such cavils. It is now known that there are some skin-diseases which originate in an acarus, and others which proceed from a fungus. In these we may probably find the solution of the paradox. The analogy between the insect which frets the human skin and that which frets the garment that covers it, between the fungous growth that lines the crevices of the epidermis and that which creeps within the interstices of masonry, b is close enough for the purposes of a ceremonial law, to which it is essential that there should be an arbitrary element intermingled with provisions manifestly reasonable. Michaelis (ib. art. exi. iii. 290-93) has suggested a nitrous efflorescence on the surface of the stone, produced by salpetre, or rather an acid containing it, and issuing in red spots, and cited the example of a house in Lubeck; he mentions also exfoliation of the stone from other causes; but probably these appearances would not be developed without a greater degree of damp than is common in Palestine and Arabia. It is manifest also that a disease in the human subject caused by an acarus or by a fungus would be certain to cause the propagation of those fungous causes to be transferred from person to person. c Some physicians indeed assert that only such skin diseases are contagious. Hence perhaps arose a further reason for marking, even in their analogies among hideless substances, the strictness with which forms of disease so arising were to be shunned. The sacrificial law attending the purgation of the leper will be more conveniently treated under LEVITANNS.

The lepers of the New Testament do not seem to offer occasion for special remark, save that by the N. T. period the disease, as known in Palestine, probably did not differ materially from the Hippocratic record of it, and that when St. Luke at any rate uses the words λέπρα, λέπρος, he does so with a recognition of their strict medical significance.

From Surenhusius (Mishna, Negaim), we find that some rabbinical commentators enumerate 16, 36, or 72 diverse species of leprosy, but they do so by including all the phases which each passes through, reckoning a red and a green variety in garments, the same in a house, etc., and counting coelitum, reculco, abulatia, and even veles, as so many distinct forms of leprosy.

For further illustrations of this subject see Schilling, de Lepro; Reinhard, Bibliotheca hebraica; Schmidt, Bibliotheca medicinae; Bayer, ut sup., who refers to Roussille-Chamomier, Recherches sur le véritable Génotype de la Lèpre des Hebreaux, and Relation Chirurgicale de l'Armée de l'Orient, Paris, 1804; Cazeneve and Scheidt, Abrégé Pratique des Maladies de la Peau; Dr. Mead, et sup., who refers to Areteus, c Morb. Chron. ii. 13; Praccontorius, de Morbis Contagiosis; Johannes Manandus, Epist. Anatom. ii. 26, and ii. 3, 9, § 1; Avicenna, de Medicina, vi. 28, 94; also Dr. Sim in the North American Chur. Rev. Sept. 1839, p. 876. The ancient authorities are Hippocrates, Prorbevictica, lib. xii. op. fin.; Galen, Explotinti Linguaorum Hippocratic, and de Art. Curat. lib. ii.; Celsius, de Medici. vi. 28, § 19. H. H.

LEUSHEM (λήσθεμ, [strong, fortress, Furst]): Leseon, a variation in the form of the name of Laisit, afterwards DAX, occurring only in Josh. xix. 47 (twice). The Vat. LXX. is very corrupt, having λαῖσχ and λασθαναβ (Rom. λαίσχ und λασθαναβ), (see Mai's ed.); but the Alex., as usual, is in the second case much closer to the Hebrew, λαεσηα and λασθαναβ.

The commentators and lexicographers afford no clue to the reason of this variation in form. G.

* LET is used in a few passages of the A. V. (Ex. v. 4; Num. xxii. 16; mars.; Josh. xiii. 13; Rom. i. 13; 2 Thess. i. 7; Wisd. vii. 22) in the sense of to hinder, being derived from the Anglo-Saxon letten, connected with het, late. "Let" in the sense of "permit" is a word of different origin.

A.

LETUS (Λετος): [Val. omits.] Alex. A不得不: Archias, the same as HARTHUS (1 Esdr. viii. 29). The Alex. MS. has evidently the correct rendering, of which the name as it appears in the Vat. MS. (Roman ed.) is a mere corruption, from the similarity of the uncial A and Λ.

LEUTUSIM (λετουσίμων, [bare ground, sharpened]: Λετοςιμως: Lutusim, Lutosim), the name of the son of the sons of Dedan, son of Jobel, (Gen. xxv. 3 and 1 Chr. i. 32, Vulg.). Fresnèi (Journ. Archit. iii. seric, vol. vi. pp. 217, 218) identifies it with Tawos, one of the ancient and extinct agios, in both of which scales are formed upon the skin. Galen remarks on the tendency of this disease to pass into lepra and scabies.

[The examples of the late Dr. Morius Contagiosi, cap. 9. There is no such title extant to any portion of Areteus' work; see, however, the Schuleham Soc's 'Bibl. of that writer, p. 370.]

a See, however, Lev. xv. 3, 4, which suggests another possible meaning of the words of St. Jude.

b The word λαίσχ (the 'lichen' of botany), the Assyrian word to express the dreaded scurvy in Charchar 271 271 (comp. Exodus 27.28, 253), is also the technical term for a disease skin to leprosy. In the Lægæ, generally sacrificed to Galen (ib. p. 25), two variations are described, the Benon mutus and the leken.
tribes of Arabia, like as he compares Leummim with Uzmeiyim. The names may perhaps be regarded as commencing with the Hebrew article. Nevertheless, the identification in each case seems to be quite untenable. (Respecting these tribes, see LEUUMMIM and ARARAH.) It is noteworthy that the three sons of the Keturite Dedan are named in the plural form, evidently as tribes descended from him. E. S. P.

LEUUMMIM (לועים, Loomim), from לוע (people): Λαμμίρια: [Alex. Λαμμούρι, and in 1 Chr. Λαμμούρι]: Loomin, Lunamin, the name of the third of the descendants of Dedan, son of Jokshan, Gen. xxv. 3 (1 Chr. i. 32, Vulg.), being in the plural form like his brethren, Asharim and Letushim. It evidently refers to a tribe or people sprung from Dedan, and indeed in its present form literally signifies "peoples," "nations;" but it has been observed in art. LETUSHIM, that these names perhaps commence with the Hebrew article. Leummim has been identified with the Αλαμμίρια of Ptolemy (vi. 7, § 24; see Dist. of Geogr.), and by Frenzel (in the Journ. Asiat. litter., vol. vi. p. 217) with an Arab tribe called Outsiyt. a Of the former, the writer knows no historical trace: the latter was one of the very ancient tribes of Arabia of which no genealogy is given by the Arabs, and who appear to have been anti-Arabian, and possibly aboriginal inhabitants of the country. [ARABIA.] E. S. P.

LEVI. 1. (לוי) [perh. crown, wreath, Gen.]: Nouns: Levi: Levi. The name of the third son of Jacob by his wife Leah. This, like most other names in the patriarchal history, was connected with the thoughts and feelings that gathered round the child's birth. As derived from לוי, "to ad-here," it gave utterance to the hope of the mother that the affections of her husband, which had hitherto rested on the favored Rachel, would at last be drawn to her. "This time will my husband be joined unto me, because I have borne him three sons" (Gen. xxix. 24). The new-born child was to be a נועם בדליות (Jos. Ant. i. 19, § 8), a new bliss binding the parents to each other more closely than before. b But one fact is recorded in which he appears prominent. The sons of Jacob have come from Padan-Aram to Canaan with their father, and are with him "at Shalem, a city of Shechem." Their sister Dinah goes out "to see the daughters of the land" (Gen. xxxiv. 1), i.e. as the words probably indicate, and as Josephus distinctly states (Ant. i. 21), to be present at one of their great annual gatherings for some festival of nature-worship, analogous to that which we meet with afterwards among the Midianites (Num. xxv. 2). The license of the time or the absence of her natural guardians exposes her, though yet in earliest youth, to lust and outrage. A stain is left, not only on her, but on the honor of her kindred, which, according to the rough justice of the time, nothing but blood could wash out. The duty of extorting that revenge fell, as in the case of Jael and Tamar (2 Sam. xiii. 22), and in most other states of society in which polygamy has prevailed (comp. for the customs of modern Arabs, J. D. Michaelis, quoted by Kurtz, Hist. of Old Covenant, i. § 82, p. 349), on the brothers rather than the father, just as in the case of Rekabah, it belonged to the brother to conduct the negotiations for the marriage. We are left to conjecture why Heben, as the first-born, was not foremost in the work, but the sin of which he was afterwards guilty, makes it possible that his zeal for his sister's purity was not so sensitive as theirs. The same explanation may perhaps apply to the non-appearance of Judah in the history. Simeon and Levi, as the next in succession to the first-born, take the task upon themselves. Though not named in the Hebrew text of the O. T. till xxxiv. 25, there can be little doubt that they were "the sons of Jacob" who heard from their father the wrong over which he had brooded in silence, and who planned their revenge accordingly. The LXX. version does introduce their names in ver. 14. The history that follows is that of a cowardly and revolting crime. The two brothers exhibit, in its broadest contrasts, that union of the noble and the base, of characteristics above and below the level of the heathen tribes around them, which marks the whole history of Israel. They have learned to hate and scorn the impurity in the midst of which they lived, to regard themselves as a peculiar people, to glory in the sign of the covenant. They have learnt only too well from Jacob and from Laban the lessons of treachery and falsehood. They lie to the men of Shechem as the Druses and the Maronites lie to each other in the prosecution of their blood-feuds. For the offense of one man, they destroy and plunder a whole city. They cover their murderous schemes with fair words and professions of friendship. They make the very token of their religion the instrument of their perfidy and revenge.c Their father, timid and anxious as ever, utters a feeble lamentation (Blunt's Script. Coincidences, Part i. § 8), "Ye have made me to stink among the inhabitants of the land . . . I being few in number, they shall gather themselves against me." With a zeal that, though mixed with baser elements, fire-shadows the zeal of Phineas, they glory in their deed, and make all avowance with the question, "Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?" Of other facts in the life of Levi, there are none in which he takes, as in this, a prominent and distinct part. He shares in the hatred which his brothers bear to Joseph, and joins in the plots against him (Gen. xxxvi. 4). Heben and Judah interfere severally to prevent the consummation of the crime (Gen. xxxvi. 21, 29). Simeon appears, as being made afterwards the subject of a sharper discipline than the others, to have been foremost — as his position among the sons of Leah made it likely that he would be — in this attack on the favored son of Rachel; and it is at least probable that in this, as in their former guilt, Simeon and Levi were brethren. The rivalry of the mothers was perpetuated in the jealousies of their children; and the two who had shown themselves so keenly sensitive when their sister had been wronged, make themselves the instruments and authors of

a The same etymology is recognized, though with a higher significance, in Num. xviii. 2.

b Josephus (Ant. i. c.) characteristically glosses over all that connects the attack with the circumcision of the Shechemites, and represents it as made in a time of heating and rejoicing.
LEVI

complies of the hatred which originated, we are zeal, with the laser-horn sons of the concubines (Gen. xxxvii. 2). Then comes for him, as for the others, the discipline of suffering and danger, the special education by which the brother whom they had wounded led them back to falsehood and natural alienation. The detention of Simeon in Egypt may have been designed at once to be the punishment for the large share which he had taken in the common crime, and to separate the two brothers who had hitherto been such close companions in evil. The discipline does its work. Those who had been relentless to Joseph became self-sacrificing for Benjamin.

After this we trace Levi as joining in the migration of the tribe that owned Jacob as its patriarch. He, with his three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari, went down into Egypt (Gen. xvi. 11). As one of the four eldest sons we may think of him as among the five (Gen. xvi. 2) that were specially presented before Pharaoh.a Then comes the last scene in which his name appears. When his father's death draws near, and the sons are gathered round him, he hears the old crime brought up again to receive its sentence from the lips that are no longer feeble and hesitating. They, no less than the incestuous first-born, had forfeited the privileges of their birthright. “In their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness they maimed oxen” (margin reading of A. V.: comp. LXX. ἐν ξυροτροφίᾳ ἐπεκυότον.) And therefore the sentence on those who had been united for evil was, that they were to be divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel.” How that condemnation was at once fulfilled and turned into a benediction, how the zeal of the patriarch reappeared purified and strengthened in his descendants; how the very name came to have a new significance, will be found elsewhere. [LEVITES.]

The history of Levi has been dealt with here in what seems the only true and natural way of treating it, as a history of an individual person. Of the theory that sees in the sons of Jacob the mythical Eponymic of the tribes that claimed descent from them—which finds in the crimes and chances of their lives the outlines of a national or tribal chronicle— which refuses to recognize that Jacob had twelve sons, and insists that the history of Dinah records an attempt on the part of the Canaanites to enslave and degrade a Hebrew tribe (Ewald, Geschichten, i. 406-496)—of this one may be content to say, as the author says of other hypotheses hardly more extravagant, “die Wissenschaft verschnechtet alle solche Gespenster” (dtbd. i. 406). The book of Genesis tells us of the lives of men and women, not of ethnological phantoms.

A yet wilder conjecture has been hazarded by another German critic. P. Redshaw (Die alttestamentl. Namen, Hamburg, 1846, pp. 24, 25), recognizing the meaning of the name of Levi as given above, finds in it evidence of the existence of a confederacy or council of the priests that had been connected with the several local worship of Canaan, and who, in the time of Samuel and Saul, were gathered together, “round the Central Pantheon in Jerusalem.” Here also we may borrow the terms of our judgment from the language of the writer himself. If there are “aiggeschmackten etymologischen Mühren” (Redshob, p. 82) connected with the name of Levi, they are hardly those we meet with in the narrative of Genesis. E. H. P.

2. (Aeβας: Rec. Text. Aeβ: Levi.) Son of Melchii, one of the near ancestors of Joseph, in fact the great-grandfather of Joseph (Luke iii. 24). This name is omitted in the list given by Africaus.

3. A more remote ancestor of Christ, son of Simeon (Luke iii. 29). Lord A. Hervey considers that the name of Levi reappears in his descendant Labbaeus (General of Christ, p. 132, and sect 30, 46).


LEVIAHAN (λεβιαθαν, λεβιαθαν, τὸ μέγα κυότος, δρακόντας: Leviathan, leviathan, devore) occurs five times in the text of the A. V., and once in the margin of Job iii. 9, where the margin has “serpent.” The name is found in the Bible the word λεβιαθαν which is, with the foregoing exception, always left untranslated in the A. V., is found only in the following passages: Job iii. 8, xlii. 25 (xliii. 5, A. V.); Ps. lixiv. 14, civ. 26; Is. xxvii. 1. In the margin of Job iii. 8, and text of Job xli. 16 the crocodile is most clearly the animal denoted by the Hebrew word. Ps. lixiv. 14 also clearly points to this same animal. The context of Is. xiv. 26, “There go the ships: there is that leviathan, whom thou hast made to play therein,” seems to show that in this passage the name represents some animal of the whole tribe: but it is somewhat uncertain what animal is denoted in Is. xxvii. 1. It would be out of place here to attempt any detailed explanation of the passages quoted above, but the following remarks are offered. The passage in Job iii. 8 is best with difficulties, and it is evident from the two widely different readings of the text and margin that our translators were at a loss. There can however be little doubt that the margin is the correct rendering, and this is supported by the LXX., Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, the Vulgate and the Syriac. There appears to be some reference to those who practiced enchantments. Job is lamenting the day on which he was born, and he says, “Let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready to raise up a leviathan: i. e. c. Let those be hired to implicate evil on my natal day who say they are able by their incantations to render days propitious or unpropitious, yea, let such as are skillful enough to raise up even leviathan (the crocodile) from his watery bed, be summoned to curse that day;” c. F. Mason Good has translated the passage, “O! that night! let it be a barren rock! let no sprites issue into it! let the serpents of the day curse it; the expert among them that can conjure up leviathan!”

The detailed description of leviathan given in Job xli. indisputably belongs to the crocodile, and it is astonishing that it should ever have been understood to apply to a whale or a dolphin; but Levi (Gen. c. Job xli.), following Haunou (Planc. de lrv. Job et Cot. Jomn. Brux., 1723), has labored hard, though unsuccessfully, to prove that the levi-
LEVIATHAN

athan of this passage is some species of whale, probably, he says, the Delphinus oreo, or common grampus. That it can be said to be the pride of any cetacean that his "scales shut up together as with a close seal," is an assertion that no one can accept, since every member of this group has a body almost hald and smooth.

The Egyptian crocodile also is certainly the animal denoted by levithan in Ps. xxviii. 14: "a Thon, O God, didst destroy the princes of Pharaoh, the great crocodile or dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers." (Ex. xxviii. 3) in the Red Sea, and didst give their bodies to be food for the wild beasts of the desert." The levithan of Ps. civ. 21 seems clearly enough to allude to some great cetacean. The "great and wide sea" must surely be the Mediterranean, "the great sea," as it is usually called in Scripture; it would certainly be stretching the point too far to understand the expression to represent any part of the Nile. The crocodile, as is well known, is a fresh-water, not a marine animal; it is very probable therefore that some whale is signified by the term levithan in this passage, and it is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris (Dict. Nat. Hist. Bib.), Mason Good (Book of Job translated), Michaelis (Suppl.), and Rosenmuller (quoting Michaelis in not. ad Bochart Hist. i. 738) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The Orex gladiator (Gray)—the grampus mentioned above by Lee—the Phygelus antiquarius (Gray), or the River-crocodile of the Mediterranean (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fis. her. Synops. Mar. 525, and Lacépède, H. N. des Cétac. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous.

There is some uncertainty about the levithan of Is. xxvii. 1. Rosenmüller (Schol. in l. c.) thinks that the word narkus, here rendered serpent, is to be taken in a wide sense as applicable to any monster; and that the prophet, under the term "levithan that crooked serpent," is speaking of Egypt, typified by the crocodile, the usual emblem of the prince of that kingdom. The Chaldee paraphrase understands the "levithan that piercing serpent" to refer to Pharaoh, and "levithan that crooked serpent" to refer to Sennacherib.

As the term levithan is evidently used in no limited sense, it is not improbable that the "levithan the piercing serpent," or "levithan the crooked serpent," may denote some species of the great rock-snakes (Bohier) which are common in South and West Africa, perhaps the Boa cuboidea, which Schneider (Anph. ii. 266), under the synonym Boa hieroglyphica, appears to identity with the huge serpent represented on the Egyptian monuments. This python, as well as the crocodile, was worstriped by the Egyptians, and may well therefore be understood in this passage to typify the Egyptian power. Perhaps the English word monster may be considered to be as good a translation of liyiththâh as any other that can be found; and though the crocodile seems to be the animal more particularly denoted by the Hebrew term. yet, as has been shown, the whale, and perhaps the rock-snake also, may be signified under this name. [WHALE.] Bochart (iii. 760, ed. Rosenmüller) says that the Talmudists use the word liyiththâh to denote the crocodile; this however is denied by Lewysohn (Zoöl. des Tuls. pp. 155, 593), who says that in the Talmud it always denotes a whale, and never a crocodile. For the Talmudical fables about the levithan, see Lewysohn (Zool. des Tuls.), in passages referred to above, and Buxtorf, Lex. Chal. Tula. s. v. leviththâh. W. H.

LEVIS (Aevus; [Vat. Aevus] Lervis), improperly given as a proper name in 1 Esdr. ix. 14. It is simply a corruption of the Levite in Ezr x. 15.

LE'VITES (אֱלִיִּטֵים) [Aevitae; [Vat. -ei-]: Levites: also לֶבְיִים [Vat. Aevi]; Bllī Levī]). The analogy of the names of the other tribes of Israel would lead us to include under these titles the whole tribe that traced its descent from Levi. The existence of another division, however, within the tribe itself, in the higher office of the priesthood as limited to the "sons of Aaron," gave to the common form, in this instance, a peculiar meaning. Most frequently the Levites of a contest between these animals. Cuvier thinks that a species of dogfish is meant (Aenbates vulgatius), on account of the dorsal spines of which Piley speaks, and which no species of dolphin possesses.

a The modern Arabic name of crocodile is rimâs. The word is derived from the Coptic, enas, ams, whence with the aspirate yâsûm (Herod. ii. 38). Wilkins, however (de L. Copt. p. 101), contends that the word is of Arabic origin. See Joublasson. Opera i. 867, 257, ed. To Water, 1804.
b The "people inhabiting the wilderness," a poetical expression to denote the wild beasts; comp. "the ants are not a strong people," "the conies are but a feeble folk." (Prov. xxx. 25, 26). For other interpretations of this passage see Rosenmüller, Schätz, and Bochart Psalms, p. 318.
c According to Warburton (Ceres. & Gr. 85), the crocodile is never now seen below Minyeh, but it should be stated that Pliny (N. H. viii. 25), not Herodotus, as Mr. Warburton asserts, speaks of crocodiles being attacked by dolphins at Cæ month of the Nile. Seneca (Nat. Questiv. iv. 2) gives an account of a contest between these animals. Cuvier thinks that a species of dogfish is meant (Aenbates vulgatius), on account of the dorsal spines of which Piley speaks, and which no species of dolphin possesses.
d The Heb. word לָכְו occurs about thirty times in the O. T., and it seems clear enough that in every case its use is limited to the serpent tribe. If the LXX. interpretation of לָכְו be taken, the fertile a. 1 not piercing serpent is the rendering: the Heb. לָכְו לָכְו is tortuus, is more applicable to a serpent than to any other animal. The expression, "He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea," refers also to the Egyptian power, and is merely expressive — the dragon being the crocodile, which is in this part of the verse an emblem of Pharaoh, as the serpent is in the former part of the verse.
are distinguished, as such, from the priests (1 K. viii. 4; Ezr. ii. 70; John i. 13, &c.), and this is the meaning which has perpetuated itself. Sometimes the word extends to the whole tribe, the priest included (Num. xxxii. 2; Josh. xxi. 3, 41; Ex. vi. 20; Lev. xxv. 32, &c.). Sometimes again it is added as an epithet of the smaller portion of the tribe and of the "priests the Levites." (Josh. iii. 3; Ez. xlv. 15). The history of the tribe, and of the functions attached to its several orders, is obviously essential to any right apprehension of the history of Israel as a people. They are the representatives of its faith, the ministers of its worship. They play at least as prominent a part in the growth of its institutions, in fostering or in pressing the higher life of the nation, as the clergy of the Christian Church have played in the history of any European kingdom. It will be the object of this article to trace the outlines of that history, marking out the functions which at different periods were assigned to the tribe, and the influence which its members exercised. This is, it is believed, a truer method than that which would attempt to give a more complete picture by combing into one whole the fragmentary notices which are separated from each other by wide intervals of time, or treating them as if they represented the permanent characteristics of the order. In the history of all priestly or quasi-priestly bodies, functions vary with the changes of time and circumstances, and to ignore those changes is a sufficient proof of incompetency for dealing with the history. As a matter of convenience, whatever belongs exclusively to the functions and influence of the priesthood will be found under that head [Priests]; but it is proposed to treat here of all that is common to the priests and Levites, as being together the sacerdotal tribe, the "priests of Israel." The history will fall naturally into four great periods

I. The time of the Exodus.
II. The period of the Judges.
III. That of the Monarchy.
IV. That from the Captivity to the destruction of Jerusalem.

I. The absence of all reference to the consecrated character of the Levites in the book of Genesis is noticeable enough. The prophecy ascribed to Jacob (Gen. xlix. 5-7) was indeed fulfilled with singular precision; but the terms of the prophecy are hardly such as would have been framed by a later writer, after the tribe had gained its subsequent prominence; and unless we frame some hypothesis to account for this omission as deliberate, it takes its place, so far as it goes, among the evidences of the antiquity of that section of Genesis in which these prophecies are found. The only occasion on which the priesthead of the tribe appears — the massacre of the Shechemites — may indeed have contributed to influence the history of his descendants, by fostering in them the same fierce wild zeal against all that threatened the purity of their race; but generally what strikes us is the absence of all recognition of the later character. In the genealogy of Gen. xvi. 11, in like manner, the list does not go lower than the three sons of Levi, and they are given in the order of their birth, not in that which would have corresponded to the official superiority of the Kohathites. There are no signs, again, that the tribe of Levi had any special precedence over the others during the Egyptian bondage. As tracing its descent from Leah, it would take its place among the six chief tribes sprung from the wives of Jacob, and share with them a recognized superiority over those that bore the names of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. Within the tribe itself there are some slight tokens that the Kohathites are gaining the first place. The classification of Ex. vi. 16-25 gives to that section of the tribe four clans or houses, while those of Gershon and Merari have but two each. To it belonged the house of Amram; and "Aaron the Levite" (Ex. iv. 14) is spoken of as one to whom the people will be sure to listen. He marries the daughter of the chief of the tribe of Judah (Ex. vi. 23). The work accomplished by him, and by his yet greater brother, would tend naturally to give prominence to the family and the tribe to which they belonged; but as yet there are no traces of a caste-character, no signs of any intention to establish an hereditary priesthood. Up to this time the Israelites had worshipped the God of their fathers after their fathers' manner. The first-born of the people were the priests of the people. The eldest son of each house inherited the priestly office. His youth made him, in his father's lifetime, the representative of the purity which was connected from the beginning with the thought of worship (Ewald, Afterthwm. p. 273, and comp. Priest). It was apparently with this as their ancestral worship that the Israelites came up out of Egypt. The "young men" of the sons of Israel offer sacrifices (Ex. xxv. 5). They, we may infer, are the priests who remain with the people while Moses ascends the heights of Sinai (xx. 22-24). They represented the truth that the whole people were "a kingdom of priests" (xix. 6). Neither they, nor the "officials and judges" appointed to assist Moses in

---

a Ewald (Gesch. ii. 454) refers the language of Gen. xlix. 7 not to the distribution of the Levites in their 1st cite, but to the time when they had fallen into iniquity, and become, as in Judg. xxi., a wander- ing, intransigent order. But see Kalisch, Genesis, vol. i.
b The later genealogies, it should be noticed, reproduce the same order. This was natural enough; but a genealogy originating in a later age, and reflecting its feelings, would probably have changed the order. (Comp. Ex. vi. 16, Num. iii. 17, 1 Chr. vi. 16.)
c As the names of the lesser houses recur, some of them frequently, it may be well to give them here.
s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amram</th>
<th>Moses</th>
<th>Eliezer</th>
<th>Ithamar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kohath</td>
<td>Izhar</td>
<td>Nesibah</td>
<td>Zizri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Elah</td>
<td>Zizri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merari</td>
<td>Mahlai</td>
<td>Shimri</td>
<td>Musli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"This is expressly stated in the Targ. Pseudo-

on this verse: "And he sent the first-born of the Ch

of Israel, even for that time the worship was by the

first-born, because the Tabernacle was not yet made

nor the priesthood given to Aaron," etc.
administering justice (xviii. 25) are connected in any special manner with the tribe of Levi. The first step towards a change was made in the institution of a hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron, during the first withdrawal of Moses to the solitude of Sinai (xxviii. 1). This, however, was one thing: it was quite another to set apart a whole tribe of Israel as a priestly caste. The directions given for the construction of the tabernacle imply no preeminence of the Levites. The chief workmanship in it is done by the Levites and the tribe of Judah and of Dan (Ex. xxi. 2-6). The next extension of the idea of the priesthood grew out of the terrible crisis of Ex. xxxii. If the Levites had been sharers in the sin of the golden calf, they were at any rate the foremost to rally round their leader when he called on them to help him in stemming the progress of the evil. And then came that terrible consecration of themselves, when every man was against his son and against his brother, and the offering with which they filled their hands (יִבְעָסֹת סֹחֲרָה, Ex. xxxii. 23, comp. Ex. xxvii. 41) was the blood of their nearest of kin. The tribe stood forth, separate and apart, recognizing even in this stern work the spiritual as higher than the natural, and therefore conformed worthily to be the custodians of that sacred life of the people, 'an Israel within an Israel' (Ewalt, Alterheim, p. 279), chosen in its higher representatives to offer incense and burnt-sacrifice before the Lord (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10), not without a share in the glory of the Urin and Thummim that were worn by the prince and chief-tain of the tribe. From this time accordingly they occupied a distinct position. Experience had shown how easily the people might fall back into idolatry how necessary it was that there should be a body of men, an order, numerically large, and when the people were in their promised home, equally diffused throughout the country, as witnesses and guardians of the truth. Without this the individualism of the older worship would have been fruitful in an ever-multiplying idolatry. The tribe of Levi was therefore to take the place of that earlier priesthood of the first-born as representatives of the holiness of the people. This was the case in the consecration of this tribe, the purpose of which was to be drawn to the fact of the substitution by the close numerical correspondence of the consecrated tribe with that of those whom they replaced. The first-born males were numbered, and found to be 22,273; the census of the Levites gave 22,000, reckoning in each case from children of one month upwards a (Num. iii.). The fixed price for the redemption of a victim vowed in sacrifice (comp. Lev. xxvii. 6; Num. xviii. 16) was to be paid for each of the odd number by which the first-born were in excess of the Levites (Num. iii. 47). In this way the latter obtained a sacrificial as well as a priestly character. b They for the first-born of men, and their cattle for the firstlings of beasts, fulfilled the idea that had been asserted at the time of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Ex. xiii. 12, 13). The commencement of the march from Sinai gave a prominence to their new character. As the Tabernacle was the sign of the presence among the people of their unseen King so the Levites were, among the other tribes of Israel, as the royal guard that waited exclusively on Him. The wardlike title of 'host' is specially applied to them (comp. use of צְבָאֹת, in Num. iv. 3, 39; and of צְבָאֹת, in 1 Chr. ix. 19). As such they were not included in the number of the armies of Israel (Num. i. 47, ii. 33, xxvi. 62), but reckoned separately by themselves. When the people were at rest they encamped as guardians round the sacred tent; no one else might come near it under pain of death (Num. i. 51, xviii. 22). They were to occupy a middle position in that ascending scale of consecration, which, starting from the idea of the whole nation as a priestly people, reached its culminating point in the high-priest who, alone of all the people, might enter 'within the veil.' The Levites might come nearer than the other tribes: but they might not sacrifice, nor burn incense, nor see the 'holy things' of the sanctuary till they were covered (Num. iv. 13). When on the march, no host but theirs might strike the tent at the commencement of the day's journey, or carry the parts of its structure during it, or pitch the tent once again when they halted (Num. i. 51). It was obviously essential for such a work that there should be a fixed assignment of duties; and now accordingly we meet with the first outlines of the organization which afterwards became permanent. The division of the tribe into the three sections that traced their descent from the sons of Levi, formed the groundwork of it. The work which they all had to do required a man's full strength, and therefore, though twenty was the starting-point for military service (Num. i.) they were not to enter on their active service till they were thirty (Num. iv. 23, 30, 35). At fifty they were to be free from all duties but those of superintendence (Num. viii. 25, 26). The result of this limitation gave to the Kohathites 2,750 on active service out of 8,900: to the sons of Gershon 2,630 out of 7,560; to those of Merari 3,290 out of 6,290 (Num. iv.). Of these the Kohathites, as nearest of kin to the priests, held from the first the highest offices. They were to bear all the vessels of the sanctuary, the ark itself included d (Num. iii. 31, iv. 15; Deut. xxxi. 25), after the priests had covered them with the dark-blue cloth which was to hide them from all profane gaze: and thus they became also the guar- 

a The separate numbers in Num. iii. (Gershom, 7,500; Kohath, 8,900; Merari, 6,290) give a total of 23,380. The received solution of the discrepancy is that 300 were the first-born of the Levites, who as such were already consecrated, and therefore could not take the place of others. Talmudic traditions (Genar. R. wisdom, 2. Sankdruin, quoted by Patrick) add that the question, which of the Israelites should be redeemed by a Levite, or which should pay the five shekels, was settled by lot. The number of the first-born appears disproportionately small, as compared with the population. It must be remembered, however, that the conditions to be fulfilled were that they should be at (1) the first child of the father, (2) the first child of the mother, (3) males. (Comp. on this question, and on that of the difference of numbers, Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, iii. 20.)

b Conformity in the same thought in the Lev. 26. 33.

c The mention of twenty-five in Num. viii. 24, as the age of entrance, must be understood either of a probationary period during which they were trained for their offices, or of the length of the time of the tabernacle. The ages of the tabernacle.

d On more solemn occasions the priests themselves appear as the bearers of the ark (Jebus. iii. 3, 6, vi. 4; 1 K. viii. 6).
dians of all the sacred treasures which the people had so freely offered. The Gershonites, in their turn, had to carry the tent-hangings and curtains (Num. iv. 22-26). The heavier burden of the boards, bars, and pillars of the Tabernacle fell on the sons of Merari. The two latter companies were allowed, however, to use the oxen and the wagons which were furnished for the carrying of the congregation, in consideration of its heavier work, having two-thirds of the number (Num. vii. 1-9). The more sacred vessels of the Kohathites were to be borne by them on their own shoulders (Num. vii. 9). The Kohathites in this arrangement were placed under the command of Eleazar, Gershon and Merari under Ithamar (Num. iv. 28, 33). Before the march began, the whole tribe was once again solemnly set apart. The rites (some of them at least) were such as the people might have witnessed in Egypt, and all would understand their meaning. Their clothes were to be washed. They themselves, as if they were, prior to their separation, polluted and unclea, like the leper, or those that had touched the dead, were to be sprinkled with water of purifying (Num. vii. 7, comp. with xix. 13; Lev. xiv. 8, 9), and then to cleave their flesh. They were then to lay their hands upon the heads of the consecrated tribe and offer them up as their representatives (Num. vii. 10). Aaron, as high-priest, was then to present them as a wave-offering (turning them, i.e. this way and that; while they bowed themselves to the four points of the compass), comp. Abaranadl on Num. vii. 11, and Kuritz, iii. 208, in token that all their powers of mind and body were henceforth to be devoted to that service. They, in their turn, were to lay their hands on the two bullocks which were to be slain as a sin-offering and burnt-offering for an atonement (יִנְטָא, Num. viii. 12). Then they entered on their work; from one point of view given by the people to Jehovah, from another given by Jehovah to Aaron and his sons (Num. iii. 9, viii. 19, xviii. 6). Their very name is turned into an mon, that they will elevate to the service of the Lord (comp. the play on וְיָנֶס in Num. xviii. 2, 4).

The new institution was, however, to receive a severe shock from those who were most interested in it. The section of the Levites whose position brought them into contact with the tribe of Reuben's required with it to receive the oil patriarchal system of a household priesthood. The leader of that revolt may have been impelled by a desire to gain the same height as that which Aaron had attained; but the ostensible pretext, that the "whole congregation were holy" (Num. xvi. 3), was one which would have cut away all the distinctive privileges of the tribe of which he was a member. When their self-willed ambition had been punished, when all danger of the sons of Levi "taking upon them" was for the time checked, it was time also to provide more definitely for them, and so to give them more reason to be satisfied with what they actually had; and this involved a permanent organization for the future, as well as for the present. If they were to have, like other tribes, a distinct territory assigned to them, their influence over the people at large would be diminished, and they themselves would be likely to forget, in labors common to them with others, their own peculiar calling. Jehovah therefore was to be their inheritance (Num. xviii. 29; Deut. x. 9, xviii. 2). They were to have no territorial possessions. In place of them they were to receive from the others the tithes of the produce of the land, from which they, in their turn, offered a tithe to the priests, as a recognition of their higher consecration (Num. xviii. 21, 24, 26; Neh. x. 37). As if to provide for the contingency of failing crops or the like, and the consequent inadequacy of the tithes thus assigned to them, the Levite, not less than the widow and the stranger, was to share the special kindness of the people (Deut. xii. 19, xiv. 27, 29). When the wanderings of the people should be over and the tabernacle have a settled place, great part of the labor that had fallen on them would come to an end, and they too would need a fixed abode. Concentration round the Tabernacle would lead to evils nearly as great, though of a different kind, as an assignment of special territory. Their ministerial character might thus be intensified, but their preserving influence as witnesses and teachers would be sacrificed to it. Distinction and diffusion were both to be secured by the assignment to the whole tribe (the priests included) of forty-eight cities, with an outlying "suburb" (יִנְטָא, Num. xxxv. 2), of meadow-land for the pasturage of their flocks and herds. The reverence of the people for them was to be heightened by the selection of six of these cities of refuge, in which the Levites were to present themselves as the protectors of the fugitives who, though they had not incurred the guilt, were yet liable to the punishment of murder. How rapidly the feeling of reverence gained strength, we may judge from the fact that within the space of thirty years it was extended to the men and women of the conquered Midianites (Num. xxxi. 27, 46). The same victory led to the dedication of gold and silver vessels of great value, and thus increased the importance of the tribe as guardians of the national treasures (Num. xxxi. 50-54).

The book of Deuteronomy is interesting as indicating more clearly than had been done before

a Comp. the analogous practice differing, however, in being constantly repeated of the Egyptian priest (Herod. II. 37; comp. Strabo, De Leg. Heb. ii. 5. c. 5). b Solomon, as this dedication is, it fell short of the consecration of the priests, and was expressed by a different word. פְּעַר. The Levites were purified, not consecrated (comp. Gesen. s. v. יָנֶס and יָנֶס). c 15. c. "Levi," in Herzog's Real-Encycl. d In the encampment in the wilderness, the sons of Aaron occupied the foremost place of honor on the west. The Kohathites were at their right, on the south, the Gershonites to their west, the sons of Merari on the north of the tabernacle. On the south were Sebbeun, Simon, and Gad (Num. ii. and iii.). e Heliodorus (Strabo, xvii. 1), Thales and Memnon in Egypt, and Benaues in Hindustan, have been referred to as parallels. The segregation of priests round a great national sanctuary, so as to make it as it were the centre of a collegiate life, was however different in its object and results from that of the polity of Israel. (Comp. Ewald, i. 402.) f The impulse of giving a sacred character to such an asylum is sufficient to account for the assignment of the cities of refuge to the Levites. Philo, however, with his characteristic love of an inner meaning, sees in it the truth that the Levites themselves, were led to flee to the cities of refuge from the world of sense, who had found their place of refuge in God.


The sole occupiers of the cities thus allotted, or whether — as the rule for the redemption of their houses in Lev. xxv. 32 might seem to indicate — others were allowed to reside when they had been provided for, must remain uncertain. The principle of a widely diffused influence was maintained by allotting, as a rule, four cities from the district of each tribe; but it is interesting to notice how, in the details of the distribution, the divisions of the Levites in the order of their precedence coincided with the relative importance of the tribes with which they were connected. The following table will help the reader to form a judgment on this point, and to trace the influence of the tribe in the subsequent events of Jewish history.3

I. KOhATHTES:

A. Priests . . . Judah and Simeon . . . 9
Benjamin . . . . . . . . . . 4
Ephraim . . . . . . . . . . 4
B. Not Priests . . . Dan . . . . . . . . . . . 4
Half Manasseh (West) . . 2
Half Manasseh (East) . . . 2
Issachar . . . . . . . . . . 4
II. GERSHOMITES . . . . A-her . . . . . . . . . . 3
Naphtali . . . . . . . . . . 2
Zebulun . . . . . . . . . . 4
III. MER期盼 . . . . Reuben . . . . . . . . 4
Judah . . . . . . . . . . 4

The scanty memorials that are left us in the book of Judges fail to show how far, for any length of time, the reality answered to the idea. The ravages of invasion, and the pressure of an alien rule, marred the working of the organization which seemed so perfect. Levitical cities, such as Aljabin (Josh. xxiv. 24; Judg. i. 35) and Gezer (Josh. xxxi. 21; 1 Chr. vi. 67), fall into the hands of their enemies. Sometimes, as in the case of Nob, others apparently took their place. The wandering, unsettled habits of the Levites who are mentioned in the later chapters of Judges, are probably to be traced to this loss of a fixed abode, and the consequent necessity of taking refuge in other cities, even though their tribe as such had no portion in them. The tendency of the people to fall into the idolatry of the neighboring nations, showed either that the Levites failed to bear their witness to the truth or had no power to enforce it. Even in the lifetime of Phinehas, when the high-priest was still consulted as an oracle, the reverence which the people felt for the tribe of Levi becomes the occasion of a rival worship (Judg. xviii.). The old household priesthood revives, and there is the risk of the national worship breaking up into individualism. Meah first consecrates one of his own sons, and then tempts a helpless Levite to dwell with him as "a father and a priest " for little more

David in later wars, who were assigned to the service of the Tabernacle, replacing possibly the Gibonites who had been slain by Saul (2 Sam. xxii. 1).  
For the local position of the forty-eight Levitical cities, as distributed among the different tribes, see especially Pinto iv. No. 9 (p. 27) in Clark's "Bible Atlas of Mapa and Plans" (Lon. 1908). For convenience of reference small capitals are employed to distinguish the Priests' cities, the letter R to distinguish the cities of refuge, and an asterisk to denote those which are not identified.

Twenty out of the forty-eight belong to this third class.

Compare, on the extent of this relapse into an earlier system, Kalsich, On transes, xlix. 7.

a This phraseology, characteristic of Deuteronomy and Joshua, appears to indicate that the functions spoken of belonged to them as the chief members of the sacred tribe, as a clergy rather than as priests in the narrower sense of the word.

b To this there is one remarkable exception. Deut. viii. 6 provides for a permanent dedication as the result of personal zeal going beyond the fixed period of service that came in rotation, and entailed accordingly to its reward.

c Comp. as indicating their presence and functions at a later date, 1 Chr. xxv. 5, 6.

d The Nethinim (Deo datti) of 1 Chr. ix. 2, Ezr. 4:43 were probably sprung from captives taken by

3 Other functions, over and above their ministrations in the Tabernacle, which were to be allotted to the tribe of Levi. Through the whole land they were to take the place of the old household priests (subject, of course, to the special rights of the Aaronic priesthood), sharing in all festivals and rejoicings (Deut. xii. 19, xiv. 26, 27, xxvi. 11). Every third year they were to have an additional share in the produce of the land (Deut. xiv. 28, xxvi. 12). The people were charged never to forsake them. To the priests the Levites 4 a was to belong; the office of preserving, transcribing, and interpreting the Law (Deut. xvi. 9—12; xxvi. 25).

They were solemnly to read it every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. xxxi. 9—13). They were to pronounce the curses from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 14).

Such, if one may so speak, was the ideal of the religious organization which was present to the mind of the lawgiver. Details were left to be developed as the altered circumstances of the people might require.4 The great principle was, that the warrior-caste who had guarded the tent of the captain of the hosts of Israel, should be throughout the land as witnesses that the people still owed allegiance to Him. It deserves notice that, as yet, with the exception of the few passages that refer to the priests, no traces appear of their character as a learned caste, and of the work which afterwards belonged to them as hymn-writers and musicians. The hymns of this period were probably occasional, not recurring (comp. Ex. xv.; Num. xii. 17; Deut. xxxii.). Women bore a large share in singing them (Ex. xv. 20; Ps. lxxviii. 25). It is not unlikely that the wives and daughters of the Levites, who must have been with them in all their encampments, as afterwards in their cities, took the foremost part among the damsels playing with their timbrels,6 or among the wise-hearted, who wove hangings for the decoration of the Tabernacle. There are at any rate signs of their presence there, in the mention of the "women that assembled" at its door (Ex. xxxvii. 8, and comp. Ewald, Altertum, p. 297).  

II. The successor of Moses, though belonging to another tribe, did faithfully all that could be done to convert this idea into a reality. The submission of the Gibeonites, after they had obtained a promise that their lives should be spared, enabled him to relieve the tribe-divisions of Gershon and Merari of the most burdensome of their duties. The conquered Hivites became 7 hewers of wood and drawers of water 7 for the house of Jehovah and for the congregation (Josh. ix. 27).9 As soon as the conquerors had advanced far enough to proceed to a partition of the country, the forty-eight cities were assigned to them. Whether they were to be the
than his food and raiment. The Levite, though probably the grandson of Moses himself, repeats the sin of Korah. [JOHANNES.] First in the house of Mieah, and then for the emigrants of Dan, he exercises the office of a priest with an anaphor, and a turban and a golden image. "With this exception the whole tribe appears to have fallen into a condition analogous to that of the clergy in the darkest period and in the most outlying districts of the Medieval Church, going through a ritual routine, but exercising no influence for good, at once corrupted and corrupting. The shameless license of the sons of Eli may be looked upon as the result of a long period of decay, affecting the whole order. When the priests were such as Hophni and Phinehas, we may fairly assume that the Levites were not doing much to sustain the moral life of the people.

The work of Samuel was the starting point of a better time. Himself a Levite, and, though not a priest, belonging to that section of the Levites which was nearest to the priesthood (1 Chr. vi. 28), adopted, as it were, by a special dedication, into the priestly line and trained for its office. (1 Sam. ii. 18.) He appears as infusing a fresh life, the author of a new organization. There is no reason to think, indeed, that the companies or schools of the sons of the prophets which appear in his time (1 Sam. x. 5), and are traditionally said to have been founded by him, consisted exclusively of Levites: but there are many signs that the members of that tribe formed a large element in the new order, and received new strength from it. It exhibited, indeed, the ideal of the Levite life as one of praise, devotion, teaching, standing in the same relation to the priests and Levites generally as the monastic institutions of the fifth century, or the mendicant orders of the thirteenth, did to the secular clergy of Western Europe. The fact that the Levites were thus brought under the influence of a system which addressed itself to the mind and heart in a greater degree than the sacrificial functions of the priesthood, may possibly have led them to apprehend the higher truths as to the nature of worship which begin to be asserted from this period, and which are nowhere prechained more clearly than in the great hymn that bears the name of Asaph (Ps. I. 7-15). The man who raises the name of prophet to a new significance is himself a Levite (1 Sam. ix. 9). It is among them that we find the first signs of that prophetic spirit which eventually pervades all Levites (1 Sam. x. 5). The order in which the Temple services were arranged is ascribed to two of the prophets, Nathan and Gad (2 Chr. xxix. 25), who must have grown up under Samuel’s superintendence, and in part to Samuel himself (1 Chr. ix. 22). Asaph and Heman, the Psalmists, bear the same title as Samuel the Seer (1 Chr. xxv. 3; 2 Chr. xxix. 30). The very term “prophesying” is applied not only to sudden bursts of song, but to the organized psalmody of the Temple (1 Chr. xxv. 2, 3). Even of those who bore the name of a prophet in a higher sense, a large number are traceable of this tribe.

III. The capture of the Ark by the Philistines did not entirely interrupt the worship of the Israelites, and the ministrations of the Levites went on, first at Shiloh (1 Sam. xiv. 3), then for a time at Nob (1 Sam. xxii. 11), afterwards at Gibea (1 K. iii. 3; 1 Chr. xvi. 39). The history of the return of the ark to Beth-shemesh after its capture by the Philistines, and its subsequent removal to Kirjath-jearim, points apparently to some strange complications, rising out of the anomalies of this period, and affecting, in some measure, the position of the tribe of Levi. Beth-shemesh was, by the original assignment of the conquered country, one of the cities of the priests (Josh. xxi. 15). They, however, do not appear in the narrative, unless we assume, against all probability, that the men of Beth-shemesh who were guilty of the act of profanation were themselves of the priestly order. Levites indeed are mentioned as doing their appointed work (1 Sam. vi. 15), but the sacrifices and burnt-offerings are offered by the men of the city, as though the special function of the priestly order had been usurped by others: and on this supposition it is easier to understand how those who had set aside the Law of Moses by one offense should defy it also by another. The singular reading of the LXX., in 1 Sam. xvi. 19 (και αυτοι γενναται εις τον άνθρωπον Βασιλευς οτι εδωκεν κυριος Κωρμον), indicates, if we assume that it rests upon some corresponding Hebrew text, a struggle between two opposed parties, one guilty of the profanation, the other — possibly the Levites who had been before mentioned — zealous in their renouncemances against it. Then comes, either as the result of this collision, or by direct supernatural influence, the great slaughter of the Beth-shemites, and they shrink from retaining the ark any longer among them. The great Eben (stone) becomes, by a slight paronomastic change in its form, the “great Abiel” (demonetation), and the name remains as a memorial of the sin and of its punishment. [BETHSHEM+EH.] We are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which led them, after this, to send the ark of Jehovah, not to Hebron or some other priestly city, but to Kirjath-jearim, round which, so far as we know, there gathered legitimately no sacred associations. It has been commonly assumed indeed that Abinadab, under whose guardianship it remained for twenty years, must necessarily have been of the tribe of Levi. [ABINADAB.] Of this, however, there is not the slightest direct evidence, and which is certain is that there is the language of David in 1 Chr. xv. 2, “Nehemiah, tempestuous, and fury of God, hath taken the ark, the Levites, for them hath Jehovah chosen,” which would lose half its force if it were not meant as a protest against a recent innovation, and the ground of a return to the more ancient order. So far as one can see one’s way through these perplexities of a dark period, the most probable explanation — already suggested under KIRJATH-JEARIM — seems to be the following. The old names of Baal-ash (Josh. xvi. 9) and Kirjath-lain (Josh. xv. 69) suggest there had been of old some special sanctity attached to the place as the centre of a Canaanite local worship. The fact that the ark was taken to the house of Abinadab in the bill (1 Sam. vii. 1; the Gibeah of 2 Sam. vi. 3, connects itself with that old Canaanite reverence for high places, which through the whole history of the
Israelites, continued to have such strong attractions for them. These may have seemed to the panic-stricken inhabitants of that district, mingling old things and new, the worship of Jehovah with the lingering superstitions of the con quer ed people, sufficient grounds to determine their choice of a locality. The conversion (the word used is the special sacerdotal term) of Eleazar as the guardian of the ark is, on this hypothesis, analogous in its way to the other irregular assumptions which characterize this period, though here the offense was less flagrant, and did not involve apparently the performance of any sacrificial acts. While, however, this aspect of the religious condition of the people brings us to the question of the priests, we should here note that as having lost the position they had previously occupied, there were other influences at work tending to reestablish them.

The rule of Samuel and his sons, and the prophetic character now connected with the tribe, tended to give them the position of a ruling caste. In the strong desire of the people for a king, we may perhaps trace a protest against the assumption by the Levites of a higher position than that originally assigned. The reign of Saul, in its later period, was at any rate the assertion of a self-willed power against the priestly order. The assumption of the sacrificial office, the massacre of the priests at Nob, the slaughter of the Gibeonites who were attached to their service, were parts of the same policy, and the narrative of the condemnation of Saul for the two former sins, no less than of the expiation required for the latter (2 Sam. xxv.), shows by what strong measures the truth, of which that policy was a subversion, had to be impressed on the minds of the Israelites. The reign of David, however, brought the change from persecution to honor. The Levites were ready to welcome a king who, though not of their tribe, had been brought up under their training, was skilled in their arts, prepared to share even in some of their ministrations, and to array himself in their apparel (2 Sam. vi. 14), and 4,680 of their number with 3,700 priests waited upon David at Hebron—itself, it should be remembered, one of the priestly cities—to tender their allegiance (1 Chr. xii. 26). When his kingdom was established, there came a fuller organization of the whole tribe. Its position in relation to the priesthood was once again definitely recognized. When the ark was carried up to its new resting-place in Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was publicly acknowledged (1 Chr. xvi. 2). When the sin of Uzzah stopped the procession, it was placed for a time under the care of Obed-Edom of Gath—probably Gath-rimmon—as one of the chief of the Kohathites (1 Chr. xiii. 13; Josh. xxii. 24; 1 Chr. xiv. 18).

In the procession which attended the ultimate conveyance of the ark to its new resting-place, the Levites were conspicuous, wearing their linen ephod, and appearing in their new character as min-

a There are 24 courses of the priests, 24,000 Levites in the general business of the Temple (1 Chr. xxiii. 4). The number of singers is 295 = 12 x 24 (1 Chr. xxv. 1).

b There is, however, a curious Jewish tradition that the schoolmasters of Israel were of the tribe of Simeon (Solum Jarchi on Ge. xvi. 7, in Godseya's Mishn. and Talm.).

c In 1 Chr. ii. 6 the four names of 1 K. iv. 31 appear belonging to the tribe of Judah, and in the second generation after Jacob. On the other hand, the

strels (1 Chr. xxv. 27, 28). In the worship of the Tabernacle under David, as afterwards in that of the Temple, we may trace a development of the simpler arrangements of the wilderness and of Shiloh. The Levites were the gatekeepers, vergers, sacristans, choirsisters of the central sanctuary of the nation. They were, in the list of Levites, 24:32, to which we may refer as almost the locus classicus on this subject, "to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts, and the chambers, and the purifying of all holy things." This included the duty of providing for the shew-bread, and the fine flour for meat-offering, and for the unleavened bread. They were to study the mystery of God, to praise Jehovah, and likewise at events. They were lastly to "offer"—i. e., to assist the priests in offering—all burnt-sacrifices to Jehovah in the sabbaths and on the set feasts. They lived for the greater part of the year in their own cities, and came up at fixed periods to take their turn of work (1 Chr. xxv., xxvi.). How long it lasted we have no sufficient data for determining. The predominance of the Levites as a military element in the nation might seem to indicate monthly periods, and the festivals of the new moon would naturally suggest such an arrangement. The analogous order in the civil and military administration (1 Chr. xxvii. 1) would tend to the same conclusion. It appears, indeed, that there was a change of some kind every week (1 Chr. ix. 25; 2 Chr. xiii. 4, 8); but this is of course compatible with a system of rotation, which would give to each a longer period of residence, or with the permanent residence of the leader of each division within the precincts of the sanctuary. Whatever may have been the system, we must bear in mind that the duties now imposed upon the Levites were such as to require almost continuous practice. They would need, when their turn came, to be able to bear their parts in the great choral hymns of the Temple, and to take each his appointed share in the complex structure of a sacrificial liturgy, and for this a special study would be required. The education which the Levites received for their peculiar duties, no less than their connection, more or less intimate, with the schools of the prophets (see above), would tend to make them, so far as there was any obligation at all, the teachers of others; the transgressors and interpreters of the Law, the chroniclers of the times in which they lived. We have some striking instances of their appearance in this new character. One of them, Ethan the Ezrahite, takes his place among the old Hebrew sages who were worthy to be compared with Solomon, and (Ps. xxxix. title) his name appears as the writer of the 8th Psalm (1 K. iv. 31; 1 Chr. xv. 17). One of the first to bear the title of "Scribe" is a Levite (1 Chr. xxiv. 6), and this is mentioned as one of their special offices under Josiah (2 Chr. xxxiv. 19). They are described as names of Henan and Ethan are prominent among the Levites under Solomon (infra); and two psalms, one of which L. K.essen manifestly to a later date, are ascribed to them, with this title of Ezrahite attached (Ps. lxxvi. and lxxxix). The difficulty arises probably out of some confusion of the later and the earlier names. Ewald's conjecture, that conspicuous ministrers of other tribes were received into the choir of the Temple, and then reckoned as Levites, would give a new aspect to the influence of the tribe. (Comp Port. Eich. i. 213; De Wette, Psalm., Enrof § III.)
"officers and judges" under David (1 Chr. xxvi. 21), and as such are employed "in all the business of Jehovah, and in the service of the king." They are the agents of Jehovah and Hezekiah in their work of reformation, and are sent forth to proclaim and enforce the law (2 Chr. xvii. 6, xxx. 22). Under Josiah the function has passed into a title, and they are "the Levites that taught all Israel" (2 Chr. xxx. 3). The two books of Chronicles bear unmistakable marks of having been written by men whose interests were all gathered round the services of the Temple, and who were familiar with its records. The materials from which they compiled their narratives, and to which they refer as the works of seers and prophets, were written by men who were probably Levites themselves, or, if not, were associated with them.

The former subdivisions of the tribe were recognized in the assignment of the new duties, and the Kohathites retained their old preeminence. They have four "princes" (1 Chr. xv. 5-10), while Merari and Gershon have but one each. They supplied, from the families of the Izharites and Hebronites, the "officers and judges" (2 Chr. xxiv. 39). To them belonged the sons of Korah, with Heman at their head (1 Chr. ix. 19), playing upon psalteries and harps. They were "over the work of the service, keepers of the gates of the tabernacle" (l. c.). It was their work to prepare the sheen-break every Sabbath (1 Chr. ix. 32). The Gershonites were represented in like manner in the Temple-choir by the sons of Asaph (1 Chr. vi. 39, xxv. 17); Merari by the sons of Ethan or Jeduthun (1 Chr. vi. 44, xvi. 42, xxv. 17). Now that the heavier work of conveying the tabernacle and its equipments from place to place was no longer required of them, and that psalmody had become the most prominent of their duties, they were to enter on their work at the earlier age of twenty (1 Chr. xxiii. 24-27). 8

As in the old days of the Exodus, so in the organization under David, the Levites were not included in the general census of the people (1 Chr. xxii. 6), and formed accordingly no portion of its military strength. A separate census, made apparently before the change of age just mentioned (1 Chr. xxiii. 4), gives—

24,000 over the work of the Temple.
6,000 officers and judges.
4,000 porters, i.e. gate-keepers, and, as such, bearing arms (1 Chr. ix. 19; 2 Chr. xxxii. 2).
4,000 praising Jehovah with instruments.

The latter number, however, must have included the full chores of the Temple. The more skilled musicians among the sons of Heman, Asaph, and Jeduthun are numbered at 288, in 24 sections of 12 each. Here again the Kohathites are prominent, having 14 out of the 24 sections; while Gershon has 4 and Merari 8 (1 Chr. xxv. 2-4). To these 288 were assigned apparently a more permanent residence in the Temple (1 Chr. ix. 34), and in the villages of the Netophathites near Bethlehem (1 Chr. ix. 16), mentioned long afterwards as inhabited by the "sons of the singers" (Neh. xii. 28).

The result of the ten tribes, and the policy pur- 8 The change is indicated in what are described as the last words of David. The king feels, in his old age, that a time of rest has come for himself and for the people, and that the Levites have a right to share

suad by Jeroboam, led to a great charge in the position of the Levites. They were the witnesses of an appointed order and of a central worship. He wished to make the priests the creatures and instruments of the king, and to establish a provincial and divided worship. The natural result was, that they left the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel, and gathered round the metropolis of Judah (2 Chr. xi. 13, 14). Their influence over the people at large was thus diminished, and the design of the Mosaic polity so far frustrated; but their power as a religious order was probably increased by this concentration within narrower limits. In the kingdom of Judah they were, from this time forward, a powerful body, politically as well as ecclesiastically. They brought with them the prophetic element of influence, in the wider as well as in the higher meaning of the word. We accordingly find them prominent in the war of Abijah against Jeroboam (2 Chr. xiii. 10-12). They are, as before noticed, sent out by Jehovah to instruct and judge the people (2 Chr. xix. 8-10). Prophets of their order encourage the king in his war against Joab and Amnon, and go before his army with their loud Hallelujahs (2 Chr. xx. 21), and join afterwards in the triumph of his return. The apostasy that followed on the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah exposed them for a time to a dominance of a hostile system; but the services of the Temple appear to have gone on, and the Levites were again conspicuous in the counter-revolution effected by Jehoiada (2 Chr. xxiii.), and in restoring the Temple to its former state under Josiah (2 Chr. xxiv. 5). They shared in the disasters of the reign of Amon (2 Chr. xxiv. 3), and in the prosperity of Uzziah, and were ready, we may believe, to support the priests, who, as representing their order, opposed the sacrilegious usurpation of the latter king (2 Chr. xxvi. 17). The closing of the Temple under Ahaz involved the cessation at once of their work and of their privileges (2 Chr. xxviii. 24). Under Hezekiah they again became prominent, as consecrating themselves to the special work of cleansing and repairing the Temple (2 Chr. xxix. 12-15); and the hymns of David and of Asaph were again renewed. In this instance it was thought worthy of special record that those who were simply Levites were more upright in heart than zealots than the priests themselves (2 Chr. xxix. 54); and thus, in the closing year, they took the lead of the unwilling or unprepared members of the priesthood. Their old privileges were restored, they were put forward as teachers (2 Chr. xxx. 22), and the payment of tithes, which had probably been discontinued under Ahaz, was renewed (2 Chr. xxxi. 4). The genealogies of the tribe were revised (ver. 17), and the old classification kept its ground. The reign of Manasseh was for them, during the greater part of it, a period of depression. That of Josiah witnessed a fresh revival and reorganization (2 Chr. xxxix. 8-13). In the great passover of his eighteenth year they took their place as teachers of the people, as well as leaders of their worship (2 Chr. xxx. 3, 15). Then came the Egyptian and Chaldean invasions, and the rule of cowardly and apostate kings. The sacred temple itself showed itself unfaithful. The
repeated protests of the priest Ezekiel indicate that they had shared in the idolatry of the people. The prominence into which they had been brought in the reigns of the two reforming kings had apparently encouraged in them a love for the traditions and maintained the practices of their tribe. They, we may believe, were those who were specially called on to sing to their conquerors one of the songs of Zion (De Wette, on Ps. xxxviii.). It is noticeable, however, that in the first body of returning exiles they are present in a disproportionately small number (Ex. xi. 36-42). Those who do come take their old parts at the foundation and dedication of the second Temple (Ex. iii. 10, vi. 18). In the next movement under Ezra their reluctance (whatever may have been its origin) was even more strongly marked. None of them presented themselves at the first great gathering (Ezr. viii. 15). The special efforts of Ezra did not succeed in bringing together more than 38, and their place had to be filled by 221 of the Nethinim (ib. 20). Those who returned with him resumed their functions at the Feast of Tabernacles as teachers and interpreters (Neh. viii. 7), and those who were most active in that work were foremost also in chanting the hymn-like prayer which appears in Neh. ix. as the last great effort of Jewish psalmody. They are recognized in the great national covenant, and the offerings and titles which were their due are once more solemnly secured to them (Neh. x. 37-39). They take their old places in the Temple and in the villages near Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 21), and are present in full array at the great feast of the Dedication of the Wall. The two prophets who were active at the time of the Return, Haggai and Zechariah, if they did not belong to the tribe, helped it forward in the work of restoration. The stronger measures are adopted by Nehemiah, as before by Ezra, to guard the purity of their blood from the contamination of mixed marriages (Ex. x. vii. 4). They are not only the guardians of the holiness of the Sadduce (Neh. xii. 22). The last prophet of the O. T. sees, as part of his vision of the latter days, the time when the Lord "shall purify the sons of Levi" (Mal. iii. 3).

The guidance of the O. T. fails us at this point, and the history of the Levites in relation to the national life becomes consequently a matter of inference and conjecture. The synagogue worship, then originated, or receiving a new development, was organized irrespectively of them [SYNGOGUE], and thus throughout the whole of Palestine there were means of instruction in the Law with which they were not connected. This would tend naturally to diminish their peculiar claim on the reverence of the people; but where a priest or Levite was present in the synagogue they were still entitled to some kind of precedence, and special sections in the lessons for the day were assigned to them (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Matt. iv. 29). During the period that followed the Captivity they contributed to the formation of the so-called Great Synagogue. They, with the priests, theoretically constituted and practically formed the majority of the permanent Sanhedrim (Maimonides in Light- foot, Hor. Heb. on Matt. xxvi. 3), and as such had a large share in the administration of justice even in capital cases. In the characteristic feature of this period, as an age of scribes succeeding to an age of prophets, they too were likely to be sharers. The training and previous history of the tribe would predispose them to attach themselves to the new system as they had done to the old. They accordingly may have been among the scribes and elders, who accumulated traditions. They may have attached themselves to the sects of Pharisees and Sadducees. But in proportion as they thus acquired fame and reputation individually, their function as Levites became subordinate, and they were known simply as the inferior ministers of the Temple. They take no prominent part in the Maccabean struggles, though they must have been present at the great purification of the Temple.

They appear but seldom in the history of the N. T. Where we meet with their names it is as the type of a formal heartless worship, without sympathy and without love (Luke x. 32). The same parable indicates Jericho as having become—what it had not been originally (see Josh. xxi. 1 Chr. vi.)—one of the great stations at which they and the priests resided (Lightfoot, Cant. Chorograp. c. 47). In John i. 19 they appear as delegates of the Jews, that is of the Sanhedrim, coming to inquire into the credentials of the Baptist, and giving utterance to their own Messianic expectations. The mention of a Levite of Cyprus in Acts iv. 36 shows that the changes of the previous century had carried that tribe also into "the dispersed among the Gentiles." The conversion of Barnabas and Mark was probably no solitary instance of the reception by them of the new faith, which was the fulfillment of the old. If "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts vi. 7), it is not too bold to believe that their influence may have led Levites to follow their example. As old puritans they too were likely to be sharers of the old customs of the Temple-service, might be transmitted through the agency of those who had been specially trained in them, to be the inheritance of the Christian Church. Later on in the history of the first century, when the Temple had received its final completion under the younger Agrippa, we find one section of the tribe engaged in a new movement. With that strange unconsciousness of a coming doom which so often marks the last stage of a decaying system, the singers of the Temple thought it a fitting time to apply for the right of wearing the same linen garment as the priests, and persuaded the king that the concession of this privilege would be the glory of his reign (Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, § 6). The other Levites at the same time asked for and obtained the privilege of joining

May we conjecture that the language of Ezekiel led to some jealousy between the two orders? 9 There is a Jewish tradition (Surenhusius, Musivt. gen. x. 10) to the effect that, as a punishment for this backwardness, Ezra deprived them of their tithes, and transferred the right to the priests.

c The life of Josephus may be taken as an example of the education of the higher members of the order (Jos. Vita, c. 1).

d * Levites, though not named, are referred to as Temple-priests in Luke xxii. 52, Acts iv. 1, and v. 29 (Capp. v. 8).
in the Temple choruses, from which hitherto they had been excluded. The destruction of the Temple so soon after they had attained the object of their desire came as with a grim irony to sweep away the occupation and to deprive them of every vestige of that which had distinguished them from other Israelites. They were merged in the crowd of captives that were scattered over the Roman world, and disappear from the stage of history. The Rabbinic schools, that rose out of the ruins of the Jewish polity, fostered a studied and habitual depreciation of the Levite order as compared with their own teachers (M.T. ma. 66 P. 445). Individual families, it may be, cherished the tradition that their fathers, as priests or Levites, had taken part in the services of the Temple. If their claims were recognized, they received the old marks of reverence in the worship of the synagogue (comp. the Regulations of the Great Synagogue of London, in Margoliouth's History of Jews in Great Britain, iii. 270), took precedence in reading the lessons of the day (Lightfoot, Homilies, on Matt. iv. 25), and pronounced the blessing at the close (Bashnag, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 730). Their existence was acknowledged in some of the laws of the Christian emperors (Bashnag, l. c.). The tenacity with which the exiled race clung to these recollections is shown in the prevalence of the names (Ozen, Levita or Levy) which imply that those who bear them are of the sons of Aaron or the tribe of Levi; and in the custom which exempts the first-born of priestly or Levite families from the payments which are still offered, in the case of others, as the redemption of the first-born (Leo of Modena, in Picart's Cérémonies Religieuses, i. 26; Allen's Modern Judaism, p. 257). In the mean time the old name had acquired a new signification. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the later hierarchy the language of the earlier, and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title (τέμπυς) that had belonged to the sons of Aaron: while the deacons were habitually spoken of as Levites (Saucer, Thes. s. v. Levites). The extinction or absorption of a tribe which had borne so prominent a part in the history of Israel, was, like other such changes, an instance of the order in which the shadow is succeeded by the substance — that which is decayed, is waxing old, and ready to vanish away, by a new and more living organization. It had done its work, and it had lost its life. It was bound up with a localized and exclusive worship, and had no place to occupy in that which was universal. In the Christian Church — supposing, by any effort of imagination, that it had had a recognized existence in it — it would have been simply an impediment. Looking at the long history of which the outline has been here traced, we find in it the light and darkness, the good and evil, which mingle in the character of most corporate or caste societies. On the one hand, the Levites, as a tribe, tended to fall into a formal worship, a narrow and exclusive exaltation of themselves and of their country. On the other hand, we must not forget that they were chosen together with the priesthood, to bear witness of great truths which might otherwise have perished from remembrance, and that they bore it well through a long succession of centuries. To members of this tribe we owe many separate books of the O. T., and probably also in great measure the preservation of the whole. The hymns which they sung, in part probably the music of which they were the originators, have been perpetuated in the worship of the Christian Church. In the company of prophets who have left behind them no written records they appear conspicuous, united by common work and common interests with the prophetic order. They did their work as a national clergy, instruments in raising the people to a higher life, educating them in the knowledge on which all order and civilization rest. It is not often, in the history of the world, that a religious caste or order has passed away with more claims to the respect and gratitude of mankind than the tribe of Levites.

(On the subject generally may be consulted, in addition to the authorities already quoted, Tarpaz, Appr. Crit. b. i. c. 5, and Annal.; Saalschütz, Archiv. der Hebr. c. 78; Michaelis, Comm. on Laws of Moses, i. art. 52.)

E. H. P.

LEVITICUS (ץיתיע), the first word in the book, giving its name: דַּוִּיתִּיָּה: Levitica: called also by the later Jews לְוָיִם, לְוָיָּם, "Law of the priests:" and לְוָיִים לְוָיִים, "Law of offerings."

CONTENTS. — The book consists of the following principal sections:

I. The laws touching sacrifices (cc. i. viii.).

II. An historical section containing, first, the consecration of Aaron and his sons (ch. viii.); next, his first offering for himself and the people (ch. ix.); and lastly, the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, for their presumptions offense (ch. x.).

III. The laws concerning purity and impurity, and the appropriate sacrifices and ordinances for putting away impurity (cc. xi.-xvi.).

IV. Laws chiefly intended to mark the separation between Israel and the heathen nations (cc. xvii.-xx.).

V. Laws concerning the priests (xxi., xxii.); and certain holy days and festivals (xxiii., xxiv.), together with an episode (xxiv.). The section extends from ch. xxi. 1 to xxii. 2.

VI. Promises and threats (xxvi., 2-46).

VIII. An appendix containing the laws concerning vows (xxvii.).

I. The book of Exodus concludes with the account of the completion of the tabernacle. "So Moses finished the work," we read (xii. 33); and immediately there rests upon it a cloud, and it is

a The tone of Josephus is noticeable as being that of a man who looked on the change as a dangerous innovation. As a priest, he saw in this movement of away their constitution, and so to the depredations of his order: and this was, in his judgment, one of the sons which brought on the destruction of the city and the Temple.

b Dr. Joseph Wolff, in his recent Tavris and Adversaries (p. 2), claims his descent from this tribe.

c In the literature of a later period the same name meets us applied to the same or nearly the same order, no longer, however, as the language of reverence, but as that of a cynical contempt for the less worthy portion of the clergy of the English Church (Macaulay Hist. of England, iii. 351).
filled with the glory of Jehovah. From the tabernacle, thus rendered glorious by the Divine Presence—(10) the legislation contained in the book of Leviticus. At first God spake to the people out of the thunder and lightning of Sinai, and gave them his holy commandments by the hand of a mediator. But henceforth his Presence is to dwell not on the secret top of Sinai, but in the midst of his people, both in their wanderings through the wilderness, and afterwards in the Land of Promise. Hence the first direction which Moses receives after the work is finished have reference to the offerings which were to be brought to the door of the Tabernacle. As Jehovah draws near to the people in the Tabernacle, so the people draw near to Jehovah in the offering. Without offerings none may approach Him. The regulations respecting the sacrifices fall into three groups, and each of these groups again consists of a declination of instructions. Bertheau has observed that this principle runs through all the laws of Moses. They are all modeled after the pattern of the ten commandments, so that each distinct subject of legislation is always treated of under ten several enactments or provisions.

Baumgarten in his Commentary on the Pentateuch, has adopted the arrangement of Bertheau, as set forth in his Sieben Gruppen des Mos. Rechts. On the whole, his principle seems sound. We find Bun- sen acknowledging it in part, in his division of the 10th chapter (see below). And though we cannot always agree with Bertheau, we have thought it worth while to give his arrangement as suggestive at least of the main structure of the book.

1. The first group of regulations (ce. i. iii.) deals with three kinds of offerings: the burnt-offering (תְּהֵיטָן), the meat-offering (תְּכִנָּה), and the thank-offering (תְּחֵיתָן), and

i. The burnt-offering (ch. i.) in three sections. It might be either (1) a male without blemish from the herd (תְּכִנָּה גָּםָה), vv. 3-9; or (2) a male without blemish from the flock, or lesser cattle (תְּכִנָּה בֶּן כִּבָּה), vv. 10-13; or (3) it might be fowls, an offering of turtle-doves or young pigeons, vv. 14-17. The subdivisions are here marked clearly enough, not only by the three kinds of sacrifice, but also by the form in which the enactment is put. Each begins with בֹּנֶה פָּרָשָׂה, "If his offering," etc., and each ends with הָיוֹתל הַנְוֵר הַמֶּ_chance. "an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah." The next group (ch. ii.) presents many more difficulties. Its parts are not so clearly marked either by prominent features in the subject-matter, or by the more technical boundaries of certain initial and final phrases. We have here—

ii. The meat-offering, or bloodless offering in four sections: (1) in its uncooked form, consisting of fine flour with oil and frankincense, vv. 1-3; (2) in its cooked form, of which three different kinds are specified—baked in the oven, fried, or boiled, vv. 4-10; (3) to vindicate the prohibition of leaven, and the direction to use salt in all the meat-offerings, 11-13; (4) the obligation of first fruits, 14-16. This at least seems on the whole to be the best arrangement of the group, though we offer it with some hesitation.

(n.) Bertheau's arrangement is different. He divides (1) vv. 1-4, thus including the meat-offering baked in the oven with the uncooked offering; (2) vv. 5 and 6, the meat-offering when fried in the pan; (3) vv. 7-13, the meat-offering when boiled; (4) vv. 14-16, the offering of the first-fruits. But this is obviously open to many objections. For, first, it is exceedingly arbitrary to connect v. 4 with vv. 1-3, rather than with the verses which follow. Why should the meat-offering baked in the oven be classed with the uncooked meat-offering rather than with the other two which were in different ways supposed to be dressed with fire? Next, two of the divisions of the chapter are clearly marked by the recurrence of the formula, "It is a thing most holy of the offerings of Jehovah made by fire," vv. 3 and 10. Lastly, the directions in vv. 11-13 apply to every form of meat-offering, not only to that immediately preceding. The Masonic arrangement is in five sections: vv. 1-3; 4; 5, 6; 7-13; 14-16.

iii. The Shelomim—"peace-offering" (A. V.), or thank-offering" (Ewald), (ch. iii.) in three sections. Strictly speaking this falls under two heads: first, when it is of the herd; and secondly, when it is of the flock. But this has has again its subdivision: for the offering when of the flock may be either a lamb or a goat. Accordingly the three sections are, vv. 1-5; 7-11; 12-16. Ver. 6 is merely introductory to the second class of sacrifices, and ver. 17 a general conclusion, as in the case of other laws. This concludes the first declination of the book.

2. Ch. iv. v. The laws concerning the sin-offering and the trespass- (or guilt-) offering.

The sin-offering (chap. iv.) is treated of under four specified cases, after a short introduction to the whole in vv. 1, 2: (1) the sin-offering for the priest, 3-12; (2) for the whole congregation, 13-21; (3) for a ruler, 22-26; (4) for one of the common people, 27-35.

After these four cases in which the offering is to be made for four different classes, there follow provisions respecting three several kinds of transgression for which atonement must be made. It is not quite clear whether these three classes are treated under the head of the sin-offering or of the trespass-offering (see Winer, Redb). We may, however, follow Bertheau, Baumgarten, and Knobel, in regarding them as special instances in which a sin-offering was to be brought. The three cases are: first, when any one hears a curse and conceals what he hears (v. 1); secondly, when any one touches without knowing or intending it, any unclean thing (vv. 2, 3); lastly, when any one takes an oath inconsiderately (ver. 4). For each of these cases the same trespass-offering, "a female from the flock, a lamb or kid of the goats," is appointed; but with that mercyfulness which characterizes the Mosaic law, express provision is made for a less costly offering where the offerer is poor.

The declaration is then completed by the three resolutions respecting the guilt-offering (or trespass-offering) first, when a man sins through ignorance in the holy things of Jehovah (vv. 14-16); next, when a person without knowing it commits any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of Jehovah (17-19); lastly, when a man lies and swears falsely concerning that which was intrusted to him, etc.
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With the holy oil; his sons also are arrayed in their garments, and the various offerings appointed are offered. In ch. ix. Aaron offers, eight days after his consecration, his first offering for himself and the people: this comprises for himself a sin- and burnt-offering (1-14), for the people a sin-offering, a burnt-offering and a peace- (or thank-) offering. He blesses the people, and fire comes down from heaven and consumes the burnt-offering. Ch. x. tells how Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, eager to enjoy the privileges of their new office, and perhaps too much elated by its dignity, forgot or despised the restrictions by which it was fenced round (Ex. xxx., 7, etc.), and daring to offer strange fire before Jehovah," perished because of their presumption.

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them therefore began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (vv. 6, 7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defense, "Such things have befallen me; and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" And Moses, the lawgiver and the judge, admits the plea, and bowers the natural feeling of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

Ii. Ce. xi.-xvi. The first seven decalogues had reference to the putting away of guilt. By the appointed sacrifices the separation between man and God was healed. The next seven concern themselves with the putting away of impurity. That ce. xi.-xv. hang together so as to form one series of laws there can be no doubt. Besides that they treat of kindred subjects, they have their characteristic words, נַעֲנָא, נַעֲנָה, "unclean," "uncleanliness," וְנַעֲנָה, "clean," which occur in almost every verse. The only question is about ch. xvi., which by its opening is connected immediately with the occurrence related in ch. x. Historically it would seem therefore that ch. xvi. ought to have followed ch. x. And as this order is neglected, it would lead us to suspect that some other principle of arrangement than that of historical sequence has been adopted. This we find in the advance in the observed significance of the Great Day of Atonement. The high-priest on that day made atonement, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (xvi. 16), and he "reconciled the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar" (ver. 29). Delivered from their guilt and cleansed from their pollutions, from that day forward the children of Israel entered upon a new and holy life. This was typified both by the ordinance that the bullock and the goat for the sin-offering were burnt without the camp (ver. 27), and also by the sending away of the goat laden with the iniquities of the people into the wilderness. Hence ce. xvi. seems to stand most fitly at the end of this second group of seven decalogues.

It has reference, we believe, not only (as Bertheloum supposes) to the putting away, as by one solemn act, of all those uncleannesses mentioned in ce. xi.-xv., and for which the various expiations are only one of those instances in which the reader

---
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(vv. 20-26). This decalogue, like the preceding one, has its characteristic words and expressions. The prominent word which introduces so many of the enactments, is הָעֵנָא, "unclean" (see iv. 27, vv. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17, vi. 2); and the phrase, "if a soul shall sin" (iv. 2), is, with occasional variations, having an equivalent meaning, the distinctive phrase of the section.

As in the former decalogue, the nature of the offerings, so in this the person and the nature of the offense are the chief features in the several statutes.

3. Ch. vi., vii. Naturally upon the law of sacrifices follows the lay of the priests' duties when they offer the sacrifices. Hence we find Moses directed to address himself immediately to Aaron and his sons (vi. 2, 18 = vi. 9, 25, A. V.).

In this group the different kinds of offerings are named in nearly the same order as in the two preceding decalogues, except that the offering at the consecration of a priest follows, instead of the thank-offering, immediately after the meat-offering, which it precedes in the thank-offering now appears after the trespass-offering. There are therefore, in all, six kinds of offering; and in the case of each of these the priest has his distinct duties. Bertheloum has very ingeniously so distributed the enactments in which these duties are prescribed as to arrange them all in five decalogues. We will briefly indicate his arrangement.

3. (a.) "This is the law of the burnt-offering" (vi. 9, A. V.), in five enactments, each verse (vv. 9-13) containing a separate enactment.

(b.) "And this is the law of the meat-offering" (ver. 14), again in five enactments, each of which is, as before, contained in a single verse (v. 4-18).

4. The next decalogue is contained in vv. 19-30. (a.) Verse 19 is merely introductory; then follow, in five verses, five distinct directions with regard to the offering at the time of the consecration of the priests, the first in ver. 20, the next two in ver. 21, the fourth in the former part of ver. 22, and the last in the latter part of ver. 22 and ver. 23.

(b.) "This is the law of the sin-offering" (ver. 25). Then the five enactments, each in one verse, except that two verses (27, 28) are given to the third.

5. The third decalogue is contained in ch. vii., 1-10, the laws of the trespass-offering. But it is impossible to avoid a misgiving as to the soundness of Bertheloum's system when we find him making the words "it is most holy," in ver. 1, the first of the ten enactments. This he is obliged to do, as vv. 3 and 4 evidently form but one.

6. The fourth decalogue, after an introductory verse (ver. 11), is contained in ten verses (12-21).

7. The last decalogue consists of certain general laws about the fat, the blood, the wave-breast, etc., and is comprised again in ten verses (22-30), the verses as before marking the divisions.

The chapter closes with a brief historical notice of the fact that these several commands were given to Moses on Mount Sinai (vv. 35-38).

Ii. Ch. viii., ix., x. This section is entirely historical. In ch. viii. we have the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses before the whole congregation. They were washed; he is arrayed in the priestly vestments and anointed with the holy oil; his sons also are arrayed in their garments, and the various offerings appointed are offered. In ch. ix. Aaron offers, eight days after his consecration, his first offering for himself and the people: this comprises for himself a sin- and burnt-offering (1-14), for the people a sin-offering, a burnt-offering and a peace- (or thank-) offering. He blesses the people, and fire comes down from heaven and consumes the burnt-offering. Ch. x. tells how Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, eager to enjoy the privileges of their new office, and perhaps too much elated by its dignity, forgot or despised the restrictions by which it was fenced round (Ex. xxx., 7, etc.), and daring to offer strange fire before Jehovah," perished because of their presumption.

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them therefore began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (vv. 6, 7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defense, "Such things have befallen me; and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" And Moses, the lawgiver and the judge, admits the plea, and bowers the natural feeling of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

Ii. Ce. xi.-xvi. The first seven decalogues had reference to the putting away of guilt. By the appointed sacrifices the separation between man and God was healed. The next seven concern themselves with the putting away of impurity. That ce. xi.-xv. hang together so as to form one series of laws there can be no doubt. Besides that they treat of kindred subjects, they have their characteristic words, נַעֲנָא, נַעֲנָה, "unclean," "uncleanliness," וְנַעֲנָה, "clean," which occur in almost every verse. The only question is about ch. xvi., which by its opening is connected immediately with the occurrence related in ch. x. Historically it would seem therefore that ch. xvi. ought to have followed ch. x. And as this order is neglected, it would lead us to suspect that some other principle of arrangement than that of historical sequence has been adopted. This we find in the advance in the observed significance of the Great Day of Atonement. The high-priest on that day made atonement, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (xvi. 16), and he "reconciled the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar" (ver. 29). Delivered from their guilt and cleansed from their pollutions, from that day forward the children of Israel entered upon a new and holy life. This was typified both by the ordinance that the bullock and the goat for the sin-offering were burnt without the camp (ver. 27), and also by the sending away of the goat laden with the iniquities of the people into the wilderness. Hence ce. xvi. seems to stand most fitly at the end of this second group of seven decalogues.

It has reference, we believe, not only (as Bertheloum supposes) to the putting away, as by one solemn act, of all those uncleannesses mentioned in ce. xi.-xv., and for which the various expiations..."
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and cleansing there appointed were temporary and unsanctified; but also to the making atonement, in the sense of hiding sin or putting away its guilt. For not only do we find the idea of cleansing as from defilement, but far more prominently the idea of reconciliation. The often repeated word פה, "to cover, to atone," is the great word of the section.

1. The first decalogue in this group refers to clean and unclean flesh. Five classes of animals are pronounced unclean. The first four enunciations declare what animals may and may not be eaten, whether (1) beasts of the earth (2-8), or (2) fishes (9-12), or (3) birds (13-20), or (4) creeping things with wings. The next four are intended to guard against pollution by contact with the carcass of any of these animals; (5) vv. 24-26; (6) vv. 27, 28; (7) vv. 29-33; (8) vv. 39, 40. The ninth and tenth specify the last class of animals which are unclean for food, (9) vv. 41, 42, and forbid any other kind of pollution by means of them, (10) vv. 43-45. Vv. 46 and 47 are merely a concluding summary.

2. Ch. xii. Women's purification in childbed. The whole of this chapter, according to Bertheau, constitutes the first law of this decalogue. The remaining nine are to be found in the next chapter, which treats of the signs of leprosy in man and in garments. (2) vv. 1-5; (3) vv. 9-17; (4) vv. 18-23; (5) vv. 24-28; (6) vv. 29-37; (7) vv. 38, 39; (8) vv. 40-41; (9) vv. 42-46; (10) vv. 47-59. This arrangement of the several sections is not altogether free from objection; but it is certainly supported by the characteristic mode in which each section opens. Thus, for instance, ch. xii. 2 begins with דביה יִהְוָֽיִתַּֽנָּה; ch. xiii. 2, with בָּדִֽיתָּה יִהְוָֽיִתַּֽנָּה; and so on, the same order being always observed, the subst. being placed first, then לֹא, and then the verb, except only in ver. 42, where the subst. is placed after the verb.

3. Ch. xiv. 1-52. "The law of the leper in the day of his cleansing," i.e. the law which the priest is to observe in purifying the leper. The priest is mentioned in ten verses, each of which begins one of the ten sections of this law: vv. 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20. In each instance the word הָדָּוָּה is preceded by ו consecut. with the verb. It is true that in ver. 3, and also in ver. 14, the word הָדָּוָּה occurs twice; but in both verses there is M.S. authority, as well as that of the Vulg. and Arab. versions for the absence of the second. Verses 21-52 may be regarded as a supplemental provision in cases where the leper is too poor to bring the required offering.

4. Ch. xiv. 33-57. The leprosy in a house. It is not so easy here to trace the arrangement noticed in so many other laws. There are no characteristic words or phrases to guide us. Bertheau's division is as follows: (1) vv. 34, 35; (2) vv. 36, 37; (3) ver. 38; (4) ver. 39; (5) ver. 40; (6) vv. 41, 42; (7) vv. 43-45. Then as usual follows a short summary which closes the statute concerning leprosy, vv. 54-57.

5. Ch. xv. 1-15. 6. Ch. xv. 16-31. The law of uncleanness by issue, etc., in two decalogues. The division is clearly marked, as Bertheau observes, by the form of cleansing, which is so exactly similar in the two principal cases, and which closes each series, (1) vv. 13-15; (2) vv. 28-30. We again give his arrangement, though we do not profess to regard it as in all respects satisfactory.

6. (1) vv. 2, 3; (2) ver. 4; (3) ver. 5; (4) ver. 6; (5) ver. 7; (6) ver. 8; (7) ver. 9; (8) ver. 10; (9) vv. 11, 12; — these Bertheau considers as one enactment, because it is another way of saying that either the word or thing which the unclean person touches is unclean; but on the same principle vv. 4 and 5 might just as well form one enactment — (10) vv. 15-15.

7. (1) ver. 16; (2) ver. 17; (3) ver. 18; (4) ver. 19; (5) ver. 20; (6) ver. 21; (7) ver. 22; (8) ver. 23; (9) ver. 24; (10) vv. 28-30. In order to complete this arrangement, he considers verses 25-27 as a kind of supplementary enactment provided for an irregular uncleanness, leaving it as quite uncertain however whether this was a later addition or not. Verses 32 and 33 form merely the same general conclusion which we have had before in xiv. 54-57.

The last decalogue of the second group of seven decalogues is to be found in ch. xvi., which treats of the great Day of Atonement. The law itself is contained in vv. 1-28. The remaining verses, vv. 29-46, consist of an exhortation to its careful observance. In the act of atonement three persons are concerned. The high-priest — in this instance Aaron; the man who leads away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; and he who burns the skin, flesh, and dung of the bullock and goat of the sin-offering without the camp. The two last have special purifications assigned them; the first because he has touched the goat laden with the guilt of the people; the last because he has come in contact with the sin-offering. The 9th and 10th enactments prescribe what these purifications are, each of them concluding with the same formula: הָדָּוָּה יִהְוָֽיִתַּֽנָּה, and hence distinguished from each other. The duties of Aaron consequently ought, if the division into decades is correct, to be comprised in eight enactments. Now the name of Aaron is repeated eight times, and in six of these it is preceded by ו consecut. as we observed was the case before when the priest was the prominent figure. According to this then the decalogue will stand thus: — (1) ver. 2, Aaron not to enter the Holy Place at all times; (2) vv. 3-5, With what sacrifices and in what dress Aaron is to enter the Holy Place; (3) vv. 6, 7, Aaron to offer the bullock for himself, and to set the two goats before Jehovah; (4) ver. 8, Aaron to cast lots on the two goats; (5) vv. 9, 10, Aaron to offer the goat on which the lot falls for Jehovah, and to send away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; (6) vv. 11-19, Aaron to sprinkle the blood both of the bullock and of the goat to make atonement for himself, for his house, and for the whole congregation, as also to purify the altar of incense with the blood; (7) vv. 20-22, Aaron to lay his hands on the living goat, and confess over it all the sins of the children of Israel; (8) v. 23, Aaron after this to take off his linen garments, bathe himself and put on his priestly garments, and then offer his burnt-offering and that of the congregation; (9) ver. 26, The man by whom the goat is sent into the wilderness to purify himself; (10) vv. 27, 28, What is to be done by him who burns the sin-offering without the camp.
We have now reached the great central point of the book. All going before was but a preparation for this. Two great truths have been established: first, that God can only be approached by means of appointed sacrifices; next, that man in nature and life is full of pollution, which must be cleansed. And now a third is taught, namely, that not by several cleansing for several sins and pollutions can guilt be put away. The several acts of sin are but so many manifestations of the sinful nature.

For this, therefore, also must atonement be made: one solemn act, which shall cover all transgressions, and turn away God's righteous displeasure from Israel.

IV. ch. xii.—xx. And now Israel is reminded that it is the holy nation. The great atonement offered, it is to enter upon a new life. It is a separate nation, sanctified and set apart for the service of God. It may not therefore do after the abominations of the heathen by whom it is surrounded. Here consequently we find those laws and ordinances which especially distinguish the nation of Israel from all other nations of the earth.

Here again we may trace, as before, a group of seven dealings. But the several dealings are not so clearly marked; nor are the characteristic phrases and the introductions and conclusions so common. In ch. xiii. there are twenty enactments, and in ch. xix. thirty. In ch. xiii., on the other hand, there are only six, and in ch. xx. there are fourteen. As it is quite manifest that the enactments in ch. xiii. are entirely separated by a fresh introduction from those in ch. xii., Bertholet, in order to preserve the usual arrangement of the laws in decalogues, would transpose this chapter, and place it after ch. xix. He observes, that the laws in ch. xiii., and those in ch. xx. 1-9, are akin to one another, and may very well constitute a single decalogue; and what is of more importance, that the words in xiii. 1-5 form the natural introduction to this whole group of laws: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye offer there their ordinances, etc."

There is, however, a point of connection between ch. xii. and xiii., which must not be overlooked, and which seems to indicate that their position in our present text is the right one. All the six enactments in ch. xii. (vv. 3-5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10-12, 13, 14, 15) bear upon the nature and meaning of the sacrifice to Jehovah and compared with the sacrifices offered to false gods. It would seem too, that it was necessary to guard against any license to idolatrous practices, which might possibly be drawn from the sending of the goat for Azazel into the wilderness (Atonement, Day of), especially perhaps against the Egyptian custom of expiating the spirit of the wilderness and averting his malice (Hengstenberg, Moses u. Jsepjten, p. 178; Movers, Floniziter, i. 389).

To this there may be an allusion in ver. 7. Perhaps however it is better and more simple to regard the enactments in these two chapters (with Bunsen, Biblerick, 2te Ath., i. 187, p. 245) as directed against two prevalent heathen practices, the eating of blood and fornication. It is remarkable, as showing how intimately moral and ritual observances were blended together in the Jewish mind, that abstention "from blood and things strangled, and fornication," was laid down by the Apostles as the only condition of communion to be required of Gentile converts to Christianity. Before we quit this chapter one observation may be made.

The rendering of the A. V. in ver. 11, "for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul," should be "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement by means of the life." This is important. It is not blood merely as such, but blood as having in it the principle of life that God accepts in sacrifice. For by thus giving vicariously the life of the dumb animal, the sinner confesses that his own life is forfeit.

In ch. xiii., after the introduction to which we have already alluded, vv. 1-5, — and in which God claims obedience on the double ground that He is Israel's God, and that to keep his commandments is life (ver. 5), — there follow twenty enactments concerning unlawful marriages and unnatural lusts. The first ten are contained one in each verse, vv. 6-15. The next ten range themselves in like manner with the verses, except that vv. 17 and 18 contain each two. Of the twenty the first fourteen are alike in form, as well as in the repeated nemi ykix npa xnu. niiv kx. niiv. xnu.

Ch. xix. Three dealings, introduced by the words, "Ye shall be holy, for I Jehovah your God am holy," and ending with, "Ye shall be holy; and ye shall make yourselves no strange gods, nor accept of their ordinances," etc.

The interpretation of ver. 1 is of late been the subject of so much discussion, that we may perhaps be permitted to say a word upon it, even in a work which excludes all dogmatic controversies. The rendering of the English Version is supported by a whole array of authorities of the first rank, as may be seen by reference to Dr. McCaul's pamphlet, The Ancient Interpretation of Levitices XVIII. 1-4, etc. We may further remark, that the whole controversy, so far as the Scriptural question is concerned, might have been avoided if the Church had but acted in the spirit of Luther's golden words: "Ad rem veniamus et dicamus. Moses non mortuum, vidisse autem populo Judeorum, see obligari nos legibus illius. Ideo quippe ex Mose ut legislatore nunc idem ex legisbus nostris, e. g. naturalibus et politicis praeclare, ne adhiberemus antiquas et oris politicas. — Bertholet, De Wette's edit. p. 356.

It is a not little remarkable that six of these enactments should only be repetitions, for the most part in a shorter form, of commandments contained in the two Tables. This is only accounted for by remembering the great object of this section, which is to remind Israel that it is a separate nation, its laws being expressly framed to be a fence and a hedge about it, keeping it from profane contact with the
The next decalogue, vv. 14-25, Bertheau arranges thus: ver. 14, ver. 15, ver. 15b, ver. 16, ver. 17, ver. 18, ver. 19a, ver. 19b, vv. 20-22, vv. 23. We object, however, to making the words in 19a, "Ye shall keep my statutes," a separate enactment. There is no reason for this. A much better plan would be to consider ver. 17 as consisting of two enactments, which is manifestly the case.

The third decalogue may be thus distributed: --

Ver. 25a, vv. 26, 27, vv. 28, vv. 29, vv. 30, ver. 31, ver. 32, ver. 33, ver. 34, vv. 35, 36.

We have thus found five decalogues in this group, which completes the number seven by transposing, as we have seen, ch. xlii., and placing it immediately before ch. xx. He also transposes ver. 27 of ch. xx. to what he considers its proper place, namely, after ver. 6. It must be confessed that the enactment in ver. 27 stands very awkwardly at the end of the chapter, completely isolated as it is from all other enactments for vv. 22-26 are the natural conclusion to this whole section. But admitting this, another difficulty remains, that according to him the 7th decalogue begins at ver. 10, and another transposition is necessary, so that vv. 7, 8, may stand after ver. 9, and so conclude the preceding series of ten enactments. It is better perhaps to abandon the search for complete symmetry than to adopt a method so violent in order to obtain it.

It should be observed that ch. xlvii. 6-23 and ch. xx. 10-21 stand in this relation to one another: that the latter declares the penalties attached to the transgression of many of the commandments given in the former. But though we may not be able to trace seven decalogues, in accordance with the theory of which we have been speaking, in cc. xlvii.-xx. there can be no doubt that they form a distinct section of themselves, of which xx. 23-26 is the proper conclusion.

Like the other sections it has some characteristic expressions: (a) "Ye shall keep my judgments and my statutes" (נְפִילָתָן, נְפִילָתָן), occurs xlvii. 4, 5, 26, xlix. 37, 38, 22, but is not met with either in the preceding or the following chapters. (b) The constantly recurring phrases, "I am Jehovah;" "I am Jehovah your God;" "Be ye holy, for I am holy;" "I am Jehovah whom ye shall fear." In the earlier sections this phraseology is only found in Lev. xi. 44, 45, and Ex. xxxi. 13. In the section which follows (xlii.-xxiv.) it is much more common, this section being in a great measure a continuation of the preceding.

V. We come now to the last group of decalogues --that contained in cc. xlii.-xxviiii. 2. The subjects comprised in these enactments are --First, the personal purity of the priests. They may not defile themselves for the dead; their wives and daughters must be pure, and they themselves must be free from all personal blemish (ch. xlii.). Next, the eating of the holy things is permitted only to priests who are free from all uncleanness; they and their household only may eat them (xliii. 1-14). Thirdly, the offerings of Israel are to be pure and without blemish (xliii. 17-33). The fourth section provides for the due celebration of the great fest-

vols when priests and people were to be gathered together before Jehovah in holy convocation.

Up to this point we trace system and purpose in the order of the legislation. Thus, for instance, cc. xi.-xvi. treat of external purity; cc. xvii.-xxii., of moral purity; cc. xxi.-xxviiii. of the holiness of the priests, and their duties with regard to holy things; the whole concluding with provisions for the solemn feasts on which all Israel appear before Jehovah. We will again briefly indicate Bertheau's groups, and then append some general observations on the section.

1. Ch. xxi. Ten laws, as follows: (1) ver. 1-3; (2) ver. 4; (3) vv. 5, 6; (4) vv. 7, 8; (5) ver. 9; (6) vv. 10, 11; (7) ver. 12; (8) vv. 13, 14; (9) vv. 17-21; (10) vv. 22, 23. The first five laws concern all the priests, the sixth to the eighth the high-priest; the ninth and tenth the effects of bodily blemish in particular cases.

2. Ch. xxii. 1-16. (1) ver. 2; (2) ver. 3; (3) ver. 4; (4) vv. 4-7; (5) vv. 8, 9; (6) ver. 10; (7) ver. 11; (8) vers. 12; (9) vers. 13; (10) vv. 14-16.

3. Ch. xxiii. 17-33. (1) vv. 18-20; (2) ver. 21; (3) vv. 22; (4) vv. 23; (5) vv. 24; (6) ver. 25; (7) ver. 27; (8) vv. 28, 29; (9) ver. 30; (10) ver. 31; and a general conclusion in vv. 32-33.

4. Ch. xxiv. (1) ver. 3; (2) ver. 4; (3) vv. 5, 6; (4) vv. 7, 8; (5) vv. 9, 10; (6) vv. 11, 12; (7) vv. 24, 25; (8) vv. 27-32; (9) vv. 34, 35; (10) vers. 36-38 contain the conclusion or general summing up of the decalogue. On the remainder of the chapter, as well as ch. xxv., see below.

5. Ch. xxv. 1-22. (1) ver. 2; (2) vv. 3, 4; (3) vers. 5; (4) vers. 6; (5) vv. 8-10; (6) vv. 11, 12; (7) vers. 13; (8) vers. 14; (9) vers. 15; (10) vers. 16; with a concluding formula in ch. xxi. xxiv., xxviii. xxix.

6. Ch. xxvi. 33-38. (1) vv. 23, 24; (2) ver. 25; (3) vv. 26, 27; (4) vv. 28; (5) vers. 29; (6) vers. 30; (7) vers. 31; (8) vers. 32, 33; (9) vers. 34; (10) vers. 35-37; the conclusion to the whole in ver. 38.

7. Ch. xxvii. 39-xxi. 2. (1) ver. 39; (2) vv. 40-42; (3) vers. 43; (4) vv. 44, 45; (5) vers. 46; (6) vv. 47-49; (7) vers. 50; (8) vers. 51, 52; (9) vers. 53; (10) vers. 54.

It will be observed that the above arrangement is only completed by omitting the latter part of ch. xxix., and the whole of ch. xxiv. But it is clear that ch. xxviiii. 33-44 is a later addition, containing further instructions respecting the Feast of Tabernacles. Ver. 39, as compared with ver. 34, shows that the same feast is referred to; whilst vv. 37, 38, are no less manifestly the original conclusion of the laws respecting the feasts which are enumerated in the previous part of the chapter. Ch. xxix., again, marks a peculiar character of its own. First, we have a command concerning the oil to be used in the lamps belonging to the Tabernacle, which is only a repetition of an enactment already given in Ex. xvi. 20, 21, which seems to be its natural place. Then follow directions about the shew-bread. These do not occur previously. In Ex. the shew-bread is spoken of always as a matter of course, consisting which no regulations are necessary (comp. Ex. xxx. xxxv. 13, xxxix. 36). Lastly, some certain enactments arising out of an historical occurrence. The son of an Egyptian father by an Israelitish woman blasphemes the name of Jehovah, and Moses is commanded to stone him in consequence: and this circumstance is the occasion of the following laws being given: (1.) That a blasphemer, whether Israelite or stranger, is to be stoned (comp. Ex. xxvii. 29). (2.) That he
leviticus

that kills any man shall surely be put to death (comp. Ex. xxi. 12-27). (3.) That he that kills a beast shall makr it good (not found where we might have expected it, in the series of laws Ex. xxi. 28-xxii. 6). (4.) That if a man cause a blush to be in his neighbour he shall be requited in like manner (comp. Ex. xxi. 22-25). (5.) We have then a repetition in an inverse order of vv. 17, 18; and (6.) the injunction that there shall be one law for the stranger and the Israelite. Finally, a brief notice of the infliction of the punishment in the case of the son of Shelomith, who blasphemed. Not another instance is to be found in the whole collection in which any historical circumstance is made the occasion of enacting a law. Then again the laws (2), (3), (4), (6), are mostly repetitions of existing laws, and seem here to have no connection with the event to which they are referred. Either therefore some other circumstances took place at the same time with which we are not acquainted, or these isolated laws, detached from their proper connection, were grouped together here, in obedience perhaps to some traditional association.

VI. The seven decalogues are now distinctly ensued by words of promise and threat—promise of largest, richest blessing to those that hearken unto and do these commandments; threats of utter destruction to those that break the commandment of their God. Thus the second great division of the Law closes like the first, except that the first part, or Book of the Covenant, ends (Ex. xxi. 20-33) with promises of blessing only. There nothing is said of the judgments which are to follow transgression, because as yet the Covenant had not been made. But when once the nation had freely entered into that covenant, they bound themselves to accept its sanctions, its penalties, as well as its rewards. And we cannot wonder if in these sanctions the punishment of transgression holds a larger place than the rewards of obedience. For already was it but too plain that "Israel would not obey." From the first they were a stiffnecked and rebellious race, and from the first the doom of disobedience hung like some fury sword above their heads.

VII. The legislation is evidently completed in the last words of the preceding chapter. These are not references and allusions and laws which Jehovah made between Him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses. Ch. xxvii. is a later appendix, again however closed by a similar form, which at least shows that the transcriber considered it to be an integral part of the original Mosaic legislation, though he might be at a loss to assign it its place. Herberc classes it with the other less regularly grouped laws at the beginning of the book of Numbers. He treats the section Lev. xvi.—Num. x. 10 as a series of supplements to the Sinaitic legislation.

Integrity. — This is very generally admitted. Those critics even who are in favor of different documents in the Pentateuch assign nearly the whole of this book to one writer, the Elohist, or author of the original document. According to Knobel the only portions which are not to be referred to the Elohist are Moses' rebuke of Aaron because the goat of the sin-offering had been burnt (x. 16-20); the group of laws in cc. xxvii.—xxxi.; certain additional enactments respecting the Sabbath and the Feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles (xxviii., part of ver. 2, from 27 to 29, and ver. 3, vv. 18, 19, 22, 33-41); the punishments ordained for blasphemy, murder, etc. (xxiv. 10-23); the directions respecting the Sabbatical year (xxv. 8-22), and the promises and warnings contained in ch. xxvi.

With regard to the section ec. xvi., xxii., he does not consider the whole of it to have been borrowed from the same sources. Ch. xvi. he believes was introduced here by the Jehovah from some ancient document, whilst he admits nevertheless that it contains certain Elohistic forms of expression, as, "all flesh," "all flesh," "all flesh," ex. 14; """"soul"" in the sense of "person"", "ex. 10; """"leat," ex. 13; """"offering," ex. 1; """"a sweet savour," ex. 6; """"a statute for ever," and """"after your generations," ex. 7. But it cannot be from the Elohist, he argues, because (c) it would have placed it after ch. xvi., or at least after ch. xv. (b) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (c) it would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in ex. 7; and lastly (d) the phraseology has something of the coloring of ec. xvi.—xxvi., which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to be entertained.

He observes further, that the chapter is not altogether Moses. The first enactment (ver. 1-7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, and holds good therefore for the time of Moses. But the remaining three contemplate the ease of strangers living amongst the people, and have a reference to all time.

Ec. xviii.—xx., though it has a hemoristic coloring, cannot have been originally from the Jehovah. The following peculiarities of language, which are worthy of notice, according to Knobel (Exod. und Levitcscn erklärt, in Kursi. com. Holm., 1851) forbid nowhere else in the O. T., """"lie down to"" and """"gender,"" xviii. 23, xix. 10, xx. 16; """"confusion," xviii. 23, xx. 12; """"grape," x. 10; """"near kinswomen," xviii. 17; """"soured," x. 20; """"free," ibid.; """"print marks," xix. 28; """"unceremonious," etc., as applied to fruit-trees, xix. 23; and """"born," xviii. 11, as well as the Egyptian word (for such it probably is) """"garment of divers sorts," which, however, does occur once beside in Deut. xxi. 11.

According to Bunsen, ch. xix. is a genuine part of the Israelite legislation, given however in its original form not on Sinai, but on the east side of the Jordan; whilst the general arrangement of the Mosaic laws may perhaps be as late as the time of the judges. He regards it as a very ancient document, based on the Two Tables, of which, and especially of the first, it is in fact an extension, and consisting of two decalogues and one penal part of laws. Certain expressions in it he considers imply that the people were already settled in the land (vv. 9, 10, 14, 15), while on the other hand ver. 23 supposes a future occupation of the land. Hence he

T. J. C.

*LEWD*, as used in Acts xvii. 5, signifies "wicked," "unprincipled" (σαρναπαί). The word is of Anglo-Saxon origin (wicde, people), and was employed to denote the common people, the laity, in distinction from the clergy. Though meaning at first no more than "by" or "unlearned" (comp. John vii. 49), it came at length to signify "sinful," "wicked." See Trench's Glossary of English Words, p. 110 f. (Amer. ed.). Its present restricted meaning is later than the date of the A. V. "Lewdness" (see Acts xviii. 14) has passed into like manner from a wider to a narrower sense.

H.

**LEWDNESS.** [LEWD.]

c vi. 18, 27; vii. 21; x. 3, 10; xi. 43, 45; xii. 21 (xvii. 21); xix. 2; xx. 7, 26.

c7.

In ec. νvii—xxv. observe the phrase, "I am Jehovah," "I am Jehovah your God." Latter part of xxv. and xxvi. somewhat changed, but recurring in xxvi. The reason given for this holiness, "I am holy," "I am Jehovah," "I am Jehovah your God."
LIBANUS

LIBANUS (Διαβατός), the Greek form of the name LIBNVS (1 Esdr. iv. 48, v. 55; 2 Esdr. iv. 29; Jud. i. 7; Ezech. xxiv. 13, 1 12). Anti-

LIBERTRINES (Αλβερτίναι: Libertini). This word occurs once only in the N. T. In Acts vi. 9, we find the opponents of Stephen's preaching described as "ticos των ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Διαβερτίναις καὶ Κορρίναις καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρεως καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κλαυσίας καὶ Λαύριας. The question is, who were these "Libertines," and in what relation did they stand to the others who are mentioned with them? The structure of the passage leaves it doubtful how many synagogues are implied in it. Some (t'akin, Beza, Bengel) have taken it as if there were but one synagogue, including men from all the different cities that are named. Winer (N. T. German. p. 179), on grammatical grounds, takes the repetition of the article as indicating a fresh group, and finds accordingly two synagogues, one including Libertines, Cynaeus, Alexandrians; the other those of Olbia and Asia. Meyer (ad loc.) thinks it unlikely that out of the 480 synagogues at Jerusalem (the number given by rabbinic writers, Megill. iv. 3, 4; Ketub. i. 105, 1), there should have been one, or even two only, for natives of cities and districts in which the Jewish population was so numerous, and on that ground assigns a separate synagogue to each of the proper names.

Of the name itself there have been several explanations. (1) The other name being local, this also has been referred to a town in Libyrium in the prosconsular province of Africa. This, it is said, would explain the close juxtaposition with Cyrene. Suidas recognizes Διαβερτίναι as θουαὶ θέρους, and in the Cornell of Carthage in 411 (Mastl. vol. iv. p. 265-274, quoted in Witsch, Handbuch der kirch. Geogr. § 96), we find an Episcopius Libertinensis (Simon, Omnium, N. T. p. 99; and Grégois, de Synag. Libert. Groning. 1736, in Winer, Realch.) Against this hypothesis it has been urged (1), that the existence of a town Libertum, in the first century, is not established; and (2) that if it existed, it can hardly have been important enough either to have a synagogue at Jerusalem for the Jews belonging to it, or to take precedence of Cyrene and Alexandrias in a synagogue common to the three. (2) Conjectural readings have been proposed, Διαβερτίναι (Leemenn, Beza, Terriers, Vulganae), Αλμήνων των κατὰ Κυρέφης (Schultes, de Chr. Sp. p. 162, in Meyer, ad loc.). The difficulty is thus removed; but every rule of textual criticism is against the reception of a reading unsupported by a single MS. or version.

(4.) Taking the word in its received meaning as a name of a town, Lightfoot finds in it a description of natives of Palestine, who, having fallen into slavery, had been manumitted by Jewish masters (Eer. on Acts vi. 9). In this case, however, it is hardly likely that a body of men so circumstances would have received a Roman name.

(4.) Grotius and Vitringa explain the word as describing Italian freedmen who had become converts to Judaism. In this case, however, the word "proscytes" would most probably have been used; and it is at least unlikely that a body of converts would have had a synagogue to themselves, or that proselytes from Italy would have been united with Jews from Cyrene and Alexandrias.

(5.) The earliest explanation of the word (Chrysot.) is also that which has been adopted by the most recent authorities (Winer, Realch., s. v.; Meyer, Kann. ad loc.). The Libertini are Jews who, having been taken prisoners by Pompey and other Roman generals in the Syrian wars, had been reduced to slavery, and had afterwards been emancipated, and returned, permanently or for a time, to the country of their fathers. Of the existence of a large body of Jews in this position at Rome we have abundant evidence. Under Tibertus, the Senatus-Consultum for the suppression of Egyptian and Jewish mysteries led to the banishment of 4,000 "libertini genera" to Sardinia, under the pretense of military or police duty, but really in the hope that the malaria of the island might be fatal to them. Others were to leave Italy unless they abandoned their religion (Tactit. Ann. xii. 88; comp. Josephus (Ant. xviii, 3, 5), narrating the same fact, speaks of the 4,000 who were sent to Sardinia as Jews, and thus identifies them with the "libertini genera" of Tacitus. Philo (Legat, ad Col. p. 1014, 4) in like manner says, that the greater part of the Jews of Rome were in the position of freedmen (παρελθενησαντες), and had been allowed by Augustus to settle in the Trans-Tiberine part of the city, and to follow their own religious customs unmolested (comp. Horace, Sat. i. 4, 143, i. 9, 70). The expulsion from Rome took place A. D. 19; and it is an ingenious conjecture of Mr. Humphry's (Comm. on Arts, ad loc.) that those who were thus banished from Italy may have found their way to Jerusalem, and that, as having suffered for the sake of their religion, they were likely to be foremost in the opposition to a teacher like Stephen, whom they looked on as impugning the sacredness of all that they most revered.

E. H. P.

LIBNAH (םיבנה) [Hebrew, splenial]: [Rav.] אֲבָדָת, אֲבָדָת, אֲבָדָת. [Leid. אֲבָדָת, אֲבָדָת. Vat. abs. אֲבָדָת.] עַם, עַמָּה. [See also] אֲבָדָת, אֲבָדָת. [Rav.] אֲבָדָת, אֲבָדָת. [Sin. in Is. xxvii. 8.] [Asa] אֲבָדָת: אֲבָדָת; אֲבָדָת; אֲבָדָת; אֲבָדָת. A city which lay in the northwestern part of the Arab Desert. It was taken by Joshua immediately after the rout of Beth-horon. That eventful day was ended by the capture and destruction of Makkedah (Josh. 11:1) in modern Jewish customs in the East. At Jerusalem, for example, the Jews, who are mostly of foreign origin, are divided into communities more or less distinct according to the countries from which they come, and they assemble for religious services in different synagogues. At Noel, also, in Galilee, where the Jews are somewhat numerous, they appropriate four of their synagogues to the Spanish and Arabian Jews, and four to the German and Polish Jews. H.

c Witsch gives no information beyond the fact just mentioned.
and then the host — "Joshua, and all Is-

rael with him." — moved on to Libnah, which was also totally destroyed, its king and all its inhabi-
tants (Josh. x. 20, 30, 32, 30, xii. 13). The next place is Beis-Lebah.8 Libnah belonged to the district of the Shefedeh, the maritime lowland of Judah, among the cities of which it is enumerated (Josh. xv. 42), not in close connection with either Makkedah or Lachish, but in an independent group of nine towns, among which are Keibah, Maresiah, and Nezib. Libnah was appropriated with its ter-
ritory to the priests (Josh. xxi. 13; 1 Chr. vi. 57). In the reign of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat it " revolted " from Judah at the same time with Edom (2 K. viii. 22; 2 Chr. xxi. 10); but, beyond the fact of their simultaneous occurrence, there is no apparent connection between the two events. On completing or relinquishing the siege of Lachish — which of the two is not quite certain — Sennacherib laid siege to Libnah (2 K. xix. 9; Is. xxxvii. 8). While there he was joined by Rab-
shakeh and the part of the army which had visited Jerusalem (2 K. xix. 8; Is. xxxvii. 8), and received the intelligence of Tirikah's approach; and it would appear that at Libnah the destruction of the Assyrian army took place, though the statements of Herodotus (II. 141) and of Josephus (Ant. x. 1, § 4) place it at Pelusium.9 (See Rawlinson, Herod. i. 48.)

It was the native place of Hanutal, or Hanitah, the queen of Josiah, and mother of Jehoashah (2 K. xxii. 31) and Zelekhiah (xxiv. 18; Jer. lii. 1). It is in this connection that its name appears for the last time in the Bible. Libnah is described by Eusebius and Jerome in the Onomasticon (c. v. A€&v and "Lebna") merely as a village of the district of Flentheropolis. Its site has hitherto escaped not only discovery, but, until lately, even conjecture. Professor Stanley (S. § of P. 307 note, 320 note), on the ground of the acquaintance of the name Libnah (white) with the "Blanchegare" of the Crusaders, and of both with the appearance of the place, would locate it at Tell es-Safjih, "a white-faced hill . . . which forms a conspicuous object in the eastern part of the plain," and is situated 5 miles N.W. of Beit- libnin. But Tell es-Safjih has claims to be identi-
fified with Gatt, which are considered under that head in this work. Van de Velde places it with confidence at Arric el-Menshejeh, a hill about 4 miles W. of Beit-libnin, on the ground of its being "the only site between Sumel (Makkedah) and Um Labjis (Lachish) showing an ancient for-
tified position." (Memoir, 330; in his Syria and Palestine it is not named). But as neither Um Labjis nor Sumel, especially the latter, are identi-
fied with certainty, the conjecture must be left for further exploration. One thing must not be over-
looked, that although Libnah is in the lists of Josh. xv. specified as being in the lowland, yet 3 of the 8 towns which form its group have been actually identified as situated among the mountains to the immediate S. and E. of Beil-libnin. — The name is also found in Shihor-Libnah. 10

LIB'NAH (linva) [white]: Lib'na; [Vat. M. -ren, exc. Ex. vi. 17:] Libni, and once, Num. iii. 18, Libni. 2. The eldest son of Gershon, the son of Levi (Ex. vi. 17; Num. iii. 18; Chr. vii. 19, 20), and ancestor of the family of the Lib-

nites. 2. [Vat. Lib'nes,]. The son of Mahli, or Mah-
hali, son of Merari (1 Chr. vi. 29), as the text at present stands. It is probable, however, that he is the same with the preceding, and that something has been omitted (comp. vv. 29 with 20, 42) [Mahli, 1.]

LIB'NITES, THE (linvii) [str. see above]: δ Λιβνιτες; [Vat. Lib'nes,]. Libni, Lib-

nites, etc., famili buses), the descendants of Libni, eldest son of Gershon, who formed one of the chief branches of the great Levitical family of Gershon-

ites (Num. iii. 21, xxvi. 58).

LIB'Y A ( λιβυα; [Libyi]) occurs only in Acts ii. 10; c in the phrase "the parts of Libya about Cyrene." (τα μερη της Λιβυας της κατα Κυρηνης) which obviously means the Cyre-

naica. Similar expressions are used by Dion Cas-

sius (Λιβυαν η περι Κυρηνης, lili. 12) and Josephus

a The sites of these have all been discovered, not in the land, as they are specified, but in the moun-
tains immediately to the south and east of Beil-libnin.8 The account of Berossus, quoted by Josephus (Ant. v. 1, § 61) is that the destruction took place when San-

nacherib had reached Jerusalem, after his Egyptian ex-

pedition, on the first night of the siege. His words ἤτοι ἤτοι των κορωνων αυτων, τον τοιχον και τα τειχη, των της τελωνης και πασας δειπονοιας, etc. Professor Stanley, on the other hand, inclines to agree with the Jewish tradition, which places the event in the pass of Beth-horon, and therefore on the road be-
tween Libnah and Jerusalem (S. § of P. 307 note).

b The A. V. has "Liby" for λιβυα in Exk.

xxx. 5, and xxxviii. 5.
LIBYANS

* LIBYANS (λιβύνοι). A: Bases: Lighter. A. V. Pan. vi. 44, should be Libum. In Jer. xvi. 9 it should be Pura (λίβυνοι; Libye).

LICE (λίκης, λίκες, λίκειον, chinium, chinun; σκινίδες, σκινίν: σκινίφες, σκινίφτης). This word occurs in the A. V. only in Ex. vii. 16, 17, 18, and in Ps. xxv. 31: both of which passages have reference to the third great plague of Egypt. In Exodus the miracle is recorded, while in the Psalm grateful remembrance of its issue. The Hebrew word shoph stands which, with some slight variation, occurs only in Ex. vii. 16, 17, 18, and in Ps. xxv. 31—has given occasion to whole pages of discussion: some commentators—amongst whom may be cited Michaelis (Suppl. s. v.), Oehleram (in Verzeich. Samen. i. v. p. 89), Rosenmuller (Schol. in Ex. vii. 12), Haremberg (Obs. Crit. de λίκης, in Mi.ell. Lipp. Nov. vol. ii. pt. iv. p. 617), Dr. Geelbrot (Crit. Rev. Ex. vii. 17), Dr. Harris (Var. Hist. of Bible), to which is to be added the authority of Philo (De Vit. Mos. ii. 97, ed. Magne) and Origen (Hom. Temp. in Exod.), and indeed modern writers generally—suppose that gnats are the animals intended by the original word; while, on the other hand, the Jewish halakha, Josephus (Ant. ii. 14, § 3), Bochart (Hier. iii. 457, ed. Rosenm. Montanus, Munster (Crit. Soc. in Ex. viii. 12), Bryant (Plagues of Egypt, p. 56), and Dr. Adam Clarke are in favor of the translation of the A. V. The old versions, the Chaldee paraphrase, the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, the Syriac, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Arabic, are claimed by Bochart as supporting the opinion that lice are here intended. Another writer believes he can identify the chinun with some worm-like creatures (perhaps some kind of Scorpiones) called ventures, mentioned in V enus’s account of the expedition of Richard I. into the Holy Land, and which by their bites during the night-time occasioned extreme pain (Harmer’s Observ. Chrik’s ed. iii. 549).

With regard to this last theory it may fairly be said that, as it has not a word of proof or authority to support it, it may at once be rejected as fanciful. Those who believe that the plague was one of gnats or monyphids appear to ground their opinion solely on the authority of the LXX., or rather on the interpretation of the Greek word σκινίδες, as given by Philo (De Vit. Mos. ii. 97) and Origen (Hom. Hl. in Exodum). The advocates of the other theory, that lice are the animals meant by chinun and monyph, base their arguments upon these facts: (1) because the chinum sprang from the dust, whereas gnats come from the waters; (2) because gnats, though they may greatly irritate men and beasts, cannot properly be said to be “in” them; (3) because their name is derived from a root b which signifies “to establish,” or “to fix,” which cannot be said of gnats; (4) because if gnats are intended, then the fourth plague of ills would be more likely anticipated; (5) because the Talmudists use the word chinun in the singular number to mean a house; as it is said in the Tentsize on the Sabbath, “As is the man who slays a camel on the Sabbath, so is he who slays a house on the Sabbath.”

Let us examine these arguments as briefly as possible. First, the LXX. has been quoted as a direct proof that chinum means gnats; and certainly in such a matter as this the one before us it is almost impossible to exaggerate the authority of the translators, who dwelt in Egypt, and therefore must be considered good authorities on this subject. But is it quite clear that the Greek word they made use of has so limited a signification? Does the Greek σκινίδες or σκινίφ mean a gnat? Let the reader, however, read carefully the passages quoted in the foot-notes, and he will see at once that at any rate there is very considerable doubt whether any one particular animal is denoted by the Greek word. In the few passages where it occurs in Greek authors the word seems to point in some instances clearly enough to the well-known pests of field and garden, the plant-louse or aphides. By the ινετίς γάρ, the proverb referred to in the note, is very likely meant one of these small active jumping insects, common under leaves and under the bark of trees, known to entomologists by the name of spring-tails (Pneumolites). The Greek lexicographers, having the derivation of the word in view, generally define it to be some small worm-like creature that eats away wood; if they used the

---

a Considerable doubt has been entertained by some scholars as to the origin of the word. See the remarks of Gen. and Furst.

b Λίκες. But see Ges. Thes. s. v. p. 12.

c De Sibb. cap. 14, fol. 167, b.

d σκινίδες, σκινίφοι, και τα τρειτρόπνην ανα και κεφάλιν, και καρπονα και σκινίδον. Hesych. Ex. s. v.

e καινίδες, καινίφοι, ή τρειτρόπνην το καρπον. Hesych. Ex. s. v.

Phryn. Lab. i. 490. Plat. ii. 230, B.

Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. ii. cap. ult.) speaks of σκινίδες, and calls them worms. Dioscorides (De Ura) speaks of the well-known visual secretion on the leaves of plants and trees, and says that when this moisture is dried up, animals like gnats appear (σκινίδες κατασκινίδες). In another place (v. 181) he calls them κυμαλοικα. No doubt plant-louse-like are meant. Aristides (ii. 9) speaks of σκινίδες, by which word he clearly means plant-louse, or aphides. Aristophanes speaks of the same class of insects (aphides) with σκινίδοι (gall-blies), and speaks of them as injuring the young shoots of the vines (Arv. p. 257). Aristotle (Hist. An. viii. 3, § 9) speaks of a bird, ωοντήρες, which he terms κυμαλος. Linnæus says they are for the most part taken on the wing: but the sceni here alluded to are doubtless the various kinds of ants, bees, aphides, psamidias, coriace, coronula, etc., etc. which are found on the leaves and under the bark of trees.

---
LICE

term winged the winged aphid is most likely intended, and perhaps veroniculax may sometimes refer to the wingless individual. Because, however, the lexicons occasionally say that the gnats are like a gnat (the "green and wing-flown insect" of Herod. ii. 37), many commentators have come to the hasty conclusion that some species of gnat is denoted by the Greek term; but resemblance by no means constitutes identity, and it will be seen that this insect, the aphid, even though it be winged, is far more closely allied to the wingless house (pediculus) than it is to the gnat, or to any species of the family Culicidae; for the term lice, as applied to the various kinds of rhipides (Phytophthirax, as is their appropriate scientific name), is by no means merely one of analogy. The wingless aphid is in appearance somewhat similar to the pediculus; and indeed a great authority, Barmerste, arranges the Anomala, the order to which the pediculus belongs, with the Rhipides, which contains the sub-order Homoptera, to which the aphides belong. Hence, by an appropriate transfer, the same word which in Arabic means pediculus is applied in one of its significations to the "thistle black with plant-lice." Every one who has observed the thistles of this country black with the peculiar species that infests them can see the force of the meaning assigned to it in the Arabic language.*

Again, almost all the passages where the Greek words lice speak of the animal, be it what it may, as being injurious to plants or trees; it cannot therefore be applied in a restricted sense to any gnat (culex or simulium), for the Culicidae are eminently blood-suckers, not vegetable-feeders.b

Oedermann (Propisch. Studiun, i. ch. vi.) is of opinion that the species of mosquito denoted by the chironax is probably some minute kind allied to the Culex reptans, c. pulicris of Linnaeus. That such an insect might have been the instrument God made use of in the third plague with which He visited the Egyptians is readily granted, so far as the irritating powers of the creature are concerned, for the members of the genus Simulium (sand-fly) are a terrible pest in those localities where they abound. But no proof at all can be brought forward in support of this theory.

Bryant, in illustrating the propriety of the plague being one of lice, has the following very just remarks: "The Egyptians affected great external purity, and were very nice both in their persons and clothing... Uncommon care was taken not to harbor any vermin. They were particularly solicitous on this head; thinking it would be a great profanation of the temple which they entered if any animalcule of this sort were concealed in their garments." And we learn from Herodotus that so scrupulous were the priests on this point

that they used to shave the hair off their heads and bodies every third day for fear of harboring any house while occupied in their sacred duties (Herod. ii. 37). "We may hence see what an abhorrence the Egyptians showed towards this sort of vermin, and that the judgments inflicted by the hand of Moses were adapted to their prejudices." (Bryant's Observations, etc., p. 56).

The evidence of the old versions, adduced by Bochart in support of his opinion, has been called in question by Rosenmüller and Gildes, who will not allow that the words used by the Syriacs, the Chaldees, and the Arabic versions, as the representatives of the sacred versions of the Hebrew chironax, can properly be translated lice; but the interpretations which they themselves allow to these words apply better to lice than to gants; and it is almost certain that the normal meaning of the words in all these three versions, and indisputably in the Arabic, applies to lice. It is readily granted that some of the arguments brought forward by Bochart (Hier. iii. 437, ed. Rosenm.) and his commentators are unanswerable. As the plague was certainly an irritation, nothing can be deduced from the assertion made that the chironax sprang from the dust; neither is Bochart's derivation of the Hebrew word accepted by scholars generally. Much force however is contained in the Talmudical use of the word chironax, to express a house, though Gesenius asserts that nothing can be adduced thence.

On the whole, therefore, this much appears certain, that those commentators who assert that chironax means gants have arrived at this conclusion without sufficient authority; they have based their arguments solely on the evidence of the LXX., though it is by no means proved that the Greek word used by these translators has any reference to gants; the Greek word, which probably originally denoted any small irritating creature, being derived from a root which means to bite, to gnaw, was used in this general sense, and selected by the LXX. translators to express the original word, which has an origin kindred to that of the Greek word, but the precise meaning of which they did not know. They had in view the derivation of the Hebrew term chironax, from charrad, "to gnaw," and most appropriately rendered it by the Greek word knv, from knw, "to gnaw." It appears therefore that there is not sufficient authority for departing from the translation of the A. V., which renders the Hebrew word by lice; and as it is supported by the evidence of many of the old versions, it is best to rest contented with it. At any rate the point is still open, and no hasty conclusion can be adopted concerning it.

W. H.

LIEUTENANTS ((!(zv-wtvwJ)). The use of the term was restricted to it by the LXX. translators. It has been shown, from the quotations given above, that the Greek word has a wide signification: it is an aphid, a worm, a flea, or a spring-tail—in fact any small insect-like animal that bites and all therefore that should legitimately be deduced from the words and that two writers in that instance to some irritating winged insect a term which, from its derivation, so appropriately describes its irritating properties. Their insect seems to refer to some species of midge (Ceratopogon).

c. If the LXX. understood gnats by the Hebrew term, why did not these translators use some well-known Greek name for gnats, as onowj or e? A
Hebrew *achashveiroshan* was the official title of the *satrap* or viceroy who governed the provinces of the Persian empire; it is rendered "lieutenant" in Keth. iii. 12, viii. 9, ix. 3; Ezr. viii. 36, and "prince" in Dan. iii. 2, vi. 1, &c. W. L. B.

**LIGN ALOES.**

**Ligure (λιγόρη, leshem: λεγόρις: Abk. ἀργύριον: lyciuris).** A precious stone mentioned in Ex. xxvii. 19, xxxix. 12, as the first in the third row of the high-priest's breastplate. "And the third row, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst." It is impossible to say, with any certainty, what stone is denoted by the Hebrew term. The LXX. version generally, the Vulgate and Josephus (B. J. v. 5, § 7), understand the *liycurium* or *lycium*; but it is a matter of considerable difficulty to identify the *liycurium* of the ancients with any known precious stone. Dr. Woodward and some old commentators have supposed that it was some kind of beryl, because, as these fossils consist of beryl-like particles, they have thought that they have been able to detect, upon heating or rubbing pieces of them, the absurd origin which Theophrastus (Frag. ii. 28, 31, xv. 2, ed. Schneider) and Pliny (H. N. xxxvii. iii.) ascribe to the *lycium*. Others have imagined that amber is denoted by this word; but Theophrastus, in the passage cited above, has given a detailed description of the stone, and clearly distinguishes it from *electrum*, or amber. Amber, moreover, is too soft for engraving upon; while the *lycurium* was a hard stone, out of which seals were made. Another interpretation seeks the origin of the word in the country of Liguria (Genoa), where the stone was found, but makes no attempt at identification. Others again, without reason, suppose the word to be meant (Rosenmüller. *Schr. in Ex. xxvii. 19*).

Dr. Watson (Phil. Trans. vol. iv. p. 391) identifies it with the *tourmalie*. Beckmann (Hist. Juxta. i. 87, Bohn) believes, with Braun, Ephraimius, and J. de Laet, that the description of the *lycurium* agrees well with the *lycurium* stone of modern mineralogists. With this supposition Hill (Notes on Theophrastus on Stones, p. 50, note 161) and Rosenmüller (Mineral. of Bibl., p. 56, Bib. Cod.) agree. It must be confessed, however, that this opinion is far from satisfactory, for there is the following difficulty in the identification of the *lycurium* with the *lycurium*. Theophrastus, speaking of the properties of the *lycurium*, says that it attracts not only particles of wood, but fragments of iron and brass. Now there is no peculiar attractive power in the hyacinth; nor is Beckmann's explanation of this point sufficient. He says: "If we consider its [the *lycurium's"] attracting of small bodies in the same manner as our hyacinth in common with all stones of the glassy species, I cannot see anything to controvert this opinion, and to induce us to believe the *lycurium* and the *tourmalie* to be the same." But surely the *lycurium*, what ever it be, had in a marked manner *magmatic properties;* indeed, the term was applied to the stone on this very account, for the Greek name *lycurion* appears to be derived from *lyceies* (λυκής), "to lick," "to attract," and doubtless was selected by the LXX. translators for this reason to express the Hebrew word, which has a similar derivation. More probable, though still inconclusive, appears the opinion of those who identify the *lycurium* with the *tourmalie*, or more definitely with the red variety known as *rubellite*, which is a hard stone and used as a gem, and sometimes sold for red *sapphire*. Theophrastus becomes, as is well known, electrically polar when heated. Beckmann's objection, that "had Theophrastus been acquainted with the *tourmalie*, he would have remarked that it did not acquire its attractive power till it was heated," is answered by his own admission on the passage, quoted from the *Histoire de l'Académie* for 1717, p. 7 (see Beckmann, i. 91).

Tourmalie is a mineral found in many parts of the world. The Duke de Nova purchased two of these stones in Holland, which are there called aschentrichter. Linnæus, in his preface to the *Flora Zeylanica*, mentions the stone under the name of *boja electrica* from Ceylon. The natives call it *tourmalie* ([Phil. Trans. in loc. cit.]). Many of the precious stones which were in the possession of the Isaraélites during their wanderings were no doubt obtained from the Egyptians, who might have procured from the Tyrian merchants specimens from even India and Ceylon, etc. The fine specimen of *rubellite* now in the British Museum belonged formerly to the King of Ava.

The word *ligure* is unknown in modern mineralogy. Phillips (Mineral. 87) mentions *ligure*, the fragments of which are meven and transparent, with a vitreous lustre. It occurs in a sort of talcose rock in the banks of a river in the Apennines. The claim of *rubellite* to be the *leshem* of Scripture is very uncertain, but it is perhaps better than that of the other minerals which writers have from time to time endeavored to identify with it.

**W. H.**

**LIKHI (לִֽיקְהִי, [learned]: Ληδίς; [Vat. Ληκεία], Alex. Ληκεία: Levi), a Manassite, son of Shemida, the son of Manasseh (1 Chr. vii. 19).**

* LIKING (A. V.), as a noun, means "condition," Job xxxix. 14: "Their young ones are in good liking;" and as a participle (נִלָּקֵי), "conditioned" (Dan. i. 10): "Why should he see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort?" H.

**LILY (לִילָֽי, shakhen, לִילָֽה, šakhanah šephôn, Matt. vii. 28, 29).** The Hebrew word is rendered "rose" in the Chaldee Tarague, and by Mozaisamer and other rabbinical writers, with the exception of Kimchi and Ben Melech, who in 1 K. vii. 19 translated it by "violet." In the Indian

---

a The LXX. give ἀργυρίῳ or ἀργυρίον, and ·έρως, the Vulgate *lithargyrum* and *principis*. Both the Hebrew and the Greek words are modifications of the same Sanskrit root: but philologists are not agreed as to the form or meaning of the word. Gesenius (Diss. p. 71) adopts the opinion of Von Bohlen that it comes from *kotarpito*, meaning "warror of the host." Pott (*Rhetor. Graec. Prod. p. 65*) associates other derivations more in consonance with the position of the *satrap* as arris or than military rulers.
Spanish version of the Canticles, *shâbhin* and *shôshanâh* are always translated by *ros*; but in Hos. xiv. 5 the latter is rendered *lilin*. But *krînô* or "lily," is the uniform rendering of the LXX, and is in all probability the true one, as it is supported by the analogy of the Arabic and Persian *susan*, which has the same meaning to this day, and by the existence of the same word in Syrian and Coptic. The Spanish *azucena*, a "white lily," is merely a modification of the Arabic.

But although there is little doubt that the word denotes some plant of the lily species, it is by no means certain what individual of this class it especially designates. Father Soucé (Recueil de doc. crit. 1715) labored to prove that the lily of Scripture is the "craven-imperial," the Persian *tastît*, the *krînô* *basâlik* of the Greeks, and the *Fritillaria imperialis* of Linnaus. So common was this plant in Persia, that it is supposed to have given its name to Susa, the capital (Athn. xii. 1: Bochart, Platyg. ii. 14). But there is no proof that it was at any time common in Palestine, and "the lily" *per excellence* of Persia would not of necessity be "the lily" of the Holy Land. Dioscorides (l. 62) bears witness to the beauty of the lilies of Syria and Fisidia, from which the best perfume was made. He says (ill. 106 [116]) of the *krînô* *basâlik* that the Syrians call it *côsa* (*shushan*), and the Africans *âdâblâbun*, which Bochart renders in Hebrew characters פֶלֶּט פֶלֶּט, "white shoot."

Kühn, in his note on the passage, identifies the plant in question with the *Lilium candidum* of Linnaeus. It is probably the same as that called in the Mishnah "king's lily" (Kid. v. 8). Pliny (xxi. 5) defines *krînô* as "rubens lillium;" and Dioscorides, in another passage, mentions the fact that there are lilies with purple flowers; but whether by this he intended the *Lilium Martagon* or *Chelidonium*, Kühn leaves undecided. Now in the passage of Athenæus above quoted it is said, *Σώρον γάρ ἐναι τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ φωνῇ τὸ κρίνῳ*. But in the *Rhetoricianus* *Lilium* (s. v. *Σώρον*) we find τὸ γάρ λεύκω ὑπὸ τῶν Φώκων σοφών εὐχων εὐχων.* As the *shushan* is thus identified both with *krînô*, the red or purple lily, and with *lêpînô*, the white lily, it is evidently impossible from the word itself to ascertain exactly the kind of lily which is referred to. If the *shushan* or *shinkhun* of the O. T. and the *krînô* of the Sermon on the Mount be identical, which there seems no reason to doubt, the plant designated by these terms must have been a conspicuous object on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret (Matt. vi. 28; Luke xii. 27); it must have flourished in the deep broad valleys of Palestine (Cant. ii. 1), among the thorny shrubs (ibid. ii. 2), and pastures of the desert (ibid. ii. 16, iv. 5, vi. 3); and must have been remarkable for its rapid and luxuriant growth (Hos. xiv. 5; Ecclus. xxxix. 14). That its flowers were brilliant in color would seem to be indicated in Matt. vi. 28, where it is compared with the gorgeous robes of Solomon; and that this color was scarlet or purple is implied in Cant. v. 13.2 A There appears to be no species of lily

which so completely answers all these requirements as the *Lilium Chelidonium*, or Scarlet Martagon, which grows in profusion in the Levant. But direct evidence on the point is still to be desired from the observation of travellers. We have, however, a letter from Dr. Bowring, referred to (Gard. Chron. ii. 534), in which, under the name of *Lilia Spicata*, Lindley identifies with the *L. Chelidonium* a flower which is "abundant in the district of Galilee" in the months of April and May. Sprangel (Ant. Bot. Spec. i. 9) identifies the Greek *krînô* with the *L. Martagon*.

With regard to the other plants which have been identified with the *shushan*, the difficulties are many and great. Gesenius derives the word from a root signifying "to be white," and it has hence been inferred that the *shushan* is the white lily. But it is by no means certain that the *Lilium candidum* grows wild in Palestine, though a specimen was found by Forskål at Zamulak in Arabia Felix.5 Dr. Boitoe (Kitto's Cyclop. art. "Shushan") identifies the "lily" of the Canticles with the *lily* of Egypt, in spite of the many allusions to "feeding among the lilies." The purple flowers of the *khôb*, or wild arborite, which abounds in the plain north of Tabor and in the Valley of Esdraelon, have been thought by some to be the "lilies of the field" alluded to in Matt. vi. 28 (Wilson, *Levili of the Bible*, ii. 110). A recent traveller mentions a plant, with lily flowers like the hyacinth, and called by the Arabs *wassik*, which he considered to be of the species denominated lily in Scripture (Bonar, *Desert of Sinai*, p. 239). Lynch enumerates the "lily" as among the plants seen by him on the shores of the Dead Sea, but gives no details which could lead to its identification (*Leyden to Jordan*, p. 286). He had previously observed the water-lily on the Jordan (p. 173), but omits to mention whether it was the yellow (*Nymphae later*) or the special mention of the *L. candidum* growing in Palestine; and in connection with the habitat given by Stram it is worth observing that the lily is mentioned in *Ant. ii. 1* with the rose of Sharon. Now let this be compared with Jerome's *Comment. at Is* xxxii. 9: "Saron omnis juxta Jupon Lydiamque appellatui regio in qua lietstini campi fertilesque tenduntur." W. H.
white (Nymphaea alba). "The only lilies which I saw in Palestine," says Prof. Stanley, "in the months of March and April, were large yellow water-lilies, in the clear spring of 'Ain Melhah, near the Lake of Merom" (S. of P. p. 129). He suggests that the name "lily," "may include the numerous flowers of the tulip or amaryllis kind, which appear in the early summer, or the autumn of Palestine." The following description of the Hülhe-lily by Dr. Thomson (The Land and the Book, i. 394) were it more precise, would perhaps have enabled botanists to identify it: "This Hülhe-lily is very large, and the three inner petals next above and form a gorgeous canopy, such as art never approached, and king never sat under, even in his utmost glory. . . . We call it Hülhe-lily, because it was here that it was first discovered.

Lilium candidum.

its botanical name, if it have one, I am unacquainted with. . . . Our flower delights most in the valleys, but is also found on the mountains. It grows among thorns, and I have easily located my hands in extricating it from them. Nothing can be in higher contrast than the luxuriant velvety softness of this lily, and the crinkled tangled hedge of thorns about it. Gazelles still delight to feed among them; and you can scarcely ride through the woods north of Tabor, where these lilies abound, without frightening them from their flowery pastures. If some future traveller would give a description of the Hülhe-lily somewhat less vague than the above, the question might be at once resolved. [PALESTINE — BOTANY.]

The Phcenician architects of Solomon's temple decorated the capitals of the columns with "lily-work," that is, with leaves and flowers of the lily (1 K. vii., corresponding to the loto-headed capitals of Egyptian architecture. The rim of the "bouquet" was possibly wrought in the form of the recurved margin of a lily flower (1 K. vii. 26). whether the shekhowna and sheboun mentioned in the titles of Ps. xlv., lxx., lxxv., and lxxv. were musical instruments in the form of lilies, or whether the word denoted a musical air, will be discussed under the article Shoshannim. W. A. W.

The description in Matt. vi. 28—30 implies that this plant was familiar to Christ's hearers. This consideration would at once exclude Lilium candidum, which, if found at all in Syria and Palestine, must be extremely rare, and probably only as escaped from cultivation.

It is impossible also that any of the water-lilies could be intended, as the lilies mentioned grew in the field.

The requirements of the text are the following:

(1) A plant of the order Liliaceae or one of the allied orders of Trillaeae or Amaryllidaceae. Any plant which would be vulgarly called a lily would suit the case, inasmuch as we are not to imagine language used here in the accurate style of a botanist.

(2) It must be a plant growing in the fields, with a stem of sufficient size and solidity to be an element of the fuel of the brazier or oriental oven. It is customary in the East to gather out the ears and various flowering plants from among the wheat, before the time of harvest, and to bind them in bundles, and either to feed them to the cattle, or burn them in the oven. The lily mentioned must be of this character, in order to suit the narrative.

(3) It must be a plant of rich colored flowers, probably purple, inasmuch as this color would better suit the comparison with the colors of royal garments.

There are several plants which have been supposed to represent the lily, which we can eliminate by the above tests. Lilium candidum has been already excluded. Anemono coronaria, with its two varieties of red and purple flowers, has been described as the plant in question. But in the first place it is the most distant possible from the lilies, being of the family of the Rutaceae. In the second place it is a low herbaceous plant, not occurring so much among wheat as in open grassy places, by roadsides. It has no stem, and is not gathered for the ovens. It is common enough, but for the two reasons mentioned is quite inadmissible.

The remaining hypotheses may all be grouped into one class. They consist in assuming one of the plants of the above named orders to be the plant here designated. Some have supposed the Lilium Chelidonioideum. Others have supposed the great Iris of the Hülhe, which Dr. Thomson calls the Hülhe lily. Others still have endeavored to prove the claims of others of these natural orders.

My own opinion is, that the term "lily" here is general, and that it does not refer to any species exclusively. There are several fine plants of these orders which are found more or less disflained through Palestine, as Tulipae orientales, Lilium Chelidonioideum, Iris reticulata, and others of that genus, and last, but not least likely to have been before the eyes and in the minds of the hearers of the sermon on the Mount, Gladiolus Hyoscire. Indeed, if any one species more than another be designated, I incline to think that this is the one.

This plant is a showy species, growing to a height of two or three feet, among the wheat and barley. It has a redly stem, and a large raceme of purple flowers, an inch and a half broad when open, and it is a sufficiently striking and showy flower to have been the subject of the comparison. Moreover, it is one of those wild plants which are constantly plucked up with the other weeds, and fed to cattle, or burned in the fire.

Still I incline to think that the Saviour, in speaking of the lilies, used the term in the same general way that an inhabitant of the Middle States would
peak of wild lilies, in allusion to their bright colors, not particularly designating, or perhaps not being aware of the specific differences of the individuals of the genus. He might have seen a lily, and been struck with its beauty, and used that quality to illustrate his speech, without knowing whether he had seen Gilia stand employed as captives or as lilies. Nay, he might have seen an Ergobro-

N E, or a Gladiola, and called them lilies. Or he might have drawn his illustration from the combined impression produced on his mind by all the species and general names. I conceive the latter to have been the case in the Sermon on the Mount.

G. E. P.

LIME (LAM). Acole. This substance is noticed only three times in the Bible, namely, in Deut. xxvii. 2, 4, where it is ordered to be laid on the great stones wherein the law was to be written (A. V. "thou shalt plaster them with plaster"); in Is. xxxiii. 12, where the "burnings of lime" are figuratively used to express " complete destruc-
tion," and in Am. ii. 11, where the prophet describes the outrage committed on the memory of the king of Edom by the Moabites, when they took his bones and burned them into "line," i. e. calcined them—an indignity of which we have another in-
stance in 2 K. xxi. 16. That the Jews were ac-

quisitied with the use of the lime-kiln, has been already noticed. [Furnace.] W. L. B.

LINEN. Several Hebrew words are so rendered, which in some passages admit of a closer discrimination. In addition to the ordinary applic-
ations it often denotes a line or cord used for mea-
sur ing purposes, as 174 and 177, 1 K. vii. 22; 2 K.
xxiii. 13, 6 c.; 57, Ps. lxxviii. 55 (56); Am. vii.
17; Is. xiv. 13, where the A. V. has "rule," but in this last passage 174 is probably "graver," "style", "not line" as in A. V. A peculiar use of the measuring line occurs in 2 Sam. viii. 2 (where the word is 174). David, after a signal victory over the Moabites, who appear to have given him special provocation, put to death two thirds of his captives and spared one third. He required them to be down on the ground, and then with a line mea-
sured them off after that proportion. The line as employed for measuring, by a frequent metonymy stands often for lot, possession, or inheritance (as 174 in Jos. xvii. 14, xix. 9; Ps. xvi. 5 (6); Ezek. xlvii. 13 ff.). The sense of "their line" (174), i. e. of the heavens in Ps. xix. 5 (5), is uncertain. In this highly poetical passage it may well enough denote the expense of or expenditure on which the heavens measure off as they bend over all the earth, through-out which is to be heard the proclamation which they make of God's existence and attributes. So Hippelet (Die Psalmen, i. 410), who agrees here with Hengstenberg (Die Psalmen, i. 440 f.). Paul's citation of the passage (Rom. x. 18) follows the LXX. which has φιλογένος, "a sound" (A. V.), as from the strings of a lyre. By "plumb-line" 174, only Am. vii. 7, (twice) is usually under-
stood a line with lead attached to it for determining the perpendicularity of objects. Jehovah, as repre-
ented there by the prophet, stands on a straight-
line wall with a line in his hand, as a symbol of the strict justice with which He will call his people to account for their sins (see Baur, Der

Prophet Amos, p. 407, and Keil, Die 12 kleinere

Propheten, p. 221). The proper rendering of
174, Gen. xxxviii. 18, is line or cord (in the A. V. "bracelets"), by which the signet-ring was attached to the neck. See Conant, Genesis, etc. p. 160. The literal and metaphorical senses blend themselves in Paul's expression (ἐν ἀλάτισσα κορώνα), 2 Cor. x. 16, i. e. another line or sphere of labor allotted to him by God's providence.

LINEN. Five different Hebrew words are thus rendered, and it is difficult to assign to each its precise significance. With regard to the Greek words so translated in the N. T. there is less ambiguity.

1. As Egypt was the great centre of the linen manufacture of antiquity, it is in connection with that country that we find the first allusion to it in the Bible. Joseph, when promoted to the dignity of ruler of the land of Egypt, was arrayed in "vestures of fine linen" (shēsh), marg. "silk," Gen. xli. 42); and among the offerings for the tabernacle of the things which the Israelites had brought out of Egypt were "purple, and blue, and fine twined linen" (Ex. xxvii. 6, xxvi. 5). Of twisted threads of this material were composed the ten embroidered hangings of the tabernacle (Ex. xxvi.

1), the vail which separated the holy place from the holy of holies (Ex. xxvii. 31), and the curtain for the entrance (ver. 36), wrought with needle-

work. The ephod of the high-priest, with its "curious," or embroidered girdle, and the breast-

plate of judgment, were of "fine twined linen" (Ex. xxviii. 6, 15). Of fine linen woven in checker-work were made the high-priest's tunic and mitre (Ex. xxviii. 39). The tunics, turbans, and drawers of the inferior priests (Ex. xxxix. 27, 28) are simply described as of woven work of fine linen.

2. But in Ex. xxviii. 42, and Lev. vi. 10, the drawers of the priests and their flowing robes are said to be of "linen" (bad) and the tunic of the high-priest, his girdle, and mitre, which he wore on the day of atonement, were made of the same material (Lev. xvi. 4). Conant (De Reg. Hebr. ii. c. i.) maintained that the robes worn by the high-priest throughout the year, which are called by the Talmudists "the golden vestments," were thus named because they were made of a more valuable kind of linen (shēsh) than that of which "white vestments," worn only on the day of atone-

ment, were composed (bad). But in the Mishna (Cod. Joma, iii. 7) it is said that the dress worn by the high-priest on the morning of the day of atonement was of linen of Pefusium, that is, of the finest description. In the evening of the same day he wore garments of Indian linen, which was less costly than the Egyptian. From a comparison of Ex. xxviii. 42 with xxxix. 28, it seems clear that bad and shēsh were synonymous, or, if there be any difference between them, the latter probably de-
notes the spun threads, while the former is the linen woven from them. Maimonides (Cele hom-
imkibot, c. 8) considered them as identical with regard to the material of which they were composed, for he says, "wherever in the Law bad or shēsh are mentioned, they signify flax, that is, byssus." And Abbaranel (on Ex. xxvii.) defines shēsh to be Egyptian flax, and distinguishes it as
composed of six (Heb. šākēḥ, = six) threads twisted together, from bōd, which was single. But in opposition to this may be quoted Ex. xxxix. 28, where the drawers of the priests are said to be linen (bōd) or fine twined linen (šākēḥ). The wise-hearted among the women of the congregation spun the flax which was used by Bezaleel and Aholin for the hangings of the tabernacle (Ex. xxxv. 25), and the making of linen was one of the occupations of women of whose dress it forms an insipid part (Prov. xxxi. 22, A. V. "silks," Ex. xxxix. 10, 13; comp. Rev. xvi. 16). In Ez. xxvii. 7 šākēḥ is enumerated among the products of Egypt, which the Tyrians imported and used for the sails of their ships; and the vessel constructed for Tidoney Philopator is said by Athenæus to have had a sail of bōsus (βοσῦν ἔχων ἱστόν, Deipn. i. 27. 1). Hermippus (quoted by Athenæus) describes Egypt as the great emporium for sails—

"Ex 8 Ἀληθεύτω τὰ κηρύσσατα ἱστία καὶ βηθανάω.

Cleopatra's galley at the battle of Actium had a sail of purple canvas (Plin. xix. 5). The ephebōn worn by the priests (1 Sam. xxii. 18), by Samuel, though he was a Levite (1 Sam. ii. 18), and by David when he danced before the ark (2 Sam. vi. 14; 1 Chr. xxv. 27), were all of linen (bōd). The man whom Daniel saw in vision by the river Hiddekel was clothed in linen (bōd, Dan. x. 5, xii. 6, 7; comp. Matt. xxviii. 3). In no case was linen used for other than a dress worn in religious ceremonies, though the other terms rendered "linen" are applied to the ordinary dress of women and persons in high rank.

3. Bōtēs, always translated "fine linen" except 2 Chr. v. 12, is apparently a late word, and probably the same with the Greek βατος, by which it is represented by the LXX. It was used for the dresses of the Levite choir in the temple (2 Chr. v. 12), for the loose upper garment worn by kings over the close-fitting tunics (1 Chr. xxv. 27), and for the veil of the Temple, embroidered by the skill of the Tyrian artificers (2 Chr. iii. 14). Morelacci was arrayed in robes of fine linen (bōtēs) and purple (Esth. viii. 15) when honored by the Persian king, and the dress of the rich man in the parable was purple and fine linen (βατος καὶ λευκός, Luke xvi. 19). The Tyrians were celebrated for their skill in linen-embroidery (2 Chr. ii. 14), and the house of Ashbeh, a family of the descendants of Shelah the son of Judah, were workers in fine linen, probably in the lowland country (1 Chr. iv. 21). Tradition adds that they wove the robes of the kings and priests (Targ. Joseph), and, according to Jarchi, the hangings of the sanctuary. The cords of the canopy over the garden-court of the palace at Shushan were of fine linen (bōtēs, Esth. i. 6). "Purple and brocaded work and fine linen" were brought by the Syrians to the market of Tyre (Ez. xxvii. 16), the ἐνδυματὰ of Syria being distinguished from the šākēḥ at Egypt, mentioned in ver. 7, as being in all probability an Aramaic word, while šākēḥ is referred o as an Egyptian original.\footnote{\textsuperscript{b}} "Fine linen" (βατος),

with purple and silk are enumerated in Rev. xvii. 12 as among the merchandise of the mystical Babylon; and to the Lamb's wife (viii. 8) it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen (βατος καὶ λευκός) clean and white: "the symbolical significance of this vesture being immediately explained, "for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." And probably with the same intent the armies in heaven, who rode upon white horses and followed the "Faithful and True," were clad in "fine linen, white and clean," as they went forth to battle with the beast and his army (Rev. xix. 14).

4. Εἴθη occurs but once (Prov. vii. 16), and there in connection with Egypt. Schultens connects it with the Greek οἴθην, οἴθων, which he supposes were derived from it. The Talmudists translate it by תַּכְלָב, chabel, a cord or rope, in consequence of its identity in form with שֵׁית, which occurs in the Targ. on Josh. ii. 15, and Esth. i. 6: R. Parchon interpret it "a girdle of Egyptian work." But in what way these cords were applied to the decoration of beds is not clear. Probably Εἴθη was a kind of thread made of fine Egyptian flax, and used for ornamenting the coverings of beds with tapestry-work. In support of this may be quoted the ἄγωντας τοῦ ΛΧΧ., and the πίττες τοπιτας of the Vulgate, which represent the עַנָּה עַנָּה of the Hebrew. But Celsius renders the word "linen," and appeals to the Greek ἐθών, οἴθων, as decisive upon the point. See Jablonski, Opusc. i. 72, 73.

Schultens (Prov. vii. 16) suggests that the Greek σταυρωθήν is derived from the Hebrew שַׁדָיוֹת, which is used of the thirty linen garments which Maimon promised to his companions (Judg. xiv. 12, 13) at his weding, and which he stripped from the bodies of the Philistines whom he slew at Ashekron (ver. 19). It was made by women (Prov. xxxi. 24), and used for girdles and under-garments (Is. iii. 23; comp. Mark xiv. 51). The LXX. in Judg. and Prov. render it σταυρωθήν, but in Judg. xiv. 13 οἴθων is used synonymously: just as σταυρωθήν in Matt. xxvii. 59, Mark xv. 46, and Luke xxii. 53, is the same as οἴθων in Luke xxiv. 12; John xv. 5, 6, xii. 10. In these passages it is seen that linen was used for the winding-sheets of the dead by the Hebrews as well as by the Greeks (Hom. II. xxviii. 358, xxix. 235; comp. Eur. Iph. 819). Towels were made of it (Ἀμφικαμμεν, John xiii. 4, 5), and τάπαινας (σαπορία, John xi. 41), like the coarse linen of the Egyptians. The dress of the poor (Ezech. xi. 4) was probably unbleached flax (αὐτόρως), such as was used for barbers' towels (Plut. De terr. 1.).

The general term which included all those already mentioned was πίστης, corresponding to the Greek Αἰων, which was employed — like our "cotton" — to denote not only the flax (Judg. xv. 14) or raw material from which the linen was made, but also the plant itself (Josh. ii. 6), and the manufacture from it. It is generally opposed to wool, as a vegetable product to an animal (Lev. xii. 47, 48, 52.)

\footnote{a} \textsuperscript{a} ΒΑΣ📦, βατος, bōtēs.
\footnote{b} In Gen. xii. 42, the Targum of Onkelo gives בִּשְׁכֶּחֶׁ as the equivalent of בַּעֲש. See also Ex. xxv. 1 xxxiv. 35.
\footnote{c} \textsuperscript{c} בַּעֲשָׁן, Yanez-Gr. βασόν.
59: Deut. xxi. 11; Prov. xxxi. 13; Hos. ii. 5, 9), and was used for nets (Isa. ix. 9), girdles (Jer. xiii. 1), and measuring-lines (Ex. xl. 3), as well as for the dress of the priests (Ex. xlv. 17, 18). From a comparison of the last-quoted passages with Ex. xxxvii. 42, and Lev. vi. 10 (3), xvi. 4, 23, it is evident that "byd and phleket denote the same material, the former being the name given to it. It is equally apparent, from a comparison of Rev. xv. 6 with xix. 14, that λιθαυν and δισθοιες are essentially the same. Mr. Yates (Text. Antiq. Rom., p. 276) contends that λιθαυν denotes the common flax, and δισθοιες the finer variety, and that in this sense the terms are used by Pausanias (vi. 20, § 4). Till the time of Dr. Forster it was never doubted that δισθοια was a kind of flax, but it was maintained by him to be cotton. That the mummy-cloths used by the Egyptians were cotton and not linen was first asserted by Rouelle (Mem. de l'Acad. Roy. des Scienc. 1750), and he was supported in his opinion by Dr. Forster and Dr. Solander, after an examination of the mummies in the British Museum. But a more careful scrutiny by Mr. Bauer of about 400 specimens of mummy-cloth has shown that they were, or variously, linen. Dr. Urn arrived independently at the same conclusion (Yates, Text. Ant. b. ii.).

One word remains to be noticed, which our A. V. has translated "linen yarn" (1 K. x. 28; 2 Chr. i. 16), brought out of Egypt by Solomon's merchants. The Hebrew mikneh, or mikneh, is variously explained. In the LXX. of 1 Kings it appears as a proper name, Κοηνατε, and in the Vulgate Ose, a place in Arabia Felix. By the Syriac (2 Chr.) and Arabic translators it was also regarded as the name of a place. Bochart once referred it to Trogodyte Egypt, anciently called Michiohe, according to Pliny (vi. 34), but afterwards decided that it signified "a tax" (Hieroc. pt. 1. b. 2, c. 9). To these Michialis adds a conjecture of his own, that Κοηνατε in the interior of Africa, S. W. of Egypt, might be the place referred to, as the country whence Egypt procured its horses (Loeae of Moses, trans. Smith, ii. 493). In translating the word "linen yarn" the A. V. followed Junius and Tremellius, who are supported by Sebastian Schmid, De Dien, and Clericus. Gesenius has recourse to a very unnatural construction, and rendering the word "troop," refers it in the first clause to the king's merchants, and in the second to the horses which they brought.

From time immemorial Egypt was celebrated for its linen (Ex. xxvii. 7). It was the dress of the Egyptian priests (Her. ii. 37, 81), and was worn by them, according to Plutarch (Is. et Osir. 4), because the color of the flax-blossem resembled that of the circumambient ether (comp. Juv. vi. 533), of the priests of Isis). Panopolis or Chemmis (the modern Akhmim) was anciently inhabited by linen-workers (Strabo, xvii. 41, p. 819). According to Herodotus (ii. 80) the mummy-cloths were of bysusa; and Josephus (Ant. iii. 6, § 1) mentions among the contributions of the Israelites for the tabernacle, "bysusa of flax;" the hangings of the tabernacle were "sindon of bysusa" (§ 2), of which material the tunics of the priests were also made (Ant. iii. 7, § 2), the drawers being of bysusa (§ 1). Phile also says that the high-priest wore a garment of the finest bysusa. Combining the testimony of Herodotus as to the mummy-cloths with the results of microscopic examination, it seems clear that bysusa was linen, and not cotton; and moreover, that the dresses of the Jewish priests were made of the same, the purest of all materials. For further information see Dr. Kuhlish's Comm. on Exodus, pp. 387-389; also article Wood, 

W. A. W.

LINTEL. The beam which forms the upper part of the framework of a door. In the A. V. "lintel" is the rendering of three Hebrew words.

1. יָּלְתֶל, ayil (1 K. vi. 31); translated "post" throughout Ex. xl. xli. The true meaning of this word is extremely doubtful. In the LXX. it is left untranslated (αιλ, αἰλεί, αἰλαίδα); and in the Chaldee version it is represented by a modification of itself. Throughout the passages of Ezekiel in which it occurs the Vulg. uniformly renders it by from; which Gesenius quotes as favorable to his own view, provided that by from be understood the projections in front of the building.

The A. V. of 1 K. vi. 31, "lintel," is supported by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and the Codex of Ex. xl. 21; while Kimchi explains it generally by "post." The Peshito-Syriac uniformly renders the word by a modification of the Greek παρατάξειοι, "pillars." Jarchi understands by ayil a round column like a large tree; Aquila (Ex. xl. 14) having in view the meaning "ramp," which the word elsewhere bears, renders it πλακας, apparently intending thereby to denote the volutes of columns, curved like rams' horns. J. D. Michaelis (Supp. ad Lex. s. v.) considers it to be the tympanum or triangular area of the pediment above a gate, supported by columns. Gesenius himself, after reviewing the passages in which the word occurs, arrives at the conclusion that in the singular it denotes the whole projecting framework of a door or gateway, including the jambs on either side, the threshold, and the lintel or architrave, with frieze and cornice. In the plural it is applied to denote the projections along the front of an edifice ornamented with columns or palm-trees, and with recesses or intercolumniations between them sometimes filled up by windows. Under the former head he places 1 K. vi. 31; Ex. xi. 9, 24, 26, 29, 31, 53, 24, 58, 48, 49, Ex. vili; while to the latter he refers xil. 10, 11, 16. No satisfactory explanation still is that of Boeotcher (quoted by Winer, Realb. ii. 575), who says that ayil is the projecting entrance and passage wall—which might appropriately be divided into compartments by paliards; and this view is adopted by Fürst (Handw. s. v.).

2. יָּלְתֶל, cophēr (Amos ix. 1; Zeph. ii. 14). The marginal rendering, "chapter or knop," of both these passages is undoubtedly the more correct, and in all other cases where the word occurs it is translated "knop." [Knop.]

3. יַכִּפָּה, maskabiph (Ex. xii. 22, 23); also rendered "upper door-post" in Ex. xi. 7. That this is the true rendering is admitted by all modern philologists, who connect it with a root which in Arabic and the cognate dialects signifies "to overlay with beams." The LXX. and Vulgate coincide in assigning to it the same meaning. Rabbi Sol. Jarchi derives it from a Chaldee root signifying "to beat," because the door in being shut "beat" against it. The signification "to look," or "peep," which was acquired by the Hebrew rea, induced
LINUS

Linus Ezra to translate *maschoph* by "window," such as the Arabs have over the doors of their houses; and in asserting to this rendering, Bochart observes "that it was so called on account of the grates and railings over the tops of the doors, through which those who desire entrance into the house could be seen before they were admitted" (Kalisch, *Execheia*). An illustration of one of these windows is given in the *Art. House*, vol. ii. p. 1103.

W. A. W.

LINUS (Luvis [luxn, luxn-ch66]), a Christian at Rome, known to St. Paul and by Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 21). That the first bishop of Rome after the Apostles was named Linus is a statement in which all ancient writers agree (e. g. Jerome, *De Fidei Haeret. c. 15; August. Ep. lii. 2). The early and unequivocal assertion of Irenæus (iii. 3, § 3), corroborated by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 2) and Theodoret, (in 2 Tim. iv. 21), is sufficient to prove the identity of the bishop with St. Paul's friend.

The date of his appointment, the duration of his episcopate, and the limits to which his episcopal authority extended, are points which cannot be regarded as absolutely settled, although they have been discussed at great length. Eusebius and Theodoret, followed by Baronius and Tillemont (Hist. Eccle. ii. 163 and 591), state that he became bishop of Rome after the death of St. Peter. On the other hand, the words of Irenæus — [Peter and Paul] when they founded and built up the church of Rome "— certainly admit, or rather imply the meaning, that he held that office before the death of St. Peter: as if the two great Apostles, having, in the discharge of their own peculiar office, completed the organization of the church at Rome, left it under the government of Linus, and passed on to preach and teach in some new region. This proceeding would be in accordance with the practice of the Apostles in other places. And the earlier appointment of Linus is asserted as a fact by Ruffinus (Pref. in Clem. Recogn.), and by the author of ch. xlv. bk. vii. of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. It is accepted as the true statement of the case by Bishop Pearson (De Scire et Successione Prima Romae Episcoporum, ii. 6, § 1) and by Henry (Hist. Eccle. ii. 26). Some persons have objected that the undistinguished mention of the name of Linus between the names of two other Roman Christians in 2 Tim. iv. 21 is a proof that he was not at that time bishop of Rome. But even Tillemont admits that such a way of introducing the bishop's name is in accordance with the simplicity of that early age. No lofty preeminence was attributed to the episcopal office in the apostolic times.

The arguments by which the exact years of his episcopate are laid down are too long and minute to be recited here. Its duration is given by Eusebius (whose H. E. iii. 16 and Chronicon give inconsistent evidence) as A. D. 68-80; by Tillemont, who however reproaches Pearson, with departing from the chronology of Eusebius. In a later place (Ed. 1671), Eusebius gives Linus 67-73; and by Pearson as 55-67. Pearson, in the treatise already quoted (i. 10), gives weighty reasons for distrusting the chronology of Eusebius as regards the years of the early bishops of Rome; and he derives his own opinion from certain very ancient (but interpolated) lists of those bishops (see i. 13 and ii. 5). This point has been subsequently considered by Baratierius (De Successione Antiquissimae Episc. Rom. 1740), who gives A. D. 56-67 as the date of the episcopate of Linus.

The statement of Ruffinus, that Linus and Cletus were bishops in Rome whilst St. Peter was alive, has been quoted in support of a theory which sprang up in the 17th century, received the sanction even of Hammond in his controversy with Blondel († Works, ed. 1684, iv. 825; Episcopatis Juro, v. 1, § 11), was held with some slight modification by Baratierius, and has been recently revived. It is supposed that Linus was bishop in Rome only of the Christians of Gentile origin, while at the same time another bishop exercised the same authority over the Jewish Christians there. Tertullian's assertion (De Prasar. Hocret. § 32) that Clement [the third bishop] of Rome was consecrated by St. Peter, has been quoted as corroborating this theory. But it does not follow from the words of Tertullian that Clement's consecration took place immediately before he became bishop of Rome: and the statement of Ruffinus, so far as it lends any support to the above-named theory, is shown to be without foundation by Pearson (ii. 3, 4). Tillemont's observations (p. 590) in reply to Pearson only show that the establishment of two contemporaries bishops in one city was contemplated in ancient times as a possible provisional arrangement to meet certain temporary difficulties. The actual limitation of the authority of Linus to a section of the church at Rome remains to be proved.

Lions is reckoned by Pseudo-Hippolytus, and in the Greek *Menon*, among the seventy disciples. The name is stated by different authors to have been derived from the Western church, and by the Eastern Church, as the day of his death. A narrative of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, printed in the *Bibliothea Petronum*, and certain pontifical decretals, are incorrectly ascribed to Linus. He is said to have written an account of the dispute between St. Peter and Simon Magus.

W. T. B.

LION

Rabbinical writers discover in the O. T. seven names of the lion, which they assign to the animal at seven periods of its life. 1. ־פ, gôr, or ליע, gôr, a cub (Gen xiii. 9; Dent. xxxii. 22; Jer. lii. 38; Nah. lii. 12). 2. יגו, ephira, a young lion (Judg. xiv. 5; Job iv. 10; Ez. xix. 2, 4). for two contemporaneous abbots residing in one monastery; and by (3) Rabbanus Maurus of *Choraepiscopos*: Op. ed. Migne, tom. iv. col. 1597, who ingeniously claims primitive authority for the institution of Choraepiscopos on the supposition that Linus and Cletus were never bishops with full powers, but were contemporaneous choraepriscopos employed by St. Peter in his absence from Rome, and at his request, to ordain clergymen for the church at Rome.
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LaOi or widow, an old lion (Gen. xlix. 9: Job iv. 11, &c.). 7.IELD Lydia, a lion desceipit with age (Job iv. 11; Is. xxx. 6, &c.). Well might Bochart (Hieros. pt. i. b. iii. 1) say, "The grammarian videtur nire sibi indulgere." He differs from this arrangement in every point but the second. In the first place, gur is applied to the young of other animals besides the lion; for instance, the sea-monsters in Lam. iv. 3. Secondly, cephir differs from gur, as 'juvenescens from virilus. Art or argh is a generic term, applied to all lions without regard to age. In Judg. the "young lion" (cephir drvlyeth) of ver. 5 is in ver. 8 called the "lion" (argh). Bochart is palpably wrong in rendering skochel "a black lion" of the kind which, according to Pliny (viii. 17), was found in Syria. The word is only used in the poetical books, and most probably expresses some attribute of the lion. It is connected with an Arabic root, which signifies "to bray" like an ass, and is therefore simply the brayer." Skochel does not denote a lion at all. Lodi is properly a "brine," and is connected with the Coptic br, which has the same signification. Lodi (comp. 3po, Hom. Il. xv. 275) is another poetic name. So far from being applied to a lion weak with age, it denotes one in full vigor (Job iv. 11; Prov. xxx. 30). It has been derived from an Arabic root, which signifies "to be strong," and, if this etymology be true, the word would be an epithet of the lion, "the strong one."

At present lions do not exist in Palestine, though they are said to be found in the desert on the road to Egypt (Schwarz, Desc. of Pol.; see Is. xxx. 6). They abound on the banks of the Empirates between Busseolah and Bagdad (Russell, Barby Lion. (From specimen in Zoological Gardens.)

Aleppo, p. 61), and in the marshes and jungles near the rivers of Babylonia (Layard, Nin. & Bub., p. 566). This species, according to Layard, is without the dark and shaggy mane of the African Lion (id. p 487), though he adds in a note that he had seen lions on the river Karooun with a long black mane.

But, though lions have now disappeared from Palestine, they must in ancient times have been numerous. The names Lachothe (Josh. xv. 32), Beth-lachothe (Josh. xvi. 6), Arieh (2 K. xv. 25), and Laish (Judg. xviii. 7; 1 Sam. xxv. 44) were probably derived from the presence of or connection with lions, and point to the fact that they were at one time common. They had their lairs in the forests which have vanished with them (Jer. v. 6, xiii. 8; Am. iii. 4), in the tangled bushwood (Jer. iv. 7, xxv. 38: Job xxxviii. 40), and in the caves of the mountains (Cant. iv. 8; Ez. xix. 9; Nah. ii. 12). The cane-brake on the banks of the Jordan, the "pride" of the river, was their favorite haunt (Jer. xlix. 19, 1. 44; Zech. xi. 3), and in this reedy covert (Lam. iii. 10) they were to be found at a comparatively recent period; as we learn from a passage of Johannes Phocas, who travelled in Palestine towards the end of the 12th century (Reland, Pol. i. 274). They abounded in the jungles which skirt the rivers of Mesopotamia (Anmian. Marc. xviii. 7, § 9), and in the time of Xenophon (de Fenv. xi.) were found in Nysa.

Persian Lion. (From specimen in Zoological Gardens.)

The lion of Palestine was in all probability the Asiatic variety, described by Aristotle (H. A. ix 44) and Pliny (viii. 18) as distinguished by its short curly mane, and by being shorter and rounder in shape, like the sculptured lion found at Arban (Layard, Nin. & Bub., p. 258). It was less daring than the longer named species, but when driven by hunger it not only ventured to attack the fleecy sheep in the desert in presence of the shepherd (Is. xxiii. 4; 1 Sam. xvii. 34), but laid waste towns and villages (2 K. xvi. 25, 29; Prov. xiv. 13, xx. 18), and devoured men (1 K. xili. 24, xx. 36; 2 K. xvi. 25; Ez. xix. 3, 6). The shepherds sometimes ventured to encounter the lion single handed (1 Sam. xvii. 34), and the viril figure employed by Amos (iii. 12), the heathen of Heloah, was but the transcript of a scene which he must have often witnessed. At other times they pursued the animal in large bands, raising loud shouts to intimidate him (Is. xxxi. 4), and drive him into the net or pit they had prepared to catch him (Ez. xix. 8). This method of capturing wild beasts is described by Xenophon (de Ven. xi. 4) and by Shaw, who says, "The Arabs dig a pit where they are observed to enter: and, covering it over lightly with reeds or small branches of trees, they frequently decoy and catch them" (Travels, 2d ed. p. 172). Bezaiah, one of David's heroic body-guard, had distinguished him.
self by slaying a lion in his den (2 Sam. xxiii. 20). The kings of Persia had a menagerie of lions (25-10

The strength (Judg. xiv. 13; Prov. xxx. 30; 2 Sam. i. 23), courage (2 Sam. xii. 10; Prov. xxviii. 1; Is. xxxi. 4; Nah. ii. 11), and ferocity (Gen. xlix. 9; Num. xxxiv. 9) of the lion were proverbial. The "lion-faced" warriors of God were among David's most valiant troopers (1 Chr. xii. 3), and the hero Judas Macabeus is described as "like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey" (1 Macc. iii. 4). The terrible roar of the lion is expressed in Hebrew by four different words, between which the following distinction appears to be maintained: —

Hunting with a lion, which has seized an ibex. (From Wilkinson's Egyptians, vol. i. p. 221.)

Leo. Among the Hebrews, and throughout the O. T., the lion was the achievement of the prizemost tribe of Judah, while in the closing book of the canon it received a deeper significance as the emblem of him who "prevailed to open the book and loose the seven seals thereof" (Rev. v. 5). On the other hand its fierceness and cruelty rendered it an appropriate metaphor for a fierce and malignant enemy (Ps. vii. 2, xxii. 21, lxxv. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 17), and hence for the arch-fiend himself (1 Pet. v. 8).

The figure of the lion was employed as an ornament both in architecture and sculpture. On each of the six steps leading up to the great ivory throne of Solomon stood two lions on either side, carved by the workmen of Hiram, and two others were beside the arms of the throne (1 K. x. 19, 20). The great bronze lion in like manner adorned with cherubins, lions, and palm-trees in graven work (1 K. vii. 20, 26).

* LIQUOR or LIQUORS. This word occurs three times in the A. V. and in every instance answers to a different Hebrew word. (1) יַּלִּיָּר, lit. tear, collect. singular in Ex. xii. 29: "Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors." It is a semitiename. philo expression for that which flows from the press, namely, wine and oil (as correctly given in the LXX:ἄραρξάς ἄξωνος καὶ λευκοῦ σαβ). (2) יַּלַיְר, properly wine that is mixed or spiced: '"A round goblet which wanteth not liquor."' (Cant. v. 2). (3) יַּלַיְר, only Num. vi. 3: "Neither shall he (the Nazarite) drink any liquor of grapes." Some suppose the word to denote "maceration" or "sweeping," and hence a species of strong white wine obtained from grapes by that particular process. Others make the word = "a crushing," "dislodging" wine, hence applicable, in itself considered, to wine of any sort, but here on account of the other connected specifications in the passage, the juice of grapes recently broken or crushed, i.e. new wine. See Knobel, Die Bücher Numerei, etc., p. 26. In the terms relating to wine see Rodiger in Ges. Theobur, p. 1140. [WINE.]

* LITTLETS, Is. xvi. 20. [WAGON, Amer. ed.]

* LIVELY, employed for "living" in 1 Pet. ii. 6: "Ye also as living stones (αινωνίας) are built up a spiritual house." By the same figure Christ himself is said in the previous verse to be a "living stone," i.e. in the spiritual edifice of the church or gospel. His place is that of the cornerstone (comp. Eph. ii. 20), and believers are built on him and into him. As the Greek is the same it should be rendered alike in both cases. "Lively" in Ex. i. 19 (for the adj. יַּלִּיָּר, said of the Hebrew women) comes nearer to the present usage, namely, "full of life," "vigoros," (comp. Acts viii. 38).

LIZARD (יַּלֵּד, leyth: Vat. and Alex. kαλαμάρ της: Compl. [with 13 MSS. ἀχαλάρτης: Mf. kαλαμάρ της: steello]. The Hebrew word, which with its English rendering occurs only
LIZARD

r. Lcc. x. 30, appears to be correctly translated by the A. V. Some species of lizard is mentioned amongst those "creeping things that creep upon the earth" which were to be considered unclean by the Israelites.

Lizards of various kinds abound in Egypt, Palestine, and Arabia; some of these are mentioned in the Bible under various Hebrew names, notices of which will be found under other articles. [See Geckos; Snail.] All the old versions agree in identifying the leddah with some saurom, and some concur as to the particular genus indicated. The LXX., the Vulg., the Targ. of Jonathan, &c., with the Arabic versions, understand a lizard by the Hebrew word. The Syrian has a word which is generally translated salamander, but, probably this name was applied also to the lizard. The Greek word, with its slight variations, which the LXX. use to express the letaddah, appears from what may be gathered from Aristotle, &c. and perhaps also from its derivation, to point to some lizard belonging to the Gekkotidae. Many members of this family of lizards are characterized by a peculiar lamellated structure on the under surface of the toes, by means of which they are enabled to run over the smoothest surfaces, and even in an inverted position, like that they can remain suspended beneath the large leaves of the tropical vegetation, and remain for hours in positions as extraordinary as the insects for which they watch; the wonderful apparatus with which their feet are furnished enabling them to overcome gravity. Now the Hebrew leddah appears to be derived from a root which, though not extant in that language, is found in its sister-tongue the Arabic; this root means to adhere to the ground; an expression which well agrees with the peculiar sucker-like properties of the feet of the geckos. Bochart has successfully argued that the lizard denoted by the Hebrew word is that kind which the Arabs call vekhara, the translation of which term is thus given by Gobius: "An animal like a lizard, of a red color, and adhering to the ground, also poison saucus inspired Gueneague contigua." This description will be found to agree with the character of the Fan-Foot Lizard (Ptydactylus Gecko), which is common in Egypt and in parts of Arabia, and perhaps is also found in Palestine. It is reddish brown, spotted with white. Hasselquist thus speaks of it: "The poison of this animal is very singular, as it exudes from the bottom of the toes. At Cairo I had an opportunity of observing how rapid the exhalations of the toes of this animal are. As it ran over the hand of a man who was endeavoring to catch it, there immediately rose little red pustules over all those parts which the animal had touched" (Voyages, p. 220). Forskål (Descri. Anim. p. 13) says that the Egyptians call this lizard Abu burs, "father of leprosy," in allusion to the leprous sores which contact with it produces; and to this day the same term is used by the Arabs to denote a lizard, probably of this same species. The geckos live on insects and worms, which they swallow whole. They derive their name from the peculiar sound which some of the species utter. This sound has been described as being similar to the double click often used in riding; they make it by some movement of the tongue against the palate. The Gekkotidae are nocturnal in their habits, and frequent houses, cracks in rocks, etc. They move very rapidly, and without making the slightest sound; hence probably the derivation of the Greek word for this lizard. They are found in all parts of the world: in the greatest abundance in warm climates. It is no doubt owing to their repulsive appearance that they have the character of being highly venomous, just as the unscientific in England attach similar properties to toads, newts, blind worms, etc., although these creatures are perfectly harmless. At the same time it must be admitted that there may be species of lizards which do secrete a venomous fluid, the effects of which are no doubt aggravated by the heat of the climate, the unhealthy condition of the subject, or other causes. The geckos belong to the sub-order Ptychoglossa.

Feet of Gecko.

The Fan-Foot. (Ptydactylus Gecko.)

a ἀσαλάμαντς. "Stellio, reptile immundum." 
b The following are the references to the Greek word ἀσαλαμάντς in Aristot. de Anim. Hist. (ed. Schneider: iv. 11, § 2; vili. 17, § 1; vili. 19, § 2; viili. 23, § 2; x. 5, § 5; ix. 19, § 2). That Aristotle understands some species of gecko by the Greek word is clear; for he says of the woodpecker, πορεύεται ἐπὶ τοὺς δέντρα, χείλοις καὶ οὔπως καθερίσαι αἱ ἀσαλαμάνται (ix. 10, § 2). He alludes also to a species in Italy, perhaps the Hemidactylus verticinatus, whose bite, he says, is fatal (?). 
c Ἀσαλαμάντς, γάτων ἡδέα νῦν ἐπιτιγή καὶ τοῖς χείλεσι τοῖς ἀηδημαῖς. This seems to identify it with one of the Gekkotha, perhaps the Tarentula was best known to the Greeks. The noiseless (φινωμεν) and, at times, fixed habits of this lizard are referred to below (See Gekk. Etym. Mag.).

d See Ges. (Thes. x. r.). A similar root has the force of "hiding;" in which case the word will refer to the gecko's habit of frequenting holes in walls, etc.

e The Gr. ἀσαλαμάντς, and perhaps Lat. stellio, indicate the genus, the red color the species.

 arabic: ياء برچين, Lizard (Gekkophora)

arab. Dict.-
LO-AMMI

LO-AMMI (ἐλλαξένοις μοι: non repulsus mensus, i. e. "not my people," the figurative name given by the prophet Hosea to his second son by Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim (Hos. i. 9), to denote the rejection of the kingdom of Israel by Jehovah. Its significance is explained in vv. 9, 10.

LOAN. The law of Moses did not contemplate any raising of loans for the purpose of obtaining capital, a condition perhaps alluded to in the parables of the "pearl," and "hidden treasure" (Matt. xiii. 44, 45; Michaelis, Comm. on Laws of Moses, art. 147, ii. 297, ed. Smith). [COMMERCE.] Such persons as bankers and sureties, in the commercial sense (Prov. xxii. 26; Neh. v. 3), were unknown to the earlier ages of the Hebrew commonwealth.

The Law strictly forbade any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person, either in the shape of money or of produce, and at first, as it seems, even in the case of a foreigner; but this prohibition was afterwards limited to Hebrews only, from whom, of whatever rank, not only was usury on any pretence to be exacted, but relief to the poor by way of loan was enjoined, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden (Ex. xxii. 25; Lev. xxv. 35, 37; Deut. xv. 3, 7); Ex. xxii. 19, 20). The instances of extortionate conduct mentioned with disapprobation in the book of Job probably represent a state of things previous to the Law, and such as the Law was intended to remedy (Job xxvi. 6, xxiv. 3, 7). As commerce increased, the practice of usury, and so also of usurship, grew up; but the exacting of it from a Hebrew appears to have been regarded to a late period as discreditable (Prov. vi. 1, 4, xi. 15, xvii. 18, xx. 16, xxii. 26; Ps. xv. 5; Jer. xv. 10; Ezek. xviii. 13, 12). Systematic breach of the Law in this respect was expected by Nehemiah after the return from captivity (see No. 6) (Neh. vi. 1, 13; Michaelis, ib. arts. 148, 151). In later times the practice of borrowing money appears to have prevailed without limitation of race, and to have been carried on on systematic principles, though the original spirit of the Law was approved by our Lord (Matt. v. 24, xxv. 27; Luke vii. 43, xix. 25).

The money-changers (κεραυνασται, and κολυμβεται), who had seats and tables in the temple courts, are whose credits arose chiefly from the exchange of money with those who came to pay their annual half-shekel (Pulux, iii. 84, vii. 170; Schleusner, Lex. N. T. s.v.; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.; Matt. xxii. 12). The documents relating to loans of money appear to have been deposited in public offices in Jerusalem (Joseph. B. ii. 17, §6).

In making loans no prohibition is pronounced in the Law against taking a pledge of the borrower, but certain limitations are prescribed in favor of the poor.

1. The outer garment, which formed the poor man's principal covering by night as well as by day, if taken in pledge, was to be returned before sun-set. A beast, however, might be taken (Ex. xxii. 26, 27; Deut. xxi. 12, 13; comp. Job xxii. 6; Prov. xxii. 27; Shaw, Prov. 224, 225; Richardit, Notes on Ezek. i. 47, 241; Nichol, Exe. de la France, 56; Luce, Med. Lit. i. 57, 58; Ges. Thes. 403; Michaelis, Lives of Moses, arts. 143 and 150). The prohibition was absolute in the case of (a) the widow's garment (Deut. xxiv. 17), and (b) a millstone of either kind (Deut. xxiv. 6). Michaelis (art. 150, li. 321) supposes also all inde-

LOCK

LOCK

LOCK.

LOCK.

LOYAES. [Bread.]

LOCK. Where European locks have not been introduced, the locks of eastern houses are usually of wood, and consist of a partly hollow bolt from 14 inches to 2 feet long for external doors or gates, or from 7 to 9 inches for interior doors. The bolt passes through a groove in a piece attached to the door in a socket in the door-post. In the grooves are from 4 to 6 small iron or wooden sliding-pins or wires, which drop into corresponding holes in the bolt, and fix it in its place. The key is a piece of wood furnished with a like number of pins, which, when the key is introduced sideways, raise the sliding-pins in the lock, and allow the bolt to be drawn back. Ancient Egyptian doors were fastened with central bolts, and sometimes with bars passing from one door-post to the other. They were also sometimes sealed with clay. [CLAY.] Keys were made of bronze or iron, of a simple construction. The gates of Jerusalem set up under Nebuchadnezzar's direction had both bolts and locks. (Jude ii. 23, 24; Cant. v. 6; Neh. iii. 3, &c.; Ranwoll, Trav. in Ray, ii. 17; Russell, Aleppo, i. 22; Volney, Travels, ii. 438; Luce, Med. Lit. i. 42; Char-
LOCUST, a well-known insect, which com-
mitsterrific devastation to vegetation in the coun-
tries which it visits. In the Bible there are fre-
quent allusions to locusts; and there are nine or
tenHebrew words which are supposed to denote
different varieties or species of this destructive
family. They belong to that order of insects known
by the term Orthoptera. This order is divided into
two large groups or divisions, namely, Caelifera
and Saltatoria. The first, as the name imports,
includes only those families of Orthoptera which
have legs formed for creeping, and which were
considered unclean by the Jewish law. Under the
second are comprised those whose two posterior legs,
by their peculiar structure, enable them to move
on the ground by leaps. This group contains, ac-
cording to Serville’s arrangement, three families,
the Gryllidae, Locustariide, and the Acrididae, dis-
tinguished one from the other by some peculiar no-
bles of the structure. The common house locust
(Gryllus domesticus, Linn.) may be taken as an illus-
tration of the Gryllidae; the green grasshopper
(Locusta migratoria, Linn.) which the French call
Sauterie verte, will represent the family Locustari-
ide; and the Acrididae may be typified by the com-
monly migratory locust (Ephippus migratorius, Aud.
Serv.), which is an occasional visitor to this coun-
try.

Ephippus migratorius.

try. Of the Gryllidae, G. cerisi has been found
in Egypt, and G. domesticus, on the authority of
Dr. Kitto, in Palestine; but doubtless other species
also occur in these countries. Of the Locustariide,
Phaneroptera fidelis, Serv. (G. fulc. Scopoli) has
also, according to Kitto, been found in Palestine,
Bradypus dosigos in Asia Minor, Turkey, etc.,
Suga Nilotica near Sivrya. Of the locusts proper,
or Acrididae, four species of the genus Truxuia are
recorded as having been seen in Egypt, Syria, or
Arabia: namely, T. murat, T. variabilis, T. pro-
cer, and T. nitidus. The following kinds also
occur: Dysacta pliciformis, in Egypt and the ooats
of Harrat; Pakidorcerus hieroglyphicus, P. bifoni-
us, P. punctiventris, P. vulvifacies, in the deserts of
Cairo; Dericovia athisa in Egypt and Mount
Lebanon. Of the genus Acridium, A. mestum, the
most formidable perhaps of all the Acrididae, A.
locusta (= G. Egypt. Linn.), which is a species
commonly sold for food in the markets of Bagdad
(Serv. Orthopt. 657), A. semiferaciscutum, A. per-
gcinus, one of the most destructive of the species,
and A. marbutus, occur either in Egypt or Arabia.
Calyptratus serapis and Chrysothus myopius are
found in Egypt, and in the cultivated lands about
Cairo; Erechthe carinata, in the rocky places
about Sinai. E. cist, E. paluchspinosis, E. ipicla.

Acridium lineola.

ocferaciscutus, and E. migratoria (= G. migrat.
Linn.), complete the list of the Solitutudinal Orth-
ptera of the Bible lands. From the above catalogue
it will be seen how perfectly unavailing, for the
most part, must be any attempt to identify the
Hebrew names with ascertained species, especially
when it is remembered that some of these names
occur but seldom, others (Lev. xi. 22) only once in
the Bible—that the only clue is in many instances
the mere etymology of the Hebrew word—that
such etymology has of necessity, from the fact
of there being but a single word, a very wide
meaning, and that the etymology is frequently very
uncertain. The LXX. and Vulg. do not contri-
ute much help, for the words used there are themselves
of a very uncertain signification, and moreover em-
ployed in a most promiscuous manner. Still,
though the possibility of identifying with certainty
any one of the Hebrew names is a hopeless task,
yet in one or two instances a fair approximation to
identification may be arrived at.

From Lev. xi. 21, 22, we learn the Hebrew names
of four different kinds of Solitutudinal Orthoptera.
These may ye eat of every flying creeping thing
that goeth upon all four, which have legs above
their feet, to leap withal upon the earth; even
those of them ye may eat, the orbeh after his kind,

the country in the month of July of the same year
They did great damage in Shropshire and Stafford-
shire, by eating the blossoms of the apple-trees; and especially
the leaves of oaks, which looked as bare as at Christ-
mas. The rooks did a good service in this case at
least. See Gentleman’s Magazine, July 1748, pp. 331
and 414; also The Times, Oct. 4, 1845.

It is well known that all insects, properly so
called, have six feet. But the Jews considered
the two anterior pair only as true legs in the locust family,
regarding them as additional instruments for lis-
}
and the sâdâm after his kind, and the chargid wrongly translated belde by the A. V., an insect which would be included amongst the flying creeping things forbidden as food in v. 23 and 42 after his kind, and the chayâb after his kind." Besides the names mentioned in this passage, there occur five others in the Bible, all of which locust (ii.) considers to represent so many distinct species of locusts, namely, gôb, gôdâm, châsid, yâhâ, and ûssâlâd.

(1.) Arbêkh (אָרַבְXE: •) arbôchos, ãrê- lêbos, ãrê-λεβος: in Joel ii. 25, ἄρβηξα: locust, "grasshopper") is the most common name for locust, the word occurring about twenty times in the Hebrew Bible, namely, in Ex. x. 4, 12, 13, 14, 19; Judg. vi. 5, viii. 12. Lev. xi. 22: Deut. xxxi. 15; 1 K. viii. 37; 2 Chr. vi. 28; Job xxxix. 22; Ps. cv. 34, cxxi. 39; Prov. xxii. 27; Jer. xvi. 23; Joel i. 4, ii. 20; Nah. iii. 15. The LXX. generally render arbêkh by ãpîs, the general Greek name for locust: in two passages, however, namely, Lev. xi. 22, and 1 K. viii. 37, they use bôs ãrê-ξôs as the representative of the original word. In Nah. iii. 17, arbêkh is rendered by ãrêlêbos: while the Arche version, in Joel ii. 25, has ãpîs, ãrêlêbos, the Vulg. has locusta in every instance except in Lev. xi. 22, where it has bruchus. The A. V. in the four following passages has grasshopper, Judg. vi. 5, viii. 12: Job xxxix. 20; and Jer. xvi. 24: in all the other places it has locust. The word arbêkh, which is derived from a root signifying "to be numerous," is probably sometimes used in a wide sense to express any of the larger devouring species. It is the locust of the Egyptian plague. In almost every passage where arbêkh occurs reference is made to its terribly destructive powers. It is one of the flying creeping creatures that were allowed as food by the law of Moses (Lev. xi. 21). In this passage it is clearly the representative of some species of winged orthoptera extremis, which must have possessed indications of form sufficient to distinguish the insect from the three other names which belong to the same division of orthoptera, and are mentioned in the same context. The opinion of Michaelis (Suppl. 657, 910), that the four words mentioned in Lev. xi. 22 denote the same insect in four different ages or stages of its growth, is quite untenable, for, whatever particular species are intended by these words, it is quite clear from ver. 21 that

Acradis peregrinum.

In the next passage, in which the "grasshopper," as the A. V. translates it, occurs, we find that the LXX. renders it ãpîs, or ãpîs, locusta: in all of which passages it is rendered ãpîs by the LXX., and locusta by the Vulg. In 2 Chr. vii. 13 the A. V. reads "locust," in the other passages "grasshopper." From the use of the word the Chronic. says, "If I command the locusts to devour the land," compared with Lev. xi. 22, it would appear that some species of devouring locust is intended. In the passage of Numbers, "There we saw the giants the sons of Anak . . . and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers" (ãchôb), as well as in Ecclesiastes and Isaiah, reference seems to be made to some small species of locusts; and with

...locust, so called from its multitude, ã-chôb. See Gesen. Thes. a. v., who adopts the explanation of Michaelis that the four names in Lev. xi. 22 are not the representatives of four distinct genera or species, but denote the different stages of growth. The Gebrad grenomururus of Forskal: D. etc. A. etc. 18) is perhaps identical with the Acrad peregrinum.
LOCUST

this view Oedmann (\textit{Ferm. Sasan}, ii. 90) agrees. Tychsen (\textit{Coment. de Locust}, p. 70) supposes that \textit{chagdib} denotes the Gryllus coronatus, Linn.; but this is the \textit{Acridotta} corona, of Aud. Serv., a S. American species, and probably confined to that continent. Michaelis (\textit{Supp. 668}), who derives the word from an Arabic root signifying "to veil," conceives that \textit{chagdib} represents either a locust at the fourth stage of its growth, "ante quartas exuvias quod aultne veltas ete."

in perhaps opinionaches made is prepared numbers, on and Jewish tifully posed stage/db exunas conceives this clidr/db exunas.

\textit{pliny} is volans \textit{acniithodii} of species that is "beetle").

"beetle)."

"beetle)."

"beetle)."

I. \textit{loia} to identify the \textit{ichneuwm}, the celebrated destroyer of serpents... if then any species of locust can be ascribed whose habits resemble those of the \textit{ichneuwm}, may not this resemblance account for the name, quasi the \textit{ichneuwm} (locust), just as the whole genus (?) (family) of insects called \textit{Ichneumo\-nide}, were so denominated because of the \textit{supposed} analogy between their services and those of the Egyptian \textit{ichneuwm}? and might not this name given to that species (?) of locust at a very early period have afterwards originated the erroneous notion referred to by Aristotle and Pliny?" But is it a fact that the genus \textit{Tropulellis} is an exception to the rest of the \textit{Acrididae}, and is precociously inscitroventos. Servile (\textit{Orthop. Eurya}, p. 212) says that the nutriment of this family is \textit{plants} of various kinds. Mr. F. Smith, in a letter to the writer of this article, says he has no doubt that the \textit{Tropulellis} feed on \textit{plants}. What is Mr. Denham's authority for asserting that they are insectivorous? It is granted that there is a \textit{quasi} resemblance in external form between the \textit{Tropulellis} and some of the larger \textit{Ichneumo\-nide}, but the likeness is far from striking. Four species of the genus \textit{Tropulellis} are inhabitants of the Bible lands (see above).

\textbf{Truxalis naura}

The Jews, however, interpret \textit{chagdib} to mean a species of \textit{gamues}, \textit{Germainen Housebeck}, which M. Lawysohn identifies with \textit{Locusta cirrhae sin}, adopting the etymology of Bochart and George, who refer the name to an Arabic origin.\textsuperscript{5} The Jewish women used to carry the eggs of the \textit{chagdib} in their cars to preserve them from the ear-ache, (Buxtorf, \textit{Lex. Chab. et Robbin}, s. v. \textit{chagdib}).

\textbf{Sildain (\textit{Bacca} \textit{et a} \textit{a} \textit{a} \textit{a}: \textit{attacan}, Comp. \textit{attacan}: "bald locust") occurs only in Lev. xi. 32, as one of the four edible kinds of leaping insects. All that can possibly be known of it is that it is some kind of \textit{salibar\-toral orthopterous insect}, winged, and good for food. Tychsen, however, arguing from what is said of the \textit{sildain in the Tal-}

\textit{mud (Tract, Cholin), namely, that "this insect has a smooth head," and that the female is without the sword-shaped tail," conjectures that the species here

\textit{is forbidden the flesh of fish and of locusts" (\textit{Hiera. Nedar. fol. 40, 2.)\textsuperscript{6}}


\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Locusts species salina, a saltando. Genesis-

\textit{lue refers the word to the Arabic \textit{sal} (hardyana) sah\textit{t}, comparing the Germ. \textit{Housebeck} from \textit{serbcek-}

\textit{en}, saire.

\textit{Hence perhaps the epithet bald, applied to \textit{salina} in the text of the A. V.}
intended is *Gryllus crenovar* (Asso), a synonym that it is difficult to identify with any recorded species.

(5.) **Gizzám (ג_globals).** See Palmer-worm.

(6.) *Gib* (גיב, גיב), *Arab. ghib, ghaba*: *Ap. in Am. vii. 1, *Spadóv: locusta*: *locusta locusta* = גיב, גיב in Nah. iii. 17: "great grasshoppers;" "grasshoppers," margin "green worms," in Amos). This word is found only in Is. xxxiii. 4, and in the two places cited above. There is nothing in any of these passages that will help to point out the species denoted. That some kind of locust is intended seems probable from the passage in Nahum, "thy captains are as the great *gibor* which camp in the hedges in the cool of the day, but when the sun ariseth they flee away, and their place is not known where they are." Some writers, led by this passage, have believed that the *gibor* represented the larva state of some of the large locusts; the habit of halting at night, however, and encamping under the hedges, as described by the prophet, in all probability belongs to the *winged* locust as well as to the *gibor*, see Ex. x. 13, "the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all that night; and when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts." Mr. Barrow (i. p. 257-58), speaking of some species of S. African locusts, says, that when the larva, which are still more voracious than the parent insect, are on the march, it is impossible to make them turn out of the way, which is usually that of the wind. At sunset the troop halts and divides into separate groups, each occupying in bee-like clusters the neighboring eminences for the night. It is quite possible that the *gib* may represent the *vera or nymphal* state of the insect; nor is the passage from Nahum, "when the sun ariseth they flee away," any objection to this supposition, for the last stages of the *vera* differ but slightly from the *nymphal*, both which states may therefore be comprehended under one name; the *gibor* of Nah. iii. 17 may easily have been the *nymphal* (which in all the *Amatut* continue to feed as in their larva condition);

a גיב, according to Gesenius (*Thes. s. v.*), is from an unused root, מקר, the *Arab. *�كر, to emerge from the ground. First refers the word to a Hebrew origin. See note, Amah.

Locust flying.

b Since the above was written it has been discovered that Dr. Kittel (*Dict. Fisch.*, note on Nah. iii. 17) is of a similar opinion, that the *gib* probably denotes the *nymphal* species.

LOCUST

self (mat. gr.) and fleeth away," is no objection to the opinion that the gēlek may represent the harva or nymphula, for the same reason as was given in a former part of this article (666).

(9.) Chahil (ךְַּחַל). See CATECHILLAR.

(10.) Tschalil (ךְַּחַל): epopaoz?  rubigo: "locust "). The derivation of this word seems to imply that some kind of locust is indicated by it. It occurs only in this sense in Deut. xxviii. 42: "All thy trees and fruit of thy land shall the locust consume." In the other passages where the Hebrew word occurs, it represents some kind of tinkling musical instrument, and is generally translated cymbala by the A. V. The word is evidently onomatopoetic, and is here perhaps a synonym for some one of the other names for locust. Michaelis (Spruch, p. 294) believes the word is identical with chahil, which he says denotes perhaps the mole-cricket, Gryllus talpiformis, from the stridulous sound it produces. Tychsen (pp. 79, 80) identifies it with the Gryllus striatulus, Linn. (= Edipoda striatula, Aud. Serv.). The notion conveyed by the Hebrew word will however apply to almost any kind of locust, and indeed to many kinds of insects; a similar word is dlafl, was applied by the Ethipians to a fly which the Arabs called tihib, which appears to be identical with the tecta fly of Dr. Livingstone and other African travellers. It can be positively known respecting the tschalil is, that it is some kind of insect injurious to trees and crops. The LXX. and Vulg. understand blight or mildew by the word.

The most destructive of the locust tribe that occur in the Bible lands are the Edipoda migratoria, and the Acridium peregrinum, and as both these species occur in Syria and Arabia, etc., it is most probable that one or other is denoted in those passages which speak of the dreadful devastations committed by these insects; nor is there any occasion to believe with Bochart, Tychsen, and others, that nine or ten distinct species are mentioned in the Bible. Some of the names may be synonyms; others may indicate the harva or nymphula conditions of the two preeminent devourers already named.

Locusts occur in great numbers, and sometimes Obscure the sun — Ex. x. 15; Jer. xlv. 23; Judg. vi. 3, vii. 12; Joel ii. 10; Nah. iii. 15; Lively, xii. 2; Ezran. N. A. iii. 12; Pliny, N. H. xi. 29; Shaw’s Travels, p. 187 (fol. 24 ed.); Ludolf, Hist. Ethiop. i. 13, and de Locustis, i. 4; Volney’s Trav. in Syria, i. 236.

Their voracity is alluded to in Ex. x. 12, 15; Joel i. 4; 7, 12, and ii. 3; Deut. xxviii. 38; Ps. lxviii. 45, cv. 34; Is. xxxiii. 4; Shaw’s Trav. 187, and travellers in the East, pressia.

They are compared to horses — Joel ii. 4; Rev. ix. 7. The Italians call the locust "Cavalletta;" and Ray says, "Caput oblivium, equi instar prona"

spectans." Comp. also the Arab’s description to Niebuhr, Deser. de l’Arabie.

They make a fearful noise in their flight — Joel ii. 5; Rev. ix. 9.

Forskil, Desr. 81, "transuntes grilli super verticem nostrum sono magne cataracte fervent.

"Volney, Trav. i. 235.

They have no king — Prov. xxx. 27; Kirby and Sp. Int. ii. 17.

Their irresistible progress is referred to in Joel ii. 8, 9; Shaw, Trav. p. 187.

They enter dwellings, and devour even the wood-work of houses — Ex. x. 6; Joel ii. 9, 10; Pliny, N. H. xi. 29.


Suauiniru. Rose-colored Starling. (Pastor roseus.)

The sea sends the greater number — Ex. x. 10; Joel ii. 29; Pliny, xi. 39; Hasselk. Trav. p. 443 (Engl. transl. 1766); cf. also Hidu, xxxi. 12.

Their dead bodies taint the air — Joel ii. 29; Hasselk. Trav. p. 443.

They are used as food — Lev. xi. 21, 22; Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6; Plinii. N. H. vi. 35, xi. 35; Dios. Sic. iii. 29 (the Acridophagoi); Aristoph. Achar. 1118; Ludolf, Hist. Ethiop. p. 67 (Gent’s transl.); Jackson’s Morocco, p. 52; Niebuhr, Deser. de l'Arabie, p. 150; Sparmann’s Trav. i. 367, who says the Hottentots are glad when the locusts come, for they fatten upon them: Hasselk. Trav. pp. 292, 413; Kirby and Stoskop, Trav. 1. 305.

There are different ways of preparing locusts for food; sometimes they are ground and pounded, and then mixed with flour and water and made into cakes, or they are salted and then eaten; sometimes smoked; boiled or roasted; stewed, or fried in butter. Dr. Kitto (Pict. Bibl. note on Lev. xi. 21), who tasted locusts, says they are more like shrimps than anything else; and an English clergyman, some years ago, cooked some of the green grass-hoppers, Locusta circulinalis, boiling them in water half an hour, throwing away the head, wings, and legs, and then sprinkling them with pepper and salt, he compares it in size to a swallow. The bird is about eight inches and a half in length. Yearell (Brit Birds, ii. 51, 21 ed.) says, "it is held sacred at Aleppo because it feeds on the locust;" and Col. Sykes bears testimony to the immense flocks in which they fly. He says (Catalogue of Birds of Dabobohn, "they darken the air by their numbers . . . forty or fifty have been killed at a shot." But he says, "they prove a calamity to the husbandman, as they are as destructive as locusts, and not much less numerous."
and adding batter; he found them excellent. How strange then, say, "how idle," to quote the words of Kirky and Spence (ibid. i. 305), "was the controversy concerning the locusts which formed part of the sustenance of John the Baptist, . . . and how apt even learned men are to perplex a plain question from ignorance of the customs of other countries!"

The following are some of the works which treat of locusts: Ludolf, Dissertation de Locustis, Frankfurt ad Mezn. 1694. This author believes that the quails which fed the Israelites in the wilderness were locusts (vid. his Distributa quae mutativa noce de Slevia, sive Locusts, descriptura). A more abstruse opinion was that held by Norrelus, who maintained that the four names of Lev. xi. 22 were birds (vid. his Schoelarchum de Aequis avium, Arch. Chrys. Salern. et Chrysol. in Bib. Bren. Ch. iii. p. 36). Faler, de Locustis Biblicis, et aliquot de Aequis Quadriappendicis, in loc. xi. 20, Wittgen. 1710-11. Asse's Abhandlung von den Heuschrecken, Rostock, 1787; and Tychsen's Comment. de Locustis. Oedmann's Frischdie Sammungen, ii. c. vii. Kirby and Spence's Introduction to Entomology, p. 305, etc. Boddart's Hibernica, iii. 254, etc. ed. Rosenmüller. Kitto's Phy. History of Palestine, pp. 419, 420. Kitto's Practical Bible, see Index, "Locust." Dr. Harris's Natural History of the Bible, art. "Locust." 1835. Kitto's Cyclopaedia, Arts. "Locust," "Chessit," etc. Harmer's Observations, London, 1797. The travels of Shaw, Russell, Hasselquin, Volut, etc., see. For a systematic description of the Orthoptera, see Servetus's Monograph in the Selula biuflin, und Fischer's Orthoptercompressi; and for an excellent summary, see Werner's Reischbiolbibl., i. 374, art. "Heuschrecken." For the locusts of St. John, Mr. Denham refers to Servetus's Theologiae, i. 169, 179, and Gatterer, de insect. Joanissiani, Franc. 1785; and for the symbolical locusts of Rev. i., to Newton on Prophecies, and Woodhouse on the Apocalypse.

W. H. *

* On the subject of locusts the reader may see also Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, pp. 306-318 (Lonid. 1867); the art. Heuschrecken, by Vahlinger, in Herzog's Real-Encyc. vi. 68-71; and Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies, iii. 63 f., and iv. 79. This last writer's description of their ravages in Palestine and Southern Media and the present day reads almost as if it translated from Joel (i. and ii.):

"The destructive locust (the Acrorinn perserrima, probably) comes suddenly . . . in clouds that obscure the air, moving with a slow and steady flight, and with a sound like that of heavy rain, and settling in myriads on the fields, the gardens, the trees, the terraces of the houses, and even the streets which they sometimes cover completely.

6 There are people at this day who gravely assert that the locusts which formed part of the food of the Raphtans were not Israelites, but that the long-tract poets of the locust-tree (Centauroidea sphinga, Johannin, et al., St. John's bread," as the monks of Palestine call it. For other equally erroneous explanations, or unauthorized alterations, of Scripture, see Cot's Hebrews, vol. ii.

6 For the judgment of locusts referred to in the prophec. Joel, see Dr. Pusey's "Introduction" to that book. This writer maintains that the prophet, under the figure of the locust, foretold a judgment for greater evil for mighty than the locust. Pusey, pp. 27-32, namely, the Assyrian invasion of Palestine, because Joel calls the scourage the "northern army," which Dr. Pusey says cannot be said of the locusts, because almost always by a sort of law of their being they make their inroads from their birthplace in the north. This one point, however, may be fairly questioned. The usual direction of the flight of this insect is from east to west, or from south to north; but the Egyptra magna is believed to have its birthplace in Tartary (Serv. Orph. p. 758), from whence it visits Africa, the Mauritius, and part of the South of Europe. If this species be considered to be the locust of Joel, the expression, northern army, is more applicable to it. [Joth. vi. 11, 13, 27, 31, note a.]
LODGE

Lo-debar, though with different vowel-points. In favor of this conjecture, which is adopted by J. D. Michaelis (Bib. für Ungeln), is the fact that such a use of the preposition 7 is exceedingly rare (see Kiel, Jowett ad loc.).

If taken as a Hebrew word, the root of the name is possibly “pasture,” the driving out of flocks (Ges. Thes. p. 735 &; Stanley, S. &; P. App. § 9); but this must be very uncertain.

G.

* LODGE. [CUCUMBERS, vol. i. p. 518.]

* LOOKED (προσέβουν), Acts xxviii. 6, where we should say at present “expected” or “looked for.” This sense, if not obsolete, is now obsolescent. Earlier versions (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva) have “waited” in that passage. See also Ezech. xx. 14. It.

LOOKING-GLASSES. [MIRRORS.]

LORD, as applied to the Deity, is the almost uniform rendering in the A. V. of the O. T. of the Heb. לנה, Jehovah, which would be more properly represented as a proper name. The reverence which the Jews entertained for the sacred name of God forbade them to pronounce it, and in reading they substituted for it either אביה, “Lord,” or אלהים, “God,” according to the vowel-points by which it was accompanied. [Jehovah, vol. ii. p. 1289.] This custom is observed in the version of the LXX., where Jehovah is most commonly transliterated by κυρίος, as in the N. 7. (Heb. i. 10, &c.), and in the Vulgate, where Dominius is the usual equivalent. The title אביה is also rendered “Lord” in the A. V., though, as applied to God, is of infrequent occurrence in the historical books. For instance, it is found in Genesis only in xv. 2, xxvi. 9 (where “say Lord” should be “say Jehovah”), 17, 39, 31, 32, xx. 4; once in Num. xiv. 17; twice in Deut. iii. 24, xx. 2; twice in Josh. vii. 7, 8; four times in Judges; and so on.

In other passages of these books “Lord” is the translation of Jehovah; except Ex. xxii. 17, xxiii. 23; Deut. x. 17; Josh. iii. 11, 13, where אביה is so rendered. But in the poetical and historical books it is more frequent, excepting Job, where it occurs only in xxvii. 28, and the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs, where it is not once found.

The difference between Jehovah and Adonai (אדונא) is generally marked in the A. V. by printing the word in small capitals (Lord) when it represents the former (Gen. xv. 4, &c.), and with an initial capital only when it is the translation of the latter (Ps. xxvii. 5, Is. i. 24, x. 16); except in Ex. xxiii. 17, xxviii. 30, where “the Lord God” should be more consistently “the Lord Jehovah.” A similar distinction prevails between יִתְנָה (the letters of Jehovah with the vowel-points of אדונא) and יִתְנָה, אדונא; the former being represented in the A. V. by “God” in small capitals (Gen. xv. 2, &c.), while אדונא is “God” with an initial capital only. And, generally, when the name of the Deity is printed in capitals, it indicates that the corresponding Hebrew is יִתְנָה, which is translated Lord or God according to the vowel-points by which it is accompanied.

In some instances it is difficult, on account of the pause accent, to say whether Adonai is the title of the Deity, or merely one of respect addressed to men. These have been noticed by the Masorites, who distinguish the former in their notes as “holy,” and the latter as “profane.” (See Gen. xviii. 9, xix. 18.)

* What can have led the LXX. to “translate the word יִתְנָה “heaps,” in Ps. lxix. 1, by δραπόκες εἰκόνες, which they employ for יִתְנָה in the above two passages, the writer is unable to conjecture.
LORD'S DAY, THE

LORD'S DAY, THE (ΤΟ ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗ ΥΠΕΡΑ: Ἴ μια σαββάτων). It has been questioned, though not seriously until of late years, what is the meaning of the Lord's Day, that is, to which Sunday is referred in one passage only of the Holy Scripture, Rev. i. 10, and is, in our English version, translated "the Lord's Day." The general consent both of Christian antiquity and of modern divines has referred it to the weekly festival of our Lord's resurrection, and identified it with "the first day of the week," on which He rose, with the patristical "eighth day," or "eighth," which is both the first and the eighth, in fact, with the ἱ πο τοῦ ΡΩΜΑ ΧΕΡΙΑ." "Sabbat Dies," or "Sunday," of every age of the Church.

But the views antagonistic to this general consent deserve at least a passing notice. (1.) Some have supposed St. John to be speaking, in the passage above referred to, of the Sabbath, because that institution is called in Isaiah liii. 13, by the Almighty Himself, "My holy day." To this it is replied — If St. John had intended to specify the Sabbath, he would surely have used that word which was by no means obsolete, or even exceptional, at the time of his composing the book of the Revelation. And it is added, that if an Apostle had set the example of confounding the seventh and the first days of the week, it would have been strange indeed that every week-sacred writer for the first five centuries should have avoided any approach to such confusion. They do avoid it — for as ζαββατον is never used by them for the first day, so Κυριακη is never used by them for the seventh day. (2.) Another theory is, that by the "Lord's day" St. John intended "the day of judgment," to which a large portion of the book of Revelation may be conceived to refer. Thus "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." (Υπερα ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ) would imply that he was rapt, in spiritual vision, to the date of that "great and terrible day," just as St. Paul represents himself as caught up bodily into Paradise. Now, not to dispute the interpretation of the passage from which the illustration is drawn (2 Cor. xii. 4), the abetors of this view seem to have put out of sight the following considerations. In the first place, St. John, as the Apostle who had shouldered the place in which he was writing, Parnes, and the causes which had brought him thither. It is but natural that he should further particularize the circumstances under which his mysterious work was composed, by stating the exact day on which the Revelations were communicated to him, and the employment, spiritual musing, in which he was then engaged. To suppose a mixture of the metaphysical and the literal would be strangely out of keeping. And though it be conceded that the day of judgment is in the New Testament spoken of as Η τοῦ Κυριου Χερια, the employment of the adjectival form constitutes a remarkable difference, which was observed and maintained ever afterwards. There is also a critical objection to this interpretation. This second theory then, which is sanctioned by the name of Augusti, must be abandoned. (3.) A third opinion is, that St. John intended by the "Lord's Day" that is, on which the Lord's resurrection was annually celebrated, or, as we now term it, Easter-day. On this it need only be observed, that, though it was never questioned that the weekly celebration of that event should take place on the first day of the Hebrew cycle, it was for a long time doubted on what day in the annual cycle it should be celebrated. Two schools at least existed on this point until considerably after the death of St. John. It therefore seems unlikely that, in a book intended for the whole Church, be would have employed a method of dating which was far from generally agreed upon. And it is to be added that no patristical authority can be quoted, either for the interpretation contended for in this opinion, or for the employment of Η Κυριακη Χερια to denote Easter-day.

All other conjectures upon this point may be permitted to confute themselves, but the following is so curious as to be omitted. In Scripture the first day of the week is called Η μια σαββατων, in post-Scripturnwriters it is called Η Κυριακη Χερια as well; therefore, the book of Revelation is not to be ascribed to an Apostle; or in other words, is not part of Scripture. The logic of this argument is only to be surpassed by its baldness. It says, in effect, because post-Scripturn writers have these two designations for the first day of the week; therefore, Scripturn writers must be confined to one of them. It was surely more reasonable to suppose that the adoption by post-Scripturn writers of a phrase so preeminently Christian as Η Κυριακη Χερια to denote the first day of the week, and a day so especially marked, can be traceable to nothing else than an Apostle's use of that phrase in the same meaning. Supposing then that Η Κυριακη Χερια of St. John is the Lord's Day,— What do we gather from Holy Scripture concerning that institution? How is it spoken of by early writers up to the time of Constantine? What change, if any, was brought upon it by the celebrated edict of that emperor, whom some have declared to have been its originator?

1. Scripture says very little concerning it. But that little seems to indicate that the divinely inspired Apostles, by their practice and by their precepts, marked the first day of the week as a day for meeting together to break bread, for communicating and receiving instruction, for laying out offerings in store for charitable purposes, for occupation in holy thought and prayer. The first day of the week so observed seems also to have been the day of the Lord's Resurrection, and therefore, to have been especially likely to be chosen for such purposes by those who "preached Jesus and the resurrection."

The Lord rose on the first day of the week (τη μια σαββατων), and appeared, on the very day of...
LORD'S DAY, THE

is rising, to his followers on five distinct occasions — to Mary Magdalene, to the other women, to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to ten Apostles collected together. After eight days (μεθ' ἡμέρας ἀπόκρις), that is, according to the ordinary reckoning, on the first day of the next week, He appeared to the eleven. He does not now, as before, give it little is to be expected. It may be to render that day especially noticeable by the Apostles, or, it may be for other reasons. But, however this question be settled, on the day of the Pentecost, which in that year fell on the first day of the week (see Brunham, Disc. of the Sabbath and Lord's Day, in Works, vol. v. p. 51, Oxford edition), “they were all with one accord in one place,” had spiritual gifts conferred on them, and in their turn began to communicate those gifts, as accompaniments of instruction, to others. At Troas (Acts xx. 7), many years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Christianity had begun to assume something like a settled form, St. Luke records the following circumstances. St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and “aboie seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.” In I Cor. vi. 1, 2, this practice, he writes thus: “Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.” In Heb. x. 25, the correspondents of the writer are desired not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is; but to prove their apprehensions of an injunction which seems to imply that a regular day for such assembling existed, and was well known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. And lastly, in the passage given above, St. John describes himself as being in the Spirit “on the Lord’s day.”

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedications of the first day of the week to the purposes above mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice. But, it may be observed, that it is at any rate an extraordinary coincidence, that almost immediately we emerge from Scripture, we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord’s Resurrection; that it is an extraordinary fact that we never find its dedication questioned or argued about, but accepted as something equally apostolic with Confirmation, with Infant Baptism, with Ordination, at least spoken of in the same way. And as to direct support from Holy Scripture, it is noticeable that those other ordinances which are usually considered Scriptural, and in support of which Scripture is usually cited, are dependent, so far as mere quotation is concerned, upon fewer texts than the Lord’s Day is. Stating the case at the very lowest, the Lord’s Day has at least two probable instances in Scripture, “and so is superior to any other holy day, whether of hebdomadal celebration, as Friday in memory of the Crucifixion, or of annual celebration, as Easter-fay in memory of the Resurrection itself. These other days may be, and are, defensible on other grounds: but they do not possess anything like a Scriptural authority for their observance. And if we are inclined still to press for more pertinent Scriptural proof, and more frequent mention of the institution, for such we suppose it to be, in the writings of the Apostles, we must recollect how few instances of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and how vast a difference is naturally to be expected to exist between a sketch of the manners and habits of their age, which the authors of the Holy Scriptures did not write, and hints as to life and conduct, and regulation of known practices, which they did write.

2. On quitting the canonical writings, we turn naturally to Clement of Rome. He does not, however, directly mention “the Lord’s Day,” but in I Cor. i. 40, he says, πάντα τὰ τίτικν γενέσεως φόρμας, and he speaks of ἁγιάσμα τινον καὶ ὠραῖον, at which the Christian προσόροφα καὶ λειτουργια should be made.

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John (see Magn. e. 9), contrasts Judaism and Christianity, and as an exemplification of the contrast, opposes σαββατιστική to living according to the Lord’s life (κυριακή τοῦ Κυρίου). The epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which, though certainly not written by that Apostle, was in existence in the earlier part of the 2d century, has (c. 15) the following words, “We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which too Jesus rose from the dead.”

A pagan document now comes into view. It is the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan, written while he resided over Pontus and Bithynia. “The Christians (says he), affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be, that they were accustomed to meet together on a stated day (stato die), before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a God, and to bind themselves by a Sacramentum, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery; never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon, to deliver up any trust; after which they partake of food assembled again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose.”

A thoroughly Christian authority, Justin Martyr, who flourished Α. d. 140, stands next on the list. He writes thus: “On the day called Sunday (η ημέρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Λεγομενὴ ἡμέρα), is an assembly of all those who live either in the cities or in the rural districts, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read.” Then he goes on to describe the particulars of the religious acts which are entered upon at this assembly. They consist of prayer, of the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and of collection of alms. He afterwards assigns the reasons which Christians had for meeting on Sunday. These are, because it is the First Day, on which God dispelled the darkness (το σκότος) and the original state of things (τον ἀοίδον), and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead upon it” (Apol. I. c. 67.). In another work (Did. c. Tryph.), he makes circumcision furnish a type of Sunday. “The command to circumcise infants on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we are circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week (η μαθήσεως): therefore it remains the Christian and first of days. As for σαββατιστική, he uses that with exclusi
reference to the Jewish law. He carefully distinguishes Saturday (ἡ χρωμή), the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday (αυτή τήν κρομήν ητίς ήταν ἦ τοῦ Ἑλλοῦ μέρα), upon which He rose from the dead. (If any surprise is felt at Justin’s employment of the heathen designations for the seventh and first days of the week, it may be accounted for thus. Before the death of Hadrian, A. D. 138, the hebdomadal division (which Dion Cassius, writing in the 3rd century, derives, together with its nomenclature, from Egypt) had in matters of common life almost universally superseded in Greece, and even in Italy, the national divisions of the lunar month. Justin Martyr, writing to and for heathen, as well as to and for Jews, employs it, therefore, with a certainty of being understood.)

The strange heretic, Bardesanes, who however delighted to consider himself a sort of Christian, has the following words in his book on “Fate,” or on “the Laws of the countries,” which he addressed to the Emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus: “What then shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who are Christians, whom in every country and in every region the Messiah established at his coming: for, lo! wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, Christians; and upon one day, which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed days we abstain from Lord.” (Curtier’s Translation.)

Two very short notices stand next on our list, but they are important from their casual and unstudied character. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, A. D. 170, in a letter to the Church of Rome, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusèbe, says, τὸν άχυρον αὐτοὶ κυριακά τόμον ναμέαν διηγομένων, ἐν ἑαυτοῦν οὐκ ἡ προσώπων. And Melito, bishop of Sardis, his contemporary, is stated to have composed, among other works, a treatise on the Lord’s Day (Ὁ μείζονς Κυριακάς λέγων).

The next writer who may be quoted is Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, A. D. 178. He asserts that the Sabbath is abolished; but his evidence to the existence of the Lord’s Day is clear and distinct. It is spoken of in one of the best known of his Fragments, de Haerent. Irenæus, 15, 10, 3. But a record in Eusèbe (v. 23, 2), of the part which he took in the Quadrabcean controversy, shows that in his time it was an institution beyond dispute. The point in question was this: Should Easter be celebrated in connection with the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, with the Churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia; or on the Lord’s Day, with the rest of the Christian world? The Churches of Gaul, then under the superintendence of Irenæus, agreed upon a synodical epistle to Victor, bishop of Rome, in which occurred words somewhat to this effect, “The mystery of the Lord’s Resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord’s Day, and on this alone should we observe the ‘breaking off of the Paschal Fast.’” This confirms what was said above, that while, even towards the end of the 2nd century, tradition varied as to the yearly celebration of Christ’s Resurrection, the weekly celebration of it was one upon which no diversity existed or was even hinted at.  

Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 194, comes next. One does not expect anything very definite from a writer of so mystical a tendency, but he has some things quite to our purpose. In his Strom. (iv. § 3), he speaks of τὴν ἄρχισον ἕμεραν, τὴν τῇ ἄνω αναστάσει ἤμων, τῇ δὲ καὶ πρῶτῃ τῇ ἐπί πατρός γενέσει, κ.τ.λ., words which Bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the seventh day of the Law with the eighth day of the Gospel. And, as the same learned prelate observes, “When Clement says that the Gnostic, or transcendental Christian, does not pray in any fixed place, or on any stated days, but throughout his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for the purposes of prayer.” But we are not left to mere inference on this important point, for Clement speaks of the Lord’s Day as a well-known and customary festival, and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name.  

Tertullian, whose date is assignable to the close of the 2nd century, may, in spite of his conversion to Montanism, be quoted as a witness to facts. He terms the first day of the week sometimes Sunday (Dies Solis), sometimes Dies Dominica. He speaks of it as a day of joy (“Dies Solis institutum indiguum,” Apol. c. 16), and asserts that it is wrong to fast upon it, or to pray kneeling during its continuance (“Die Dominico jumilium nefas diximus, vel de geniculis adulcere,” De Cor. c. 3).

Even business is to be put off, lest we give place to the devil (De Differentia etam nonag, ne quem Diabolo hunc densius,” De Omen. c. 14).

Origin contralts that the Lord’s Day had its superiority to the Sabbath indicated by manner having been given on it to the Israelites, while it was withheld on the Sabbath. It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to keep the Lord’s Day.

Minucius Felix, A. D. 210, makes the heathen interlocutor, in his dialogue called Octavius, assert that the Christians come together to a feast on a solemn day “(solo sancto die)” (solanum diec).

quippe et rerum, in a synodal letter A. D. 253, make the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day prefigure the newness of life of the Christian, to which Christ’s resurrection introduces him, and point to the Lord’s Day, which is at once the eighth and the first.

Commodian, cir. A. D. 270, mentions the Lord’s Day.

Victorinus, A. D. 290, contrasts it, in a very remarkable passage, with the Passover and the Sabbath:

And Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 300, says of it, “We keep the Lord’s Day as a day of joy, because of Him who rose thereon.”

The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John are as follows: The Lord’s Day (a name which has now come out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with our Lord’s resurrection than before) existed during these two centuries without a name and without any special observance, but in the Easter week of the Lord’s resurrection was considered a festal day.
turies as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of Scriptural Christianity. It was never defended, for it was never impugned, or at least only impugned as other things received from the Apostles were. It was never conformed with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it (though we have not quoted nearly all the passages by which this point might be proved). It was not an institution of severe Sabbatical character, but a day of joy (χαράταινα) and cheerfulness (εὐφορία), rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the Holy Eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for almsgiving; and though, being an institution under the law of liberty, work does not appear to have been formally interdicted, or rest formally enjoined, Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's Day and the Sabbath, in no passage that has come down to us is the Fourth Commandment appealed to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's Day. Ecclesiastical writers reiterate again and again, in the strictest sense of the word, "Let no man therefore judge you in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days" (Mq της ἡμέρας κρινόντων ἐν μέρει διυτίου, η γουνάρια, η σαββάτων, Col. ii. 16). Nor, again, is it referred to any Sabbatical foundation anterior to the promulgation of the Mosaic economy. On the contrary, those, those before the Mosaic era are constantly assumed to have had neither knowledge nor observance of the Sabbath. And as little is it anywhere asserted, that the Lord's Day is merely an ecclesiastical institution, dependent on the post-apostolic Church for its origin, and by consequence capable of being done away, should a time ever arrive when it appears to be no longer needed.

Our design does not necessarily lead us to do more than state facts; but if the facts be allowed to speak for themselves, they indicate that the Lord's Day is a purely Christian institution, sanctioned by apostolic practice, mentioned in apostolic writings, and so possessed of whatever divine authority all apostolic ordinances and doctrines (which were not obviously temporary, or were not abrogated by the Apostles themselves) can be supposed to possess.

3. But on whatever grounds "the Lord's Day" may be supposed to rest, it is a great and indisputable fact that four years before the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, it was recognized by Constantine in his celebrated edict, as "the venerable Day of the Sun." The terms of the document are these:—


Omnibus ecclesiae urbebusque plebis et canonicorum archierarchia officiis venerandi Die Solis religiosi. Rursi tam est in principia liberae laetetur inscribantur, quantum frequentiores erectur un non aptiis alio die fruunt.

Ταν εντυχενευ κοιμουμενες ημερες, εν Επισκοπαι προτείνει της εξουσίας ὑποκάζονται, Ἑλέστε δὲ την ἱερατικὴν καταδίκην, καὶ την τοιοτῆς εἰσαγωγῆς ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πραγμάτων σχετικῶς ὑπερευπαίνεται, καὶ εν εὐχαῖς καὶ λατινὸς τοῦ θεοῦ θυσίας εὐπνεους διὰ τὴν κυρίαν, ὥστε τοῦ Κριτῶν οὐσιωδοῦ εὐαίσθεντος εἰκόνας, εἰς τοὺς τετράδες συνάρτησις εἰς χειρός τοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦ ἔτους εἰς ἡμέρας τοὺς ἐσταιρώμενους Τιττ. Χριστ. Ἰunct. i. c. 9.


Some have endeavored to explain away this document by alleging — 1st, that "Solis Dies" is not the Christian name of the Lord's Day, and that Constantine did not therefore intend to acknowledge it as a Christian institution.

2d. That, before his conversion, Constantine had professed himself to be especially under the guardianship of the sun, and that, at the very best, he intended to make a religious compromise between sun-worshippers, properly so-called, and the worshippers of the "Sun of Righteousness," i.e., Christians.

3d. That Constantine's edict was purely a kalendarial one, and intended to reduce the number of public holidays, "Dies Nefasti," or "Feriatii," which had, so long ago as the date of the "Actiones Ferrine," become a serious impediment to the transaction of business. And that this was to be effected by choosing a day which, while it would be accepted by the Paganism then in fashion, would of course be agreeable to the Christians.

4th. That Constantine then instituted Sunday for the first time as a religious day for Christians.

The fourth of these statements is absolutely refuted, both by the quotations made above from writers of the second and third centuries, and by the terms of the edict itself. It is evident that Constantine, accepting as facts the existence of the "Sulis Dies," and the reverence paid to it by some one or other, does nothing more than make that reverence practically universal. It is "venerabilis" already. And it is probable that this most natural interpretation would never have been disturbed, had not Sozomen asserted, without warrant from either the Justinian or the Theodosian Code, that Constantine did for the sixth day of the week what the codes assert he did for the first.

The three other statements concern themselves rather with what Constantine meant than with what he did. But with such considerations we have little or nothing to do. He may have purposely selected an ambiguous appellation. He may have been only half a Christian, wavering between allegiance to Christ and allegiance to Mithras. He may have affected a religious syncretism. He may have wished his people to adopt such syncretism. He may have feared to offend the Pagans. He may have hesitated to awow too openly his inward leanings to Christianity. He may have considered that community of religious days might lead by and by to community of religious thought and feeling. And he may have had in view the rectification of the calendar. But all this is nothing to the purpose.

It is, in fact, that in the year A.D. 321, in a public edict, which was to apply to Christians as well as to Pagans, he put especial honor upon a day already honored by the former — judiciously calling it by a name which Christians had long tam esse deceruit. " There is a passage also in Eusebius (Vit. Const. i. 15), which appears to assert the same thing of Saturday. It is, however, manifestly corrupt, and can scarcely be translated at all, except by the employment of an emendation; while, if we do thus emend it, it will speak of Friday, as Sozomen does, and not of Saturday; and, what is more to our purpose, to whichever of those days it does refer, what is said in it concerning the εἰκόνας της Παρασκευῆς remains.
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employed without scruple, and to which, as it was in ordinary use, the Pagans could scarcely object. What he did for it was to insist that worthy purpose, whether by the functionaries of the law or by private citizens, should be intermitted during its continuance. An exception indeed was made in favor of the rural districts, avowedly from the necessity of the case, covertly perhaps to prevent those districts, where Paganism (as the word Pagan would intimate) still prevailed extensively, from feeling aggrieved by a sudden and stringent change. It need only be added here, that the readiness with which Christians acquiesced in the interference of business on the Lord's Day affords no small presumption that they had long considered it to be a day of rest, and that, so far as circumstances admitted, they had made it so long before.

Were any other testimony wanting to the existence of Sunday as a day of Christian worship at this period, it might be supplied by the Council of Nicaea, A. D. 325. The Fathers there and then assembled made no objection of the observance of that day — do not ordain it — do not detest it. They assume it as an existing fact, and only notice it incidentally in order to regulate an indifferent matter, the posture of Christian worshippers upon it.

Richard Baxter has well summed up the history of the Lord's Day at this point, and his words may not unaptly be inserted here: — "That the first Christian emperor, finding all Christians unanimous in the possession of the day, should make a law (as our kings do) for the due observing of it, and that the first Christian council should establish uniformity in the very gesture of worship on that day, are strong confirmations of the matter of fact, that the churches unanimously agreed in the holy use of it, as a separated day even from and in the Apostles' days." (Richard Baxter, On the Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day, p. 41, 1671.)

Here we conclude our inquiry. It patristical or ecclesiastical ground has been touched upon, it has been only so far as appeared necessary for the elucidation of the Scripture phrase, ἡ Κυρίας ἡμέρα. What became of the Sabbath after Christianity was fairly planted; what Christ said of it in the Gospels, and how his words are to be interpreted: what the Apostles said of that day, and how they treated it: what the early ecclesiastical writers held respecting it; and in what sense "There remaineth a Sabbath after the Commandment" (Heb. iv. 9): these are questions which fall rather under the head of Sabbath than under that of "Lord's Day." And as no debate arose in apostolic or in primitive times respecting the relation, by descent, of the Lord's Day to the Mosaic Sabbath, or to any Sabbathial institution of assumed higher antiquity, none need be raised here. [See SABBATH.]

The whole subject of the Lord's Day, including its "origin, history, and present obligation," is treated of by the writer of this article in the Bampton Lecture for 1800.

J. A. H.

LORD'S SUPPER (Κυριακὸν δείνυμι: Eam Dominico). The words which thus describe the great central act of the worship of the Christian Church occur but in one single passage of the N. T. (1 Cor. xi. 20). Of the fact which lies under the same we have several notices, and from these, incidentals and fragmentary as they are, it is possible to form a tolerably distinct picture. To examine these notices in their relation to the life of the Christian society in the first stages of its growth, and so to learn what the "Supper of the Lord" actually was, will be the object of this article. It would be foreign to its purpose to trace the history of the sotely names which grew up out of it in the 2d and 3d centuries, except so far as any supply or suggest evidence as to the customs of the earlier period, or to touch upon the many controversies which then, or at a later age, have clustered round the original institution.

I. The starting-point of this inquiry is found in the history of that night when Jesus and his disciples met together to eat the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 19; Mark xiv. 16; Luke xxii. 13). The manner in which the Paschal feast was kept by the Jews of that period differed in many details from that originally prescribed by the rules of Ex. xii. The multitudes that came up to Jerusalem, met, as they could find accommodation, family by family, or in groups of friends, with one of their number as the celebrant, or "proclaimer" of the feast. The ceremonies of the feast took place in the following order (Lightfoot, Tempel Service, xxxii.; Meyer, Comm. in Matt. xxvi. 20). (1.) The members of the family that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being now as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. Matt. xxvi. 22, ἀνάκαρτο: Λουκ. xxii. 14; and John xiii. 23, 25). The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing "for the day and for the wine," pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to rabbinical traditions, to be mixed with water; and the reason of this custom being both a memorial of the ancient practice, and a mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best way of using the best wine (comp. 2 Macc. xx. 39). (2.) All who were present then washed their hands; this also having a special benediction. (3.) The table was then set out with the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as Charoseth (τηροσθή), a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins, and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt (Baxter, Lex. Rabb. 831). (4.) The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the Charoseth and ate them. (5.) The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the

The phraseology to which we are accustomed is to him only an example of the "ridicula Calvinistarum et Lutheranorum insinu," innovating on the received language of the Church. The keen detector of heresy, however, is in this instance at variance not only with the consensus of the chief fathers of the ancient Church (comp. Suicer. Thes. s. v. δείνυμι), but with the authoritative teaching of his own (Catechism Trident. c. iv. qu. 6)
questions that might be asked by children or pro-selytes, who were astonished at such a strange beginning of a feast, and the cup was passed round and drunk at the close of it. (6.) The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the paschal supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving. (7.) Then came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread, and gave thanks over it. All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Chareseth, and so ate them. (8.) After this they ate the flesh of the paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked; and after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the “cup of blessing,” was handed round. (9.) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of 1s. cxv.-cxviii. followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song. (10.) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the “great Hallel” (possibly Psalm cxv.-cxviii.) was sung over it.

Celebrating the ritual thus gathered from Rabbinic writers with the N. T., and assuming (1) that it represents substantially the common practice of our Lord’s time; and (2) that the meal of which He and his disciples partook, was either the Passover itself, or an anticipation of it, conducted according to the same rules, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the old practice presented for the institution of the new. To (1) or (3), or even to (8), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (Luke xxii. 17, 18); to (2) or (7), the dipping of the sop (φαγετον) of John xiii. 29; to (7), or to an interval during or after (8), the distribution of the bread (Matt. xxv. 25; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25); to (9) or (10) (“after supper.”) Luke xxii. 20), the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the meal was terminated. It will be noticed, according to this order of succession, the question whether Judas partook of what, in the language of a later age, would be called the consecrated elements, is most probably to be answered in the negative.

The narratives of the Gospels show how strongly the disciples were impressed with the words which had given a new meaning to the old familiar acts. They leave unnoticed all the ceremonies of the Passover, except those which had thus been transferred to the Christian Church and perpetuated in it. Old things were passing away, and all things becoming new. They had looked on the bread and the wine as memorials of the deliverance from Egypt. They were now told to partake of them in remembrance of their Master and Lord. The festival had been annual. No rule was given as to the time and frequency of the new feast that thus superseded on the old, but the command “Do this as oft as ye drink it” (1 Cor. xi. 25), suggested the more continual recurrence of that which was to be their memorial of one whom they would with never to forget. The words, “This is my body,” gave to the unleavened bread a new character. They had been prepared for language that would otherwise have been so startling, by the teaching of John (vi. 32-34), and they were thus taught to see in the bread that was broken the witness of the closest possible union and incorporation with their Lord. The cup which was “the new testament” (βαπτισμος) “in His blood,” would remind them, in like manner, of the wonderful prophecy in which that new covenant had been foretold (Jer. xxxi. 31-34) of which the crowning glory was in the promise, “I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”

His blood shed, as He told them, “for them and for many,” for that remission of sins which He had been proclaiming throughout his whole ministry, was to be to the new covenant what the blood of sprinkling had been to that of Moses. (Ex. xxiv. 8.) It is possible that there may have been yet another thought connected with these symbolic acts. The funeral customs of the Jews involved, at or after the burial, the administration to the mourners of bread (comp. Jer. xvi. 7. “neither shall they break bread for them in mourning,” in marginal reading of A. V.: Ewald and Hitzig, ad loc.; Ez. xxiv. 17; Hos. ix. 4; Tob. iv. 17), and of wine, known, when thus given, as the cup of consolation. May not the bread of Ps. cxiii, and the wine of the Last Supper have had something of that character, preparing the minds of Christ’s disciples for his departure by treating it as already accomplished? They were to think of his body as already anointed for the burial (Matt. xxv. 12; Mark xiv. 8; John xii. 7), of his body as already given up to death, of his blood as already shed. The passover-meal was also, little as they might dream of it, a funeral-feast.

The bread and the wine were to be signs of communication for their sorrow, analogous to the verbal promises of John xiv. 1, 27, xvi. 20. The word βαπτισμος might even have the twofold meaning which is connected with it in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

May we not conjecture, without leaving the region of history for that of controversy, that the thoughts, desires, emotions, of that hour of divine sorrow and communion would be such as to lead the disciples to crave earnestly to renew them? Would it not be natural that they should seek that renewal in the way which their Master had pointed out to them? From this time, accordingly, the words “to break bread,” appear to have had for

* It may be interesting to give the words, as showing what kind of forms may have served as types for the first worship of the Christian Church.

1. This is the passover, which we eat because the Lord passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt.

2. These are the bitter herbs, which we eat in remembrance that the Egyptians made the lives of our fathers bitter in Egypt.

3. This is the unleavened bread, which we eat, because the dough of our fathers had not time to be leavened before the Lord revised himself and redeemed them out of hand.

4. Therefore are we bound to give thanks, to praise, to laud, to glorify, to extol, to honor, to praise, to magnify him that hath done for our fathers, and for us, all these wonders; who hath brought us from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to rejoicing, from mourning to a good time; from darkness to a great light, from affliction to redemption; therefore must we say before him, Hallelujah, praise ye the Lord . . . . followed by Ps. cxiii. (Lightfoot, l. c.)

* This reservation is made as being a possible alternative for explaining the difference between the three first Gospels and St. John.
the disciples a new significance. It may not have assumed indeed, as yet, the character of a distinct liturgical act; but when they met to break bread, it was with new thoughts and hopes, and with the meaning that even this could be natural that the Twelve should transmit the command to others who had not been present, and seek to lead them to the same obedience and the same blessings. The narrative of the two disciples to whom their Lord made himself known "in breaking of bread" at Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 30-35) would strengthen the belief that this was the way to an abiding fellowship with Him. In the same context, given by the writer of the Acts of the life of the first disciples at Jerusalem, a prominent place is given to this act, and to the phrase which indicated it. Writing, we must remember, with the definite associations that had gathered round the words during the thirty years that followed the events he records, he describes the baptized members of the Church as continuing steadfast in or to the teaching of the Apostles, in fellowship with them and with each other, and in breaking of bread and in prayers (Acts ii. 42). A few verses further on, their daily life is described as ranging itself under two heads: (1) that of public devotion, which still belonged to them as Jews ("continuing daily with one accord in the Temple"); (2) that of their distinct acts of fellowship - breaking bread from house to house (or "privately," Meyer). They did eat their meat in gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Taken in connection with the account given in the preceding verses of the love which made them live as having all things common, we can scarcely doubt that this implies that the chief actual meal of each day was one in which they met as brothers, and which was either preceded or followed by the more solemn commemorative acts of the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup. It will be convenient to anticipate the language and the thoughts of a somewhat later date, and to say that, apparently, they thus united every day the Agape or feast of Love with the celebration of the Eucharist. So far as the former was concerned, they were reproducing in the streets of Jerusalem the simple and

The general consensus of patristic and Roman Catholic interpreters finds in this also a solemn celebration of the Eucharist. Here, they say, are the solemn benediction, and the technical words for the distribution of the elements as in the original institution, and as in the subsequent commemoration of the Acts. It should be remembered, however, that the phrase "to break bread" had been a synonym for the act of any one partaking at a meal (comp. Jer. xvi. 7; Iam iv. 4), and that the rabbinical rule required a blessing whenever three persons sat down together at it. (Comp. Mal. 4:11; and Meyer, ad loc.)

The meaning of κοιναίνοι in this passage is probably explained by the εἰς ἑαυτάκερα σύναρσιν that follows (comp. Meyer, ad loc.). The Vulg. rendering, "et communicatio fractionis pasi," probably comes in a wish to give to the word its later liturgical sense.

The fact is traceable to the earliest days of the Church. The origin of the name is obscure. It occurs in the sense only in two passages of the N. T. (1 Pet. ii. 19, 20) and that of Peter the apostle is the only one strongly supported by and other great MSS.; it is undisputed. The absence of any reference to it in St. Paul's memorable chapter on Agape (1 Cor. xiii.) makes it improbable that it was then and there in use. In the age after the Apostles, however, it is a currently accepted word for the meal here described (Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 8; Tertull. Apol. c. 30; ad Mart. c. 2; Cyprian, Testim. ad Quirin. iii. 3).

The account given by Josephus (Bell. Jud. ii. 3, 4) deserves to be studied, both as coming from an eye-witness (Vita, c. 2), and as showing a type of holiness which could hardly have been unknown to the first Christian disciples. The description of the meal of the Essenes, it would be necessary to introduce words that would show that what was done was in remembrance of their Master. At some time, before or after the meal of which they partook as such, the bread and the wine would be given with some special form of words or acts, to indicate its character. New converts would need some explanation of the meaning and origin of the observance. What would be so fitting and so much in harmony with the precedents of the Paschal feast as the narrative of what had passed on the night of its institution (1 Cor. xvi. 23-27)? With this there would naturally be associated (as in Acts ii. 42) prayers for themselves and others. Their gladness would show itself in the psalms and hymns with which they praised God (Acts ii. 46, 47; James v. 13). The analogy of the Passover, the general

LORD'S SUPPER
The plural \textit{agap\ae} has been understood as implying that the congregation took part in the act of breaking bread and blessing the cup (1 Cor. xii. 16). It may be questioned, however, whether this is sufficient ground for an interpretation for which there is no support either in the analogues custom of the Jews or in the traditions of the Church. The practice of the Agape, which stands parallel to \\textit{Eucharistia}, can hardly be referred to the whole body of partakers. When the act is described historically, the singular is always used (Acts xx. 11, xlvii. 35). Tertullian, in his passage to which Prof. Stanley refers, speaks of the other practice

The Lord's Supper

The feeding of the Jews, and the practice of the Essenes may possibly have suggested allusions, partial or entire, as a preparation for the feast (Heb. x. 22; John xiii. 1-15; comp. Tertull. de \\textit{Eremit.} c. xli; and for the later practice of the Church, August. \textit{Sermon.} cxciv.). At some point in the feast those who were present, men and women sitting apart, would rise to salute each other with the "holy kiss" (1 Cor. vii. 38; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Clem. Alex. \textit{Piq.\textit{Piq.}\textit{Piq.}} iii. c. 11; Tertull. de \\textit{Orat.} c. 14; Just. M. \textit{Apol.} ii.). Of the stages in the growth of the new worship we have, it is true, no direct evidence, but the contrasts mentioned between the earlier and later custom are confirmed by the fact that this order appears as the common element of all later liturgies.

The next traces that meet us are in 1 Cor., and the fact that we find them is in itself significant. The commemorative feast has not been confined to the personal disciples of Christ, or the Jewish converts whom they gathered round them at Jerusalem. It has been the law of the Church's expansion that this act should spring forth in its various places everywhere. Wherever the Apostles or their delegates have gone, they have taken this with them. The language of St. Paul, we must remember, is not that of a man who is setting forth a new truth, but of one who appeals to thoughts, words, phrases that are familiar to his readers, and we find accordingly evidence of a received liturgical terminology. The title of the "cup of blessing" (1 Cor. x. 16), Hebrew in its origin and form (see above), has been imported into the Greek Church. The synonym of "the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. x. 21) distinguishes it from the other cups that belonged to the Agape. The word "fellowship" (\textit{Koinonia}) is passing by degrees into the special signification of "Communion." The Apostles refer to his own office as breaking the bread and blessing the cup (1 Cor. x. 16). A table on which the bread was placed was the Lord's Table, and that title was to the Jew not, as later controversies have made it, the antithesis of altar (\textit{Ostensorium}), but as nearly as possible a synonym (\textit{Mal. i. 17}, 2 Ex. xii. 22). But the practice of the Agape, as well as the observance of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evils had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social purpose; the introduction of all sorts of rank, at once an obstacle and an encouragement to unscrupulous conduct; the making of a banquet out of the Lord's feast; the showing the ungodly to eat and drink with the saints; the making of a festival out of the Lord's Supper, have been condemned with great vehemence, constituting the subject of the five chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

"These things I do not approve," says St. Paul, "nor do I approve of the man who has the care of the Lord's feast making it a cause of his wrong doing." But we must notice, that the words of St. Paul are not fully comprehended by the first and last of the five chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostle's instruction is clearly not addressed to those who, being profane, were plundering the Church of Christ, and actually committing sacrilege, but to such as had improperly introduced their own society into the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The instruction of the Apostle is, in the first place, one of teaching and warning; in the second of exhortation, and in the third of example. The words of St. Paul, properly understood and applied, are a corrective of sin, a comfort to the soul, and a guide to the Church. The Lord's Supper, in the hands of St. Paul, is not a support of vice, an argument for sloth, an occasion for intemperance, a source of corruption, but a comfort to the conscience, an exhortation to the spirit, and a guide to the Church.

The practice of the Agape, as well as the observance of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evils had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social purpose; the introduction of all sorts of rank, at once an obstacle and an encouragement to unscrupulous conduct; the making of a banquet out of the Lord's feast; the showing the ungodly to eat and drink with the saints; the making of a festival out of the Lord's Supper, have been condemned with great vehemence, constituting the subject of the five chapters of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostle's instruction is clearly not addressed to those who, being profane, were plundering the Church of Christ, and actually committing sacrilege, but to such as had improperly introduced their own society into the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The instruction of the Apostle is, in the first place, one of teaching and warning; in the second of exhortation, and in the third of example. The words of St. Paul, properly understood and applied, are a corrective of sin, a comfort to the conscience, an exhortation to the spirit, and a guide to the Church.

The tendency of this language, and therefore probably of the order subsequently established, was to make the Lord's Supper a true sacrament, and to form it into a celebration solemn, serious, and sacred. This idea is the true foundation of the liturgy of the Church of Christ, and it is the Church that has lived up to the idea of St. Paul, and has for the last six hundred years with the utmost integrity and holiness performed the great duty of celebrating the Lord's Supper. This is the true and scriptural supposition of the Lord's Supper. The Church has lived up to the idea of St. Paul, and has for the last six hundred years with the utmost integrity and holiness performed the great duty of celebrating the Lord's Supper.
and finally dies out.\(^a\) Traces of it linger in some of the traditional practices of the Western Church.\(^b\) There have been attempts to revive it among the Moravians and other religious communities. The other also has it changes. The morning celebration takes the place of the evening. The names — Eucharist, Mass, Holy Name, — gather round it. New epithets and new ceremonies express the growing reverence of the people. The mode of celebration at the high altar of a basilica in the 4th century differs so widely from the circumstances of the original institution, that a careless eye would have found it hard to recognize their identity. Speculations, controversies, superstitions crystallize round this as their nucleus. Great disruptions and changes threaten to destroy the life and unity of the Church. Still, through all the changes, the Supper of the Lord vindicates its claim to universality, and bears a permanent witness of the truths with which it was associated.

In Acts xx. 11 we have an example of the way in which the transition may have been effected. The disciples at Troas meet together to break bread. The hour is not definitely stated, but the fact that St. Paul's discourse was protracted till past midnight, and the mention of the many hands that indicate a later time than that commonly fixed for the Greek ἐκκλησία. If we are not to suppose a scene at variance with St. Paul's rule in 1 Cor. xi. 34, they must have had each his own supper before they assembled. Then came the teaching and the prayers, and then, towards early dawn, the breaking of bread, which constituted the Lord's Supper, and for which they were gathered together. If this midnight meeting be taken as indicating a common practice, of evening in reverence for an ordinance which Christ had enjoined, we can easily understand how the next step would be (as circumstances rendered the midnight gatherings unnecessary or inexpedient) to transfer the celebration of the Eucharist permanently to the morning hour, to which it had gradually been approaching.\(^c\) Here also in later times there were traces of the original custom. Even when a later celebration was looked on as at variance with the general custom of the Church (Ssozomen, συνάγωνα), it was recognized as legitimate to hold an evening communion, as a special commemoration of the original institution, on the Thursday before Easter (August. Ep. p. 118; ad Jon. c. 57-77; and again on Easter eve, the celebration in the latter case probably taking place "very early in the morning while it was yet dark") (Tertull. ad Uxor. ii. 6. 4).

The recurrence of the same liturgical words in Acts xx. 35 makes it probable, though not certain, that the food of which St. Paul thus partook was intended to have, for himself and his Christian companions, the character at once of the Agape and the Eucharist. The heathen soldiers and sailors, it may be noticed, are said to have followed his example, not to have partaken of the bread which he had eaten. When we adopt the same conclusion, we have in this narrative another example of a celebration in the early hours between midnight and dawn (comp. vv. 27, 39), at the same time, i. e., as we have met with in the meeting at Troas.

All the distinct references to the Lord's Supper which occur within the limits of the N. T. have, it is believed, been noticed. To find, as a recent writer has done (Christian Remembrancer for April, 1880), quotations from the Liturgy of the Eastern Church in the Pauline Epistles, involves (ingeniously as the hypothesis is supported) assumptions too many and too bold to justify our acceptance of it.\(^d\) Extending the inquiry, however, to the times as well as the writings of the N. T., we find reason to believe that we can trace in the later worship of the Church some fragments of that which belonged to it from the beginning. The language of the four great families of liturgies implies the substratum of a common order. To that order may well have belonged the Hebrew words Hallelujah, Amen, Hosanna, Lord of Sabaoth; the salutations "Peace to all," "Peace to thee;" the Sumsur Corda (Ἄνω σχόλως τάς χαρίς), the Triregion, the Kyrie Eleison. We are justified in looking at these as having been portions of a liturgy that was really primitive; guarded from change by the tenacity with which the Christians of the second century clung to the traditions (the παραμόρφωσις of 2 Thess. ii. 15. iii. 6) of the first, forming part of the great deposit (παρασκηνεῖς) of faith and worship which they had received from the Apostles and have transmitted to later ages (comp. Bingham, Eccl. Antiq. b. x. c. 7; Augusti, Christi. Archid. b. viii.; Stanley on 1 Cor. x. and xi.).

E. H. P.

**LOT (ロート)**

**LOT (ロート)** is the son of Haran and the nephew of Abraham (Gen. xi. 27, 31). His sisters were Milcah, the wife of Nahor, and Iscah, both identified with Sarah. The following genealogy exhibits the family relations:

```
LOT (ロート) & Joseph (ヨセフ) &osaic, and so Veneto-Greek Vers.: LOT) the son of Haran, and therefore the nephew of Abraham (Gen. xi. 27, 31). His sisters were Milcah, the wife of Nahor, and Iscah, both identified with Sarah. The following genealogy exhibits the family relations:
```

\(a\) The history of the Agape, in their connection with the life of the Church, is full of interest, but would be out of place here. An outline of it may be found in Augusti, Christi. Archid. iii. 704-711.

\(b\) The practice of distributing bread, which has been blessed but not consecrated, to the congregation generally (children included), at the greater festivals of the Church, presents a vestige, or at least an analogue, of the old Agape. Liturgical writers refer it to the period (A. D. 318-356) when the earlier practice was falling into disuse, and this taking its place as the expression of the same feeling. The bread thus distributed is known in the Eastern Church as ἀγαπησ, in the Western as the pars brevica, the "pain boîle" of the modern French Church. The practice

\(c\) is still common in France and other parts of Europe (Comp. Morat, Lexicon. Etc.; Pascal, Liturg. Cathol., in Migne's Encyc. Theol. s. v. "Eloge.")

\(d\) comp. the "antelucanum entity" of Tertull. (de Cor. Mor. c. 3). The annunciation in the ritual of the monastic order, of the Nocturnes, and Matins-Lauds, into the single office of Matins presents an instance of an analogous transition (Pulner, Orig. Liturg. l. 2:22).

\(e\) 1 Cor. ii. 9, compared with the recurrence of the same words in the Liturgy with an antecedent to the epitaph without one, is the passage on which most stress is laid 1 Pet. ii. 16 and Eph. v. 14, are added as further instances.
Haran died before the emigration of Terah and his family from Ur of the Chaldees (ver. 28), and Lot was therefore born there. He removed with the rest of his kindred to Charan, and again subsequently with Abram and Sarai to Canaan (xii. 4, 5). With them he took refuge in Egypt from a famine, and with them returned, first to the "South" (xiii. 1), and then to their original settlement between Bethel and Ai (vv. 3, 4), where Abram had built his first altar (xii. 6; comp. xii. 7), and invoked on it the name of Jehovah. But the pastures of the hills of Bethel, which had with ease contained the two strangers on their first arrival, were not able any longer to bear them, so much had their possessions of sheep, goats, and cattle increased since that time. It was not any disagreement between Abram and Lot—their relations continued good to the last; but between the slaves who tended their countless herds disputes arose, and a parting was necessary. The exact equality with which Jehovah treats Lot is very remarkable. It is as if they were really, according to the very ancient idiom of these records (Ewald on Gen. xxx.), "brethren," instead of uncle and nephew. From some one of the round swelling hills which surround Bethel—from none more likely than that which stands immediately on its east [Bethel, vol. I.]—the two Hebrews looked over the comparatively empty land, in the direction of Sodom, Gomorrah, and Zoar (xii. 10). "The occasion was to the two lords of Palestine—then almost 'free before them where to choose'—what in Grecian legends is represented under the figure of the Choice of Hercules: in the fables of Islam under the story of the Prophet turning back from Damascus." And Lot lifted up his eyes towards the left, and beheld all the precinct of the Jordan that it was well watered everywhere: like a garden of Jehovah: like that unutterably green and fertile land of Egypt he had only lately quitted. Even from that distance, through the clear air of Palestine, can be distinctly discovered the long and thick masses of vegetation which fringe the numerous streams that descend from the hills on either side, to meet the central stream in its tropical depths. And what it now is immediately opposite Bethel, such as it seems then to have been "even to Zoar," to the farthest extremity of the sea which now covers the "valley of the fields?"—the fields of Sodom and Gomorrah. "No crust of salt, no volcanic convulsions, had as yet blasted its verdure, or alarmed the secure civilization of the early Phoenician settlements which had struck root in its fertile depths." It was exactly the prospect to tempt a man who had no fixed purpose of his own, who had not like Abram observed a stern inward call of duty. So Lot left his uncle on the barren hills of Bethel, and he "chose all the precipice of the Jordan, and journeyed east," down the ravines which give access to the Jordan Valley; and then when he reached it turned again southward and advanced as far as Sodom (11, 12). Here he "pitched his tent," for he was still a nomad. But his nomad life was virtually at an end. He was now to relinquish the freedom and independence of the simple life of the tent—a mode of life destined to be one of the great methods of educating the descendants of Abram—and encounter the corruptions which seem always to have attended the life of cities in the East—"the men of Sodom were wicked, and sinners before Jehovah exceedingly." 2. The next occurrence in the life of Lot is his capture by the four kings of the East, and his rescue by Abram (Gen. xiv.). Whatever may be the age of this chapter in relation to those before and after it, there is no doubt that as far as the history of Lot is concerned, it is in its right position in the narrative. The events which it narrates must have occurred after those of ch. xiii., and before those of xviii. and xix. Abram has moved further south, and is living under the oaks of Mamre the Amorite, where he remained till the destruction of Sodom. There is little in it which calls for remark here. The term "brother" is once used (ver. 16) for Lot's relation to Abram (but comp. ver. 12, "brother's son"); and a word is employed for the possessions of Lot (ver. 11, A. v. "goods"), which, from its being elsewhere in these early records (xvi. 6; Num. xxx. 3) distinguished from "cattle," and employed specially for the spoil of Sodom and Gomorrah, may perhaps denote that Lot had exchanged the wealth of his pastoral condition for other possessions more peculiar to his new abode. Women are also named (ver. 16), though these may belong to the people of Sodom. 3. The last scene preserved to us in the history of Lot is too well known to need repetition. He is still living in Sodom (Gen. xix.). Some years have passed, for he is a well-known resident in the town, with wife, sons, and daughters, married and marriageable. But in the midst of the licentious corruption of Sodom—the eating and drinking, the buying and selling, the planting and building (Luke

**Terah's sons are given above in the order in which they occur in the record (Gen. xi. 27-32). But the facts that Nahor and Isaac (and if Isaac be Sarai, Abram also) married wives out of their own generation, but of the next below them, and that Abram and Lot went together and behaved as if exactly on equal terms, seem to show that Haran was the eldest of Terah's three descendants, and Abram the youngest. It would be a parallel to the case of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, where Japhet was really the eldest, though enumerated last. [Abram, vol. I. p. 13, note d.]**

**b "Valley of Siddim"—Siddim = fields**
LOT

vii. 28), and of the darker evils exposed in the ancient narrative — he still preserves some of the delightful characteristics of his wandering life, his fervent and chivalrous hospitality (xix. 2, 8), the undeserved grief of the righteous (ver. 3), the water for the feet of the wayfarers (ver. 2), affording his guests a reception identical with that which they had experienced that very morning in Abraham’s tent on the heights of Hebron (comp. xviii. 3, 6). It is this hospitality which receives the commendation of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in words which have passed into a familiar proverb, “be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby have you entertained angels unawares.” (Heb. xiii. 2). On the other hand, it is his deliverance from the guilty and condemned city — the one just man in that mob of sensual lawless wretches — which points the allusion of St. Peter, to — the godly delivered out of temptations, the meek reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, an example to those that should after him live ungodly” (2 Pet. ii. 5-6). Where Zoar was situated has been a matter of contention. Lassar has found a temporary refuge during the destruction of the other cities of the plain, we do not know with absolute certainty. It, as is most probable, was at the mouth of Wady Kerak (Rob. ii. 188, 517), then by “the mountain” is meant the very elevated ground east of the Dead Sea. If with De Sauley we place it in es-Zourer, on the precipitous descent from Hebron, “the mountain” was the high ground of Judah. Either would afford caves for his subsequent dwelling. The former situation — on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, has in its favor the fact that it is in accordance with the position subsequently occupied by the Ammonites and Moabites. But this will be best examined under Zoar.

The end of Lot’s life is commonly treated as one of the “difficulties” of the Bible. It surely need not be so. It cannot be necessary, as some have done, to create the details of the story where none are given — to describe “the unhappy woman struck dead” — a blackened corpse — smothered and stifled as she stood, and fixed for the time to the soil by saline or bituminous incrustations — like a pillar of salt.” On these points the record is silent. Its words are simply these: “His wife looked back from behind him, and became a pillar of salt,” — words which neither in themselves nor in their position in the narrative asked any warrant for such speculations. In fact, when taken with what has gone before, they contradict them, for it seems plain, from vv. 22, 23, that the work of destruction by fire did not commence till after Lot had entered Zoar. But this, like the rest of her fate, is left in mystery.

The value and the significance of the story to us are contained in the allusion Christ (Mar. xi. 32): “In that day he that is in the field let him not return back; remember Lot’s wife,” who did. “Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it.” It will be observed that there is no attempt in the narrative to invest the circumstance with permanence; no statement — as in the case of the pillar erected over Rachel’s grave (xxv. 20) — that it was to be seen at the time of the compilation of the history. And in this we surely have a remarkable instance of that sobriety which characterizes the statements of Scripture, even where the events narrated are most out of the ordinary course.

Later ages have not been satisfied so to leave the matter, but have insisted on identifying the “pillar” with some one of the fleeting forms which the perishable rock of the south end of the Dead Sea is constantly assuming in its process of decomposition and foliation (Josephus, Ant. xi. 19, 5; R. F. H. Tuch, “LOT,” 181). The first allusion of this kind is perhaps that in Wisd. x. 7, where “a standing pillar of salt, the monument (μνημείον) of an unbelieving soul,” is mentioned with the “waste land that smotheth,” and the “plants bearing fruit that never come to ripeness,” as remaining to that day, a testimony to the wickedness of Sodom. Josephus also (Ant. i. 11, § 4) says that he had seen it, and that it was then remaining. So too do Clemens Romanus and Tertullus (quoted by Kitto, C. Y. “LOT”), if so does Benjamin of Tudela, whose account is more than usually circumstantial (ed. Asher, i. 72). And so don’tless have travellers in every age — they certainly have in our own times. See Mannreid, March 30; Lynch, Report, p. 13; and Anderson’s Off. Narratives, 181, where an account is given of a pillar or spur standing out detached from the general mass of the Jebel Cedron, about 40 feet in height, and which was recognized by the sailors of the expedition as “Lot’s wife.”

The story of the origin of the nations of Meab and Amnon from the incestuous intercourse between Lot and his two daughters, with which his history abruptly concludes, has been often treated as if it were a Hebrew legend which owed its origin to the litter of offspring existing from the earliest times between the “Children of Lot” and the children of Israel. The horrible nature of the transaction — not the result of impulse or passion, but a plan calculated and carried out, and that not

the victims of many a similar catastrophe, was sufficed by the sulphurous smoke or killed by lightning. The body would lie where it fell, and in such a region soon would be incinerated with salt. Blocks of salt abound there at present and illustrate this fate of the unhappy woman. (See Rob. Rob. Res. ii. 452, and Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 294, 24 ed.) It is not sold,” as Dr. Conant remarks, “that she was changed into that substance, but, incinerated with it, she became a pillar of salt.” (Book of Genesis, etc., p. 72.)

s See the quotations from the Fathers and others in Holman’s Lexicon (s. v. “LOT”); and in Mivlan, Lexicon Sasanian (ill. 224).

4 Rob. Petahia, on the other hand, looked for it but “did not see it; it no longer exists” (ed. Bohden, G.)

5 See Tuch, Genesis, 399. Von Bomlen ascribes the legend to the latter part of the reign of Josiah.
...but twice, would prompt the wish that the legendary theory was true. But even the most destructive critics (as, for instance, Teich) allow that the narrative is a continuation without a break of that which precedes it, while they fail to point out any marks of later date in the language of this portion: and it cannot be questioned that the writer records it as an historical fact.

Even if the legendary theory were admissible, there is no doubt of the fact that Ammon and Moab sprang from Lot. It is affirmed in the statements of Deut. ii. 9 and 19, as well as in the later document of Ps. lxxxiii. 8, that Ewald ascribes to the time when Nehemiah and his newly-returned colony were suffering from the attacks and obstructions of Tobiah the Ammonite and Sanballat the Horonite (Ewald, Dochter, Ps. 88).

The Mohammedan traditions of Lot are contained in the Koran, chiefly in c. vii. 52 and xi. 17, and others are given by D'Herbelot (i.e. “Lot”). According to these statements he was sent to the inhabitants of the five cities as a preacher, to warn them against the unnatural and horrible sins which they practiced — sins which Mohammed is continually denouncing, but with less success than that of drunkenness, since the former is perhaps the most common, the latter the rarest vice, of Eastern cities. From Lot’s connection with the inhabitants of Sodom, his name is given now not only to the vice in question (Freytag, Leclin, iv. 129), but also to the people of the five cities themselves — the Lotites, or Katim Loti. The local name of the Dead Sea is Beher Lot — Sea of Lot.

LOT. The custom of deciding doubtful questions by lot is one of great extent and high antiquity, recommending itself as a sort of appeal to the Almighty, secure from all influence of passion or bias, and is a sort of divination employed even by the gods themselves (Horn. II. xxii. 299; Cie. de Dic. i. 34, ii. 41). The word sops is thus used for an official response (Cie. de Dic. ii. 58). [DIVINATION.] Among heathen instances the following may be cited: 1. Choice of a champion or of priority in combat (H. iii. 316, vii. 17; Her. iii. 108). 2. Decision of fate in battle (H. xx. 289). 3. Appointment of magistrates, jurymen, or other functionaries (Arist. Pol. iv. 16; Schol. On Aris. Top. Plut. 277; Her. vi. 193; Xen. Cyr. iv. 3, 59; Demosth. c. Aris. Top. i. 778, 16; Dict. ofHist. vii. 178, “Discretor.” 4. Priests (Gen. in Tim. p. 185, Beck.). 5. A German practice of deciding by marks on twigs, mentioned by Tacitus (Germ. 10). 6. Division of conquered or colonized land (Thuc. iii. 50; Plut. Peric. 84; Boeckh, Pub. Econ. of Ath. ii. 170).

Among the Jews also the use of lots, with a religious intention, direct or indirect, prevailed extensively. The religious estimate of them may be gathered from Prov. xvi. 34. The following historical or ritual instances correspond in most respects to those of a heathen kind mentioned above: 1. Choice of men for an invading force (Judg. 3, x. 9). 2. Partition, (a) of the soil of Palestine among the tribes (Num. xxvi. 53; Josh. xviii. 19; Judges xviii. 19); (b) of Jerusalem; i.e. probably its spoil.

or captives among captors (Olad. 11); of the land itself in a similar way (1 Mac. iii. 36). (c.) After the return from captivity, Jerusalem was populated by inhabitants drawn by lot in the proportion of 1 of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin (Ne. xi. 1, 2; see Ps. xvi. 5, 6, Ez. xxiv. 6). (d.) Apporportion of possessions, or spoil, or of prisoners, to foreigners or captors (Joel iii. 3; Nah. iii. 10, Matt. xxvii. 35). 3. (a.) Settlement of doubtful questions (Prov. xvii. 33, where “? “ is perhaps = urn; xviii. 18). (b.) A mode of divination among heathens by means of arrows. (c.) Two inscribed, and one without, mark. (d.) The lot was drawn (Hos. iv. 12; Ez. xxii. 21; Mauritius, de Sortiarn. c. 14, § 4; see also Euth. iii. 7, iv. 24-32; Mishna, Taanith, ii. 10). [DIVINATION. PRUR. (c.) Detection of a criminal, as in the case of Achan (Josh. vii. 14, 18). A notion prevailed among the Jews that this detection was performed by observing the shining of the stones in the high-priest’s breastplate (Mauritius, c. 21, § 4). Jonah was discovered by lot (1 Sam. xiv. 41, 42). (d.) Appointment of persons to offices or duties. Saul (1 Sam. x. 20, 21) said to have been chosen as above in Achan’s case. St. Matthias, to replace Judas among the Twelve (Acts i. 24-20). Distribution of priestly offices in the Temple-service among the sixteen of the family of Eleazar, and the eight of that of Ithamar (1 Chr. xxiv. 3, 5, 19; Luke i. 9). Also of the Levites for similar purposes (1 Chr. xxii. 8, xxiv. 20-21; xxv. 8, xxvi. 13; Mishna, Tamid, i. 2, ii. 1, v. 2; Joan, ii. 2, 3, 4; Shabb. xxii. 2; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Luke i. 8, 9, vol. ii. p. 489). The election by lot appears to have prevailed in the Christian Church as late as the 7th century (Bingham, Eccl. Antiq. iv. 1, vol. i. p. 429; Euseb., Conc. ii. 69).

(c.) Selection of the scape-goat on the Day of Atonement (Lev. vii. 8, 10). The two inscribed tablets of boxwood, afterwards of gold, were put into an urn, which was shaken, and the lots drawn out (Joan, iii. 9, iv. 1). [ATONEMENT, DAY OF.]

4. The use of words heard or passages chosen at random from Scripture. Sortes Bibliæ, like the Sortes Virgilianæ, prevailed among Jews, as they have also among Christians, though denounced by several writers (e.g. Dict. ofHist. “Sortes.” John¬ son, “Life of Cowley,” Works, ii. 8; Bingham, Eccl. Ant. xvi. 3, 5, id. vi. 53, &c.; Bruns, Conc. ii. 145-54, 166; Mauritius, ch. 15; Hofmann, Lex. “Sortes”).

H. W. P.

* In Prov. xxvi. 33 (see no. 3 (a) above), “?” is the true rendering, and there is no reference to an “urn.” In such a proverbial allusion or expression, we should expect to find, of course, the earliest and simplest, as well as the readiest, mode of using the lot. The “?” (or bosom of the outer garment) was a convenient receptacle, always at hand, into which the lots could be cast, and thence drawn forth. “Cast into the lot” was, therefore, the most suitable form of expression for a proverbial saying, the idea of which originated in the earliest and rudest stage of society, and was acted on under all circumstances. In the more formal and official use of the lot (as in Lev. xvi. 8 wards employed for the Cross, see FabriBritii, Cat. Pseudophr. V. T. i. 428-431.)
LOTAN

Josh. xviii. 6) when every convenience was at hand, a vessel in the shape of an urn was likely to be used, though there is no allusion to this in the Scriptures.

The Heb. word הלטונ ("lan" or "bosom," of the garment), is used metaphorically of a similar receptacle in any other object only in connection with the name of the object itself: as in 1 Kings xxii. 35, "into the bosom (hollow) of the chariot." (A. V. "midst of"), and in Ezek. xliii. 13, 14, 17, in the ideal description of the altar.

"To cast lots" (Lev. xvi. 18; Josh. xviii. 6) means to employ them in the decision of any matter. This was done by casting them into some convenient receptacle, from which they were drawn forth. Hence the phrase, "the lot came forth" (or "out"), Josh. xix. 1, 17, 24, 32, 40; 1 Chron. xxiv. 7; and also, "the lot came up," Josh. xix. 10, the lot being drawn up from the bottom of the receptacle. In 1 Chron. xxvi. 14 is found the full expression, "they cast lots, and his lot came out," etc.

The phrase, "the lot fell upon" (Lev. xvi. 9, 10), or "fell to" (1 Chron. xxvi. 14), expresses the result of an appeal to the lot, as coming upon, or affecting the person or object concerned. The full expression occurs in Jonah, i. 7, "they cast lots, and the lot fell upon Jonah.

The suggestion of Lyezers (Herzog's Red-Engl. art. Eron, viii. 485), that the use of the word "tell" originated from the practice of casting the lots out of a vessel or the lap, is not consistent with Prov. xvi. 33, "the lot is cast into the lap." T. J. C.

LOTAN (לטונ [coveting]: Logos: Lotan) the eldest son of Seir the Horite, and a "duke" or chief of his tribe in the land of Edom (Gen. xxxvi. 29, 24, 25; 1 Chr. i. 38, 39).

LOTHASUBUS (Λόθασου, Subus), a corruption of HASTUS in Neh. viii. 4, for which it is not easy to account (1 Esdr. ix. 44). The Vulg. is a further corruption of the LXX.

LOTS, FEAST OF. [PURIM.]

LOVE-FEASTS (αγάπη: epula, convivio; in this sense used only twice, Jude 12, and 2 Pet. ii. 13, in which latter place, however, ἀγάπη is also used as an entertainment in which the poorer members of the church partook, furnished from the contributions of Christians resorting to the Eucharistic celebration, but whether before or after it may be doubted. The true account of the matter is probably that given by Chrysostom, who says that after the early communions of goods had ceased, the richer members brought to the church contributions of food and drink, of which, after the conclusion of the service and the celebration of the Eucharist, all partook together, by this means helping to promote the principle of love among Christians (Hom. in 1 Cor. xi. 19, vol. iii. p. 235, and Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor. xi. vol. x. p. 281, ed. Guenée). The intimate connection, especially in early times, between the Eucharist itself and the love-feast, has led several writers to speak of them almost as identical. Of those who either take this view, or regard the feast as subsequent to the Eucharist, may be mentioned Pliny, who says the Christians met and exchanged sacramental pledges against all sorts of immorality; after which they separated, and met again to partake in an entertainment. a

The same view is taken by Ignatius, ad S. Aug. ch. 8; Tertull. Apol. 39; Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 322 (vol. ii. p. 882), iii. 185 (vol. i. p. 514), but in Tert. ii. 61 (vol. i. p. 165), he seems to regard them as distinct: Apol. Const. ii. 28,1: and besides these, Jerome on 1 Cor. xi.; Theodoret and Eusebius, quoted by Bingham, who considers that the Agapè was subsequent (Orig. Eiccl. xv. 6, 7; vol. v. p. 284); Holmesc. LXX. "Agape." On the other side may be mentioned Grotius (on 2 Pet. ii. 13, in Crit. Sacri), Suicer (Theol. Eiccl. vol. i. s. c.), Hammond, Whity, Corn. A. Lapiude, and authorities quoted by Bingham, L. C. b

The almost universal custom to receive the Eucharist fasting proves that in later times the love-feasts must have followed, not preceded, the Eucharist (Sozomen, H. E. vii. 19; Aug. c. Fect. xx. 29; Ep. Ix. (alias cxxviii.); ad jamvar. c. 6, vol. ii. p. 203, ed. Migne; Conc. Carth. iii. A. D. 357, ch. 25; Bruns, Conc. i. p. 127): but the exception of one day from the general rule (the day called Cena Domini, or Maundy Thursday), seems to assume a previously different practice. The love-feasts were forbidden to be held in churches by the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 321 (367), Conc. Quinisext., A. D. 692, ch. 74, Aix-la-Chapelle, A. D. 816: but in some form or other they continued to a much later period.

Entertainments at births, deaths, and marriages were also in use under the names of ἄγαπη μεταμολογίας, μανδύας and ἤφαρχα (Reed, Hist. Eiccl. Gent. iii. 90; Ap. Const. viii. 41; Theodoret, Hom. viii. pp. 920, 924, ed. Sende; Greg. Naz. Ep. i. 14, and Carna. x. Hofmann, LXX. l. c.)

H. W. P.

* LOW COUNTRY (לטונב), 2 Chron. xxv. 10, 16. [LOTAN, p. 1460.]

LOZON (לוזון) (Dothan), one of the sons of "Solomon's servants" who returned with Zorobabel (1 Esdr. x. 23).

The name corresponds with the parallel lists of Ezra. ii. 56 and Neh. vii. 58, and the variation may be an error of the transcriber, which is easily traceable when the word is written in the usual character.

LUBIM (לובים), 2 Chr. xii. 3, 8; Nah. iii. 9, p. 67, Dan. xi. 43 [perhaps, thence inhabitants of a dry land, Ges.]: Λοβίς: Libya: except Daniel Libya (Libyia, Van Ess), a nation mentioned as contributing, together with Cushites and Sukkim, to Shishak's army (2 Chr. xii. 3); and apparently as forming with Cushites the bulk of Zerah's service (2 Sam. xx. 9) with Put or Phut, as helping Ne-Amon (Thebes), of which Cush and Egypt were the strength; and by Daniel (xi. 43) as paying court with the Cushites to a conqueror of Egypt or the Egyptians. These particulars indicate an African nation under tribute to Egypt, if not under Egyptian rule, contributing, in the 10th century B.C., valuable aid in mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Egyptian armies, and down to Nahuim's time, and a period prophesied of by Daniel, probably the

a "Promiscuum et innocuum, quod ipsum" (i.e. the entertainment is merely not a mere post eucharistic meal" (Ep. x. 5).
reg. of Antiochus Epiphanes [Antiochus IV.], assisting, either politically or commercially, to sustain the Egyptian power, or, in the last case, dependent on it. These indications do not fix the geographical position of the Lubim, but they favor the supposition that their territory was near Egypt, either to the west or south.

For more precise information we look to the Egyptian monuments, upon which we find representations of a people called REB, or LEBI (R and L having no distinction in hieroglyphics), who cannot be doubted to correspond to the Lubim. These Rebu were a warlike people, with whom Memphites (the son and successor of Rameses II.) and Rameses III., who both ruled in the 13th century b. c., waged successful wars. The latter king routed them with much slaughter. The sculptures of the great temple he raised at Thebes, now called that of Medinet Haboo, give us representations of the Rebu, showing that they were fair, and of what is called a Semitic type, like the Berbers and Kabyles. They are distinguished as northern, that is, as parallel to, or north of, Lower Egypt. Of their being African there can be no reasonable doubt, and we may assign them to the coast of the Mediterranean, commencing not far to the westward of Egypt. We do not find them to have been mercenaries of Egypt from the monuments, but we know that the kindred Mashawasha-u were so employed by the Bubastei family, to which Shishak and probably Zerah also belonged; and it is not unlikely that the latter are intended by the Lubim, used in a more generic sense than Rebu, in the Biblical mention of the armies of these kings. (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. ii. 79 ff.) We have already shown that the Lubim are probably the Misseite LITABIM: if so, their so-called Semitic physical characteristics, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, afford evidence of great importance for the inquirer into primeval history. The mention in Manetho's Dynasties that, under Nechothes, or Nechochosis, the first Memphis king, and head of the third dynasty (n. c. cir. 2600), the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but returned to their allegiance through fear, on a wonderful increase of the moon, may refer to the Lubim, but may as probably relate to some other African people, perhaps the Naphilim, or Phunt (Punt). The historical indications of the Egyptian monuments thus lead us to place the seat of the Lubim, or primitive Libyans, on the African coast to the westward of Egypt, perhaps extending far beyond the Cyrenaica. From the earliest ages of which we have any record, a stream of colonization has flowed from the east along the coast of Africa, north of the Great Desert, as far as the Pillars of Hercules. The oldest of these colonists of this region were doubtless the Lubim and kindred tribes, particularly the Mashawasha-u and Taheunu of the Egyptian monuments, all of which appear to have ultimately taken their common name of Libyans from the Lubim. They seem to have been first reduced by the Egyptians about 1250 b. c., and to have been afterwards driven inland by the Phoenician and Greek colonists. Now, they still remain on the northern confines of the Great Desert, and even within it, and in the mountains, while their later Semite rivals posture their flocks in the rich plains. Many as are the Arab tribes of Africa, one great tribe, that of the Benue 'Alee, extends from Egypt to Morocco, illustrating the probable extent of the territory of the Lubim and their cognates. It is possible that in Ezek. xxx. 5, Lub, 267, should be read for Chub, 263; but there is no other instance of the use of this form: as, however, 267 and 2677 are used for one people, apparently the Misseite Lubim, most probably kindred to the Lubim, this objection is not conclusive (Chur; Lubim). In Jer. xlv. 9, the A. V. renders Phut "the Libyans;" and in Ezek. xxxviii. 8, "Lilyan." R. S. P.

LUCAS (Aoukas: Lucas), a friend and companion of St. Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Phil. iv. 24). He is the same as Luke, the beloved physician, who is associated with Demas in Col. iv. 14, and who remained faithful to the Apostle when others forsook him (2 Tim. iv. 11), on his first examination before the emperor. For the grounds of his identification with the evangelist St. Luke, see article Luke.

LUCIFER [see below]: Εὐαφόφασ (Lucifer). The name is found in Is. xiv. 12, coupled with the epithet "son of the morning," and (being derived from 7ειας, to "shine") clearly signifies a "bright star," and probably what we call the morning star. In this passage it is a symbolical representation of the king of Babylon, in his splendor and in his fall; perhaps also it refers to his glory as paling before the unveiled presence of God. Its application (from St. Jerome downwards) to Satan in his fall from heaven arises probably from the fact that the Babylonian Empire is in Scripture represented as the type of tyrannical and self-indulging power, and especially connected with the empire of the Evil One in the Apocalypse. The fall of its material power before the unseen working of the providence of God is therefore a type of the defeat of all manifestations of the empire of Satan. This application of the name "Lucifer" as a proper name of the Devil, is plainly ungrounded; but the magnificence of the imagery of the prophet, far transcending in grandeur the fall of Nebuchadnezzar to which it immediately refers, has naturally given a color to the symbolical interpretation of the passage, and fixed that application in our modern language.

LUCIUS (Λευκιος, Λούχιος: [Lucius]), a Roman consul ( Epatoj Rarulav), who is said to have written the letter to Phoenemy (Energetes), which assured Simon I. of the protection of Rome (cir. b. c. 130-8; 1 Macc. x. 10, 15-24). The whole form of the letter — the mention of one consul only, the description of the consul by the prenomen, the omission of the senate and of the date (comp. Wernsdorf, De fide Macc. § 69x.), — shows that it cannot be an accurate copy of the original.

a The other interpretation, which makes 7ειας, an imperative of the verb 7ειας, in the sense of "wail" or "lament," injures the parallelism, and is generally regarded as untenable.
document; but there is nothing in the substance of the letter which is open to just suspicion.

The imperfect transcription of the name has led to the identification of Lucius with three distinct persons — (1.) Lucius Furinius Philo (the lists, Clinton, First Hist ii. 112, give Philo, Fusti), who was consul in C. 136, and is therefore at once excluded. (2.) Lucius Calpurnius Metellus Calvis, who was consul in c. 142, immediately after Simon assumed the government. On this supposition it might seem not unlikely that the answer which Simon received to an application for protection, which he made to Rome directly on his assumption of power (comp. 1 Mac xiv. 17, 18), in the consilium of Metellus, has been confused with the answer to the later embassy of Numenius (1 Mac. xiv. 24, xv. 18). (3.) But the third identification with Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was consul c. 139, is most probably correct. The date exactly corresponds, and, though the praenomen of Calpurnius is not established beyond all question, the balance of evidence is decidedly against the common lists. The First Capitulii are defective for this year, and only give a fragment of the name of Popiliius, the fellow-consul of Calpurnius. Cassiodorus (Chron.) as edited, gives Ca. Calpurnius, but the eye of the scribe (if the reading is correct) was probably misled by the names in the years immediately before. On the other hand Valerius Maximus (i. 3) wrongly quoted from the printed text as giving the same praenomen. The passage in which the name occurs is in reality no part of Valerius Maximus, but a piece of the abstract of Julius Paris inserted in the text. Of eleven MSS. of Valerius which the writer has examined, it occurs only in one (Ms. Brit. Bude. 299), and there the name is given Lucius Calvus, as it is given by Mai in his edition of Julius Paris (Script. Vet. Novi Cod. iii. 7). Sigrinus says rightly (First Cons. p. 207): "Cassiodorus profet consules Ca. Pisone... epitome L. Calpurnium...". The chance of an error of transcription in Julius Paris is obviously less than in the Cassiodorus; and even if the evidence were equal, the authority of 1 Mac. might rightly be urged as decisive in such a case.

Josephus omits all mention of the letter of "Lucius" in his account of Simon, but gives one very similar in context (Ant. xiv. 8, § 5), as written on the motion of Lucius Valerius in the ninth (nineteenth) year of Hyrcanus II.; and unless the two letters and the two missions which led to them were purposely assimilated, which is not wholly improbable, it must be supposed that he has been guilty of a strange oversight in removing the incident from its proper place.

B. F. W.

LUCIUS (Λούκιος) was a kinsman or fellow-tribeman of St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 21), by whom he is said by tradition to have been ordained bishop of the church of Cenchrea, from whence the Epistle to the Romans was written (Apoc. Const. viii. 46). He is thought by some to be the same with Lucius of Cyrene. (See the following art.)

LUCIUS OF CYRENE (Λούκιος του Ἰλυταί) was a physician, born in Cenchrea (from whence St. Paul wrote to the Romans), and later, as the tradition goes, he was ordained bishop. Tradition makes him a disciple of St. Paul, and says that he was ordained by the apostle on the occasion of St. Paul's last visit to Cenchrea, when he had sent to him the above letter. It is assumed that Lucius was the ancestor of the Lydians, who, according to tradition, are stated to have been ordained by St. Paul. Lucius, however, was the name of two ancient persons: 1. Lucius of Cyrene, a disciple of St. Paul, and later, as the tradition goes, he was ordained bishop. 2. Lucius of Cyrene, a disciple of St. Paul, and later, as the tradition goes, he was ordained bishop.
with African nations, as mercenaries or auxiliaries of the king of Egypt, and therefore it would seem probable, prima jicio, that the Mizraite Ludim are intended. Ezekiel, in the description of Tyre, speaks thus of Lud: "Persia and Lud and Phut were in thine army, thy men of war: buckler (םת) and helmet hung they up in thee; they set thine adorning" (xxvii. 10). In this place Lud might seem to mean the Shemitte Lud, especially if the latter be connected with Lydia; but the association with Phunt renders it as likely that the nation or country is that of the African Ludim. In the rollup against Gog a similar passage occurs: "Persia, Cush, and Phut (A.V. "Libya") with them [the army of Gog]; all of them [with] buckler (םת) and helmet" (xxviii. 5). It seems from this that there were Persian mercenaries at this time, the prophet perhaps, if speaking of a remote future period, using their name and that of other well-known mercenaries in a general sense. The association of Persia and Lud in the former passage loses therefore somewhat of its weight. In one of the prophecies against Egypt Lud is thus mentioned among the supports of that country: "And the sword shall come upon Mizraim, and great pain shall be in Cush, at the falling of the skin in Mizraim, and they shall take away her multitude (םת) and her foundations shall be broken down. Cush, and Phunt, and Lud, and all the mingled people (םת), and Chub, and the children of the land of the covenant, shall fall by the sword with them" (xxx. 4, 5). Here Lud is associated with Cush and Phunt, as though an African nation. The Ereth, whom we have called

a The manner in which these foreign troops in the Egyptian army are characterized is perfectly in accordance with the evidence of the monuments, which, although about six centuries earlier than the prophet's time, do not represent the same condition of military matters. The only people of Africa beyond Egypt, portrayed on the monuments, whom we can consider as most probably of the same stock as the Egyptians, are the Rebū, who are the Libim of the Bible, almost certainly the same as the Mizraite Libnim [Luz, Ezra, &c.]. Therefore we may take the Rebū as probably illustrating the Ludim, supposing the latter to be Mizraite, in which case they may indeed be included under the same name as the Libim, if the application Rebū be whiter than the Libim of the Bible, and also as illustrative of Cush and Phunt. The last two are spoken of as handling the buckler. The Egyptians are generally represented with small shields, frequently round: the Rebū with small round shields, for which the term here used, מות, the small shield, and the expression "that handle," are perfectly appropriate. That the Ludim should have been archers, and apparently armed with a long bow that was strong with the aid of the foot by treading (םת ות), is note-worthy, since the Africans were always famous for their archery. The Rebū, and one other of the foreign nations that served in the Egyptian army — the monuments show the former only as enemies — were bowmen, being armed with a bow of moderate length; the other mercenaries — of which we can only identify the Philibae, Cherethim, though they probably include certain of the mercenaries or auxiliaries mentioned in the Bible — carrying scimitar and javelins, but not bows. These points of agreement, founded on our examination of the monuments, are of no little weight, as showing the accuracy of the Bible.
LUDIM

"united people" rather than "strangers," appear to have been an Arab population of the Sinaitic peninsula, perhaps including Arab or half-Arab tribes of the Egyptian desert to the east of the Nile. Chab is a name nowhere else occurring, which probably should be read Judah, for the composite nation of the Ludioi. [Chim.; Ludim.] The "children of the land of the covenant" may be some league of tribes, as probably were the Nine Bows of the Egyptian inscriptions; or the expression may mean nations or tribes allied with Egypt, as though a general designation for the rest of its supporters besides those specified. It is noticeable that in this passage, although Judah is placed among the close allies or subjects of Egypt, yet it follows the Ludioi or African nations, and is followed by a nation or tribe at least partly inhabiting Asia, although possibly also partly inhabiting Africa.

There can be no doubt that but one nation is intended in these passages, and it seems that thus far the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the Mosaic Ludim. There are no indications in the Bible known to be positive of mercenaries or allied troops in the Egyptian armies, except of Africans, and perhaps of tribes bordering Egypt on the east. We have still to inquire how the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and of profane history may affect our supposition. From the former we learn that several foreign nations contributed allies or mercenaries to the Egyptian armies. Among them we identify the Erym with the Ludim, and the Shatyatam with the Cherethim, who also served in David's army. The latter were probably from the coast of Palestine, although they may have been drawn in the case of the Egyptian army from an insular portion of the same people. The rest of these foreign troops seem to have been of African nations, but this is not certain. The evidence of the monuments reaches no lower than the time of the Babasit line. There is a single contemporary inscription recorded on one of the colossi of the temple of Asho-Simbel in Nubia, recording the passage of Greek mercenaries of a Psammitechus, probably the first (Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, p. 32).a From the Greek writers, who give us information from the time of Psammitechus I. downwards, we learn that Ionian, Carian, and other Greek mercenaries formed an important element in the Egyptian army in all times when the country was independent, from the reign of Psammitechus I. to that of the last kings of Egypt. These mercenaries were even settled in Egypt by Psammitechus. There does not seem to be any mention of them in the Bible, excepting they be intended by Judah and Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recalled that it is reasonable to connect the Shemiute Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered.
some traces of that connection with St. Paul which these passages assume to exist; and although the name of St. Luke does not occur in the Acts, there is reason to believe that under the pronoun "we" several references to the Evangelist are to be added to the three places just quoted.

Combining the usual element with the Scriptural, the uncertain with the certain, we are able to trace the following dim outline of the Evangelist's life. He was born at Antioch in Syria (Eusebius, Hist. iii. 4); in what condition of life is uncertain. That he was taught the science of medicine does not prove that he was of higher birth than the rest of the disciples; medicine in its earlier and ruder state was sometimes practiced even by a slave. The well-known tradition that Luke was also a painter, and of no mean skill, rests on the authority of Nicephorus (ii. 43), of the Menology of the Emperor Basil, drawn up in 880, and of other late writers; but none of them are of historical authority, and the Acts and Epistles are wholly silent upon a point so likely to be mentioned. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them in the circumcision by St. Paul (Comp. Col. ii. 2; but see ver. 14). If this he not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idiom in his style, for he might be a Hellenist Jew, nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of St. Paul, a Pharsee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not indeed "an eye-witness and minister of the word from the beginning" (Luke i. 2), or he would have rested his claim as an Evangelist upon that ground. Still he may have been converted by the Lord Himself, some time before his departure: and the statement of Ephipanius (Cont. Her. li. 11) and others, that he was one of the seventy disciples, has nothing very improbable in it; whilst that which Theophylact adopts (on Luke xxiv.), that he was one of the two who journeyed to Emmaus with the risen Redeemer, has found modern defenders. Tertullian assumes that the conversion of Luke is to be ascribed to Paul — "Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolics; non magister, sed discipulus, utique magistro minor, certe tanto posterior quanto posterioris Apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio" (Ad. Marcion. iv. 2); and the balance of probability is on this side.

The first ray of historical light falls on the Evangelist when he joins St. Paul at Troas, and shares his journey into Macedonia. The sudden transition to the first person plural in Acts xvi. 10 is most naturally explained, after all the objections that have been urged, by supposing that Luke, the writer of the Acts, formed one of St. Paul's company from this point. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great Apostle's followers without any hint that this was his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by St. Paul himself. As far as Philippi the Evangelist journeyed with the Apostle. The resumption of the third person on Paul's departure from that place (xvii. 1) would show that Luke was now left behind. During the rest of St. Paul's second missionary journey we hear of Luke no more. But on the third journey the same writer, who reminds us that Luke is again of the company (Acts xx. 5), having joined it apparently at Philippi, where he had been left. With the Apostle he passed through Miletus, Tyre, and Caesarea to Jerusalem (xx. 5, xxi. 18). Between the two visits of Paul to Philippi seven years had elapsed (A. D. 51 to A. D. 58), which the Evangelist may have spent in Philippi and its neighborhood, preaching the Gospel.

There remains one passage, which, if it refers to St. Luke, must belong to this period. "We have sent with him" (G. e. Titus) "the brother whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches" (2 Cor. viii. 18). The subscription of the epistle sets out that it was "written from Philippi, a city of Macedonia, by Titus and Lucas," and it is an old opinion that Luke was the companion of Titus, although he is not named in the body of the epistle. If this be so, we are to suppose that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi (Acts xx. 3) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth on this errand; and the words "whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches" enable us to form an estimate of his activity during the interval in which he has not been otherwise mentioned. It is needless to add that the praise lay in the activity with which he preached the Gospel, and that we need not doubt that his apostolic work was continued in his being the author of a written gospel. "Lucas . . . scriptit Evangelium de quo idem Paulus . . . Mischen, inquit, eum illo fratrem, cujus laus est in Evangelio per omnem ecclesias" (De Viris Ill. c. 7).

He again appears in the company of Paul in the memorable journey to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1). He remained at his side during his first imprisonment (Col. iv. 14; Phil. 24): and if it is to be supposed that the Second Epistle to Timothy was written during the second imprisonment, then the testimony of that epistle (iv. 11) shows that he continued faithful to the Apostle to the end of his afflictions.

After the death of St. Paul, the acts of his faithful companion are hopelessly obscure to us. In the well-known passage of Ephipanius (cont. Hier. li. 11, vol. ii. 464, in Dissert. recent edition), we find that "receiving the commission to preach the Gospel, [Luke] preaches first in Dalmatia and Gallia, in Italy and Macedonia, but first in Gallia, as Paul himself says of some of his companions, in his epistles, 'Crescens in Gallia,' for we are not to read 'in Galatia' as some mistakenly think, but 'in Gallia.'" But there seems to be as little authority for this account of St. Luke's ministry as there is for the reading Gallia in 2 Tim. iv. 9. How scanty are the data, and how vague the results, the reader may find by referring to the Acta Sanctorum, October, vol. viii., in the recent Brussels edition. It is, as perhaps the Evangelist wishes it to be: we only know him whilst he stands by the side of his beloved Paul; when the master departs the history of the follower becomes confusing and fable. As to the age and death of the Evangelist there is the utmost uncertainty. It seems probable that he died in advanced life; but whether he suffered martyrdom or died a natural death; whether Bithynia or Achaea, or some other country, witnessed his end, it is impossible to determine amid contradictory voices. That he died a martyr, between A. D. 75 and A. D. 100, would seem to have the balance of suffrages in its favor. It is enough for us, so far as regards the Gospel of St. Luke, that he wrote it in his father's name, was a tried and constant friend of the Apostle Paul, who shared his labors, and was not driven from his sire by danger.
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LUKE, GOSPEL OF. The third Gospel is ascribed, by the general consent of ancient Christendom, to "the beloved physician," Luke, the friend and companion of the Apostle Paul. In the well-known Muratorian fragment (see vol. ii. p. 942) we find "Terrio evangeli librum secundum Lucam. Lucanum est, hic primum omnitatem, hic notitiam Christi divinum omnem eam. Paulus, quasi ut juris studium secundum admississet, nomine suo ex opinione conscripsit. Dominum tamen nec ipsa vidit in carne. Et idem prout assequi potuit. Ita et ab matritate Johannis incepit dicere." (Here Credner's restoration of the text is followed; see his Geschichte des N. T. Kiew., p. 153, § 79; comp. Rothe's Reliquiae, vol. iv.). The citations of Justin Martyr from the Gospel narrative show an acquaintance with and use of St. Luke's account (see Kirschhofer, Quellen-Ansammlung, p. 132, for the passages). Irenæus (cont. Hist. iii. 1) says that "Luke, the follower of Paul, preserved in a book the Gospel which that Apostle preached." The same writer affords (iii. 14) an account of the contents of the Gospel, which proves that in the book preserved to us we possess the genuine words of Luke. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iv. 12) speaks without doubting, of the two books, the Gospel and the Acts, as the work of St. Luke. Both he and Jerome (Cred. Script. Eccl. c. 7) mention the opinion that when St. Paul uses the words "according to my Gospel" it is to the work of St. Luke that he refers; both mention that St. Luke derived his knowledge of divine things, not from Paul only, but from the rest of the Apostles, with whom (says Eusebius) he had active intercourse. Although St. Paul's words refer in all probability to no written Gospel at all, but to the substance of his own inspired preaching, the error is important, as showing how strong was the opinion in ancient times that Paul was in some way connected with the writing of the third Gospel.

It has been shown already [Gospels, vol. ii. p. 942 f.] that the Gospels were in use as one collection, and were spoken of and cited as the work of those whose names they bear, towards the end of the second century. But as regards the genuineness of St. Luke's any discussion is entangled with a somewhat difficult question, namely, what is the relation of the Gospel we possess to that which was used by the heretic Marcion? The ease may be briefly stated.

The religion of Jesus Christ announced salvation to men which he knew, through Him who was born a Jew, of the seed of David. The two sides of this fact produced very early two opposite tendencies in the Church. One party thought of Christ as the Messiah of the Jews; the other as the Redeemer of the human race. The former viewed the Lord as the Messiah of Jewish prophecy and tradition; the other as the revealer of a doctrine wholly new, in which divine and human salvation and enlightenment were offered to men for the first time. Marcion of Sinope, who flourished in the first half of the second century, expressed strongly the tendency opposed to Judaism. The scheme of redemption, so full of divine compassion and love, was adopted by him, though in a perverted form, with his whole heart. The aspersions on his sincerity are thrown out in the loose rhetoric of controversy, and are to be received with something more than caution. The heathen world, into the discard of which the music of that message had never come, appeared to him as the kingdom of darkness and of Satan. So far Marcion and his opponents would go to destroy the gospel. But that which Paul did, O.T.? He views it, not as a preparation for the coming of the Lord, but as something hostile in spirit to the Gospel. In God, as revealed in the O.T., he saw only a being jealous and cruel. The heretic Cerdo taught that the just and severe God of the Law and the Prophets was not the same as the merciful Father of the Lord Jesus. This dualism Marcion carried further, and blasphemously argued that the God of the O.T. was represented as doing evil and delighting in strife, as repenting of his decrees and inconsistent with Himself. This divergence of the N. T. from the Old was at the root of Marcion's doctrine. In his strange system the God of the O.T. was a lower being, to whom he gave the name of Δυναμερις, engaged in a constant conflict with matter (Τάφοί), over which he did not gain a complete victory. But the holy and eternal God, as the God of love and grace, comes not in contact with matter, and creates only what is like to and cognate with himself. In the O.T. we see the "Domninus;" the history of redemption is the history of the operation of the true God. Thus much it is necessary to state as bearing upon what follows: the life and doctrine of Marcion have received much fuller elucidation from Nestler, Kirchenwissenschaft, vol. ii., Antiochus, and Popemnngeschichte; and from Volkmar, Das Evangelium Marcionis, p. 25. The data in older writers are found in the Apology of Justin Martyr, in Tertullian against Marcion i.-v.; in Irenæus, i. ch. 27; and Epiphanius, Hær. xiii.

For the present purpose it is to be noticed that a teacher, determined as Marcion was to sever the connection between the Old and New Testament, would approach the Gospel history with strong prejudices, and would be unable to accept as it stands the written narrative of any of the three Evangelists, so far as it admitted allusions to the Old Testament as the soil and root of the New. It is clear, in fact, that he regarded Paul as the only Apostle who had remained faithful to his calling. He admitted the Epistles of St. Paul, and a Gospel which he regarded as Pauline, and rejected the rest of the N. T., not from any idea that the books were not genuine, but because they were, as he alleged, the genuine works of men who were not faithful teachers of the Gospel they had received.

But what was the Gospel which Marcion used? The ancient testimony is very strong on this point; it was the Gospel of St. Luke, altered to suit his peculiar tenets. "Et super hac," says Irenæus, 2. ch. 35, "est esset secundum Lucam Evangelium circumdedit; et enim quia sunt de generatione Domini conscripta autenses, et de doctrina sermorum Domini multa aurores, in quibus manifestissimam conditorem laius universitatis summum Patrem confitens Dominiu conscriptum est: sani intelligentissimae veracissimum quum sunt hi, qui Evangelium tradidunt apostoli, sancti disciplinis suis: non Evangelium

sin p. 942, et "Cerdon autem suum cum qui a lege et prophetis edoctum est sit lucem, non eum qui a predicatione nostrum Christum Jesum. Hinc enim egensilium autem sanctum genos; et uterum quidem justum, uterum autem sannem esse. Suceedunt autem et Marcell Pontiffus.
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The history of this controversy is highly

unobstructed. The history of this controversy is highly

instructive. For a good account of it, see Bickel's Einl.

n der N.T. § 62. It should be noted that Baur,

lower of St. Paul, and the latter with leanings to

Judaism and against the Gnostics! He considers

the Gospel of St. Luke, as we now possess it, to be in

all its general features that which Marcion found

ready to his hand, and which for doctrinal reasons

abradged and altered. In certain passages, indeed,

he considers that the Gospel used by Marcion,

as cited by Tertullian and Epiphanius, may be

employed to correct our present text. But this is

only putting the copy used by Marcion on the foot-

ing of an older MS. The passages which he con-

siders to have certainly altered since Marcion's

time are only these: Luke x. 21 (σεχορο-

τω καὶ ξυζωολογουμαι); 22 (καὶ

οδηγεῖ τοις τις πατρις τις οικισε, 

τις ευθείας ει μη δ σπητρι καὶ εις

βευλητον κ. τ. λ.); xi. 2 (δος ημων 

tο αναμνηστικα σου); xii. 18 (τη

δεποτω χαλαστη); xvii. 3 (συνετε 

αις γαβαδων δ σπητρι εις τοις 

οφανας). In all these places the deviations are such as may be

found to exist between different MSS. A new

witness as to the last, which is of the greatest

importance, is published by, Hilgenfeld,Hist.

uru. p. 254, Oxford edition, where the τι με 

λεγεις γαβαδον appears. See, on all these pas-

sages, Tischendorf's Greek Testament, ed. vii.,

and critical notes. Of four other places Volkmar

speaks more doubtfully, as having been disturbed,

but possibly before Marcion (vi. 17, xii. 32, xvii. 12,

xxii. 2).

From this controversy we gain the following result:

Marcion was in the height of his activity about A.D. 138,

soon after which Justin Martyr wrote his Apology; and he had probably

forth his Gospel some years before, i.e. about A.D.

130. At the time when he composed it he found the Gospel of St. Luke so far diffused and accepted

that he based his own Gospel upon it, altering and

cutting. Therefore we may assume that, about

A.D. 120, the Gospel of St. Luke which we possess

was in use, and was familiarly known. The theory

that it was composed about the middle or end of

the 2d century is thus overthrown; and there is

no positive evidence of any kind to set against

the harmonious assertion of all the ancient Church

that this Gospel is the genuine production of St.


(On St. Luke's Gospel in its relation to Marcion,

see, besides the fathers quoted above, Hahn, Das Evangelium Marcionis, Königsberg, 1823; Ol-

hausen, Erledigung der vier kanon. Evangelien,

Königsberg, 1823; Ritschel, Das Evangelium Mar-

cions, etc., Tübingen, 1846, with his retraction

in Theol. Jahrh. 1851; Baer, Krit. Untersuchun-

en über d. kanon. Evangelien, Tübingen, 1847;

Hilgenfeld, Krit. Untersuchungen, etc., Halle, 1850;

Volkmar, Das Evangelium Marcionis, Leipzig,

1852; Ritschel's Introduction to Schlieren-

macher on St. Luke; De Wetze, Lehrbuch [a

hist. krit. Einl. in] d. N. T., Berlin, 1848 [6th

Ausr., von Messner u. Lünebaum, 1860; see §

70 ff.]. These are but a part of the writers who

have touched the subject. The work of Volkmar

is the most comprehensive and thorough; and,

though some of his views cannot be adopted, he

has satisfactorily proved that our Gospel of St.

Luke existed before the time of Marcion.)
II. Date of the Gospel of Luke. We have seen that this Gospel was in use before the year 120; but from internal evidence the date can be more nearly fixed. From Acts i. 1, it is clear that it was written before the Acts of the Apostles. The latest time actually mentioned in the Acts is the term of two years during which Paul dwelt at Rome in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him (xxvii. 30, 31). The writer, who has tracked the footsteps of Paul hitherto with such exactness, leaves him here abruptly, without making known the result of his appeal to Caesar, or the works in which he engaged afterwards. No other motive for this silence can be suggested than that the writer, at the time when he published the Acts, had no more to tell; and in that case the Look of the Acts was completed about the end of the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment, that is, about A.D. 63 (Wieseler, Olschhausen, Alford). How much earlier the gospel, described as "the former treatise" (Acts i. 1), may have been written is uncertain. But Dean Alford (Prolegomena) remarks that the words imply some considerable interval between the two productions. The opinion of the younger Thiersch (Christian Church, p. 148, Carlyle's translation) thus becomes very probable, that it was written at Cesarea during St. Paul's imprisonment there, A.D. 58-60. The Gospel of St. Matthew is therefore probably written about the same time: and neither Evangelist appears to have used the other, although both made use of that form of oral teaching which the Apostles had gradually come to employ. [Gospels.] It is painful to remark how the opinions of many commentators, who refuse to fix the date of this Gospel earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem, have been influenced by the determination that nothing like prophecy shall be found in it. Believing that our Lord did really prophesy that event, we have no difficulty in believing that an Evangelist reported the prophecy before it was fulfilled (see Meyer's Commentary, Introduction).

III. Place where the Gospel was written. — If the time has been rightly indicated, the place would be Cesarea. Other suppositions are — that it was composed in Achaia and the region of Bœotia (Irenæus, in his Simplicius supra, 148, Ewald, etc.), in Achaia and Macedonia (Hilgenfeld), and Asia Minor (Köstlin). It is impossible to verify these traditions and conjectures.

IV. Origin of the Gospel. — The preface, contained in the first four verses of the Gospel, describes the object of its writer. "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even those which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Here are several facts to be observed. There were many narratives of the life of our Lord current before the time when Luke wrote his Gospel. The word "many" cannot apply to Matthew and Mark, because it must at any rate include more than two, and because it is implied that former labours leave something still to do. And that the writer will supersede or supplement them either in whole or in part. The ground of fitness for the task St. Luke places in his having carefully followed out the whole course of events from the beginning. He does not claim the character of an eye-witness from the first; but possibly he may have been a witness of some part of our Lord's doings (see above Luke, Life).

The ancient opinion, that Luke wrote his Gospel under the influence of Paul, rests on the authority of Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusèbeus. The two first assert that we have in Luke the Gospel preached by Paul (Iren. cont. Marc. iii. 1; Tert. cont. Marc. iv. 5); Origen calls it "the Gospel quoted by Paul," alluding to Rom. ii. 16 (Eusèbe. Hist. vi. 25); and Eusèbeus refers Paul's words, "according to my Gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8), to that of Luke (E. Hist. iii. 4), in which Jerome concurs (De Vir. Ill. 7). The language of the preface is against the notion of any exclusive influence of St. Paul. The Evangelist, a man on whom the Spirit of God was, made the history of the Saviour's life the subject of research, and with materials so obtained wrote, under the guidance of the Spirit that was upon him, the history now before us. The four verses could not have been put at the head of a book composed under the exclusive guidance of Paul or of any one Apostle, and as little could they have introduced a gospel simply communicated by another. Yet if we compare St. Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 23-25) with that in St. Luke's Gospel (xxii. 19, 20), none will think the verbal similarity could be accidental. A less obvious parallel between 1 Cor. xv. 3 and Luke xxiv. 26, 27, more of thought than of expression, tends the same way. The truth seems to be that St. Luke, seeking information from every quarter, sought it from the preaching of his beloved master, St. Paul; and the Apostle in his turn employed the knowledge acquired from other sources by his disciple. Thus the preaching of the Apostle, founded on the same body of facts, and the same arrangement of them as the rest of the Apostles used, became assimilated especially to that which St. Luke set forth in his history. This does not detract from the worth of either. The preaching and the Gospel proceeded each from an inspired man; for it is certain that Luke, employed as he was by Paul, could have been no exception in that plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost to which Paul himself bears witness. That the teaching of two men so linked together (see Life) should have become more and more assimilated is just what would be expected. But the influence was mutual, and not one-sided; and Luke still claims with right the position of an independent inquirer into historic facts.

I am to the question whether Luke made use of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, no opinion given here could be conclusive. [Gospels, vol. ii. p. 944.] Each reader should examine it for himself, with the aid of a Greek Harmony. It is probable that Matthew and Luke wrote independently, and about the same time. Some of their coincidences arise from their both incorporating the oral teach-
ing of the Apostles, and others, it may be, from their common use of written documents, such as are hinted at in Luke i. 1. As regards St. Mark, some regard his Gospel as the oldest New Testament writing, whilst others infer, from apparent abbreviations (Mark i. 12, xvi. 12), from insertions of matter from other places (Mark iv. 38-48), and from the mode in which additional information is introduced — now with a seeming connection with Matthew and now with Luke — that Mark's Gospel is the last, and has been framed upon the other two (De Wette, Einleitung, § 94). The result of this controversy should be to inspire distrust of all such seeming proofs, which conduct different critics to exactly opposite results.

V. Purpose for which the Gospel was written. — The Evangelist professes to write that Theophilus "might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed" (i. 4). Who was this Theophilus? Some have supposed that it is a significant name, applicable not to one man, but to any μανᾶς Δῆλος; but the addition of έκπαιδευτάς, a term of honor which would be used towards a man of more weight, or sometimes (see passages in Kiiiniid and Wetstein) by a person of rank, was added in this case against this. He was, then, an existing person. Conjecture has been wildly busy in endeavoring to identify him with some person known to history. Some indications are given in the Gospel about him, and beyond them we do not propose to go. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the Evangelist minutely describes the position of places which to such a one would be well known. It is so with Capharnaum (x. 31), Nazareth (ii. 15), Arimathea (xxvii. 51), the country of the Gadarenes (viii. 26), the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem (Acts i. 12; Luke xxiv. 13). If places in England — say Bristol, and Oxford, and Hampstead — were mentioned in this careful minute way, it would be a fair inference that the writer meant his work for other than English readers. By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian (Acts xvi. 12), nor an Athenian (Acts xvii. 21), nor a Cretan (Acts xxvii. 8, 12). But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data. In tracing St. Paul's journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely (Acts xxvii. 8, 12, 19); but when he comes to study Italy this is neglected. Cumaean and Rhegium, even the more obscure Putioli, and Aquis Forum and the Three Taverns, are mentioned as to one likely to know them. (For other theories see Marsh's Michaellis, vol. iii. part i. p. 296; Kuini's Prologomena, and Winer's Recl. art. Theophilus.) All that emerges from this argument is, that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. We must admit, but with great caution, that on account of the abuses to which the notion has led, that there are traces in the Gospel of a leaning towards Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham; so as to connect Him with the whole human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the mission of the Seventy, which number has been usually supposed to be typical of all nations; as twelve, the number of the Apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes. As each Gospel has within certain limits its own character and mode of treatment, we shall recognize with Obsthann that "St. Luke has the peculiar power of exhibiting with great clearness of conception and truth (especially in the long account of Christ's journey, from ix. 51 to xvii. 34), not so much the discourses of Jesus as his conversations, with all the incidents that gave rise to them, with the remarks of those who were present, and what may result from them."

On the supposed "doctrinal tendency" of the Gospel, however, much has been written which it is painful to dwell on, but easy to refute. Some have endeavored to see in this divine book an attempt to engrat the teaching of St. Paul on the Jewish representations of the Messiah, and to elevate the doctrine of universal salvation, of which Paul was the most prominent preacher, over the Judaising tendencies, and to put St. Paul higher than the twelve Apostles! (See Zeller, Apost.; Baur, Koman. Evang.; and Hilgenfeld.) How two impartial historical narratives, the Gospel and the Acts, could have been taken for two tracts written for polemical and personal ends, is to an English mind hardly conceivable. Even its supporters found that the inspired author had carried out his purpose so badly, that they were forced to admit that the editor had altered the work with a view to work up together Jewish and Pauline elements into harmony (Baur, Koman. Evang. p. 502). Of this editing and re-editing there is no trace whatever; and the invention of the second editor is a gross device to cover the failure of the first hypothesis. By such a machinery, it will be possible to prove in after ages that Gibson's History was originally a plea for Christianity, or any parallel.

The passages which are supposed to bear out this "Pauline tendency," are brought together by Hilgenfeld with great care (Evangelien, p. 220); but Reuss has shown, by passages from St. Matthew which have the same "tendency" against the Jews, how brittle such an argument is, and has left no room for doubt that the two Evangelists wrote facts and not theories, and dealt with those facts with pure historical candor (Reuss, Histoire de la Théologie, vol. ii. p. 6). Writing to a Gentile convert, and through him addressing other Gentiles, St. Luke has adapted the form of his narrative to their needs; but not a trace of a subjective bias, not a vestige of a personal motive, has been suffered to tully the inspired page. Had the influence of Paul been the exclusive or principal source of this Gospel, we should have found in it more resemblance to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains (so to speak) the Gospel of St. Paul.

VI. Language and style of the Gospel. — It has never been doubted that the Evangelist wrote his Gospel in Greek. Whilst Hebraisms are frequent, classical idioms and Greek compound words abound. The number of words used by Luke only is unusually great, and many of them are compound words for which there is classical authority (see Dean Alford's valuable Greek Test.).

Some of the leading peculiarities of style are here noted: a more minute examination will be found in Prof. Davidson's Introduction to N. T. (Bagster, 1843), and in his new work, Intro. to the Study of the N. T. (Lond. 1868), ii. 59 sq. comp. p. 12 ff.

1. The very frequent use of ἀγάπη in introducing a new narrative or a transition, and of ἀγαπή ἐν τῷ with an infinitive, are traceable to the Hebrew.
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2. The same may be said of the frequent use of χαίρε, answering to the Hebrew א.ir.
3. Ἰππομη, used six times instead of the usual γραμματές, and ἐπιστέφης used six times for Ῥαββί, διδάσκαλος, are cases of a preference for words more intelligible to Greeks or Gentiles.
4. The nearer particle is used frequently for a substantive, both in the Gospel and the Acts.
5. The infinitive with the genitive of the article, to indicate design or result, as in i. 9, is frequent in both books.
6. The frequent use of δι καὶ, for the sake of emphasis, as in iii. 9.
7. The frequent use of καὶ αἵτως, as in i. 17.
8. The preposition εἰς is used about seventy-five times in Gospel and Acts; in the other Gospels rarely.
9. ἀλλάζειν is used eleven times in Gospel and Acts; elsewhere only twice, by St. Paul (2 Cor.).
10. Εἰ δὲ μὴ γε is used five times for the εἰ δὲ μή of Mark and John.
11. Εἰπέναι πρὸς, which is frequent in St. Luke, is used elsewhere only by St. John: ἀλλὰ εἰπέναι, is, only three times by other writers.
12. St. Luke very frequently uses the auxiliary verb with a participle for the verb, as in v. 17, i. 20.
13. He makes remarkable use of verbs compounded with δια and εἰ.
14. Χάρος, very frequent in Luke, is only used thrice by John, and not at all by Matthew and Mark. ζωτίρ, σωτρία, σωτρίων, are frequent with Luke: the two first are used once each by John, and not by the other Evangelists.
15. The same may be said of εὐαγγελέσαι, once in Matthew, and not at all in Mark and John; ὑποτεύχειν, once in Mark, not in other Gospels; εὐστάται, not used in the other three Gospels; διήγεσθαι, thirty-two times in Luke's Gospel and the Acts, and only twice each in Matthew, Mark, and John: παραχρῆμα frequent in Luke, and only twice elsewhere, in Matthew.
16. The words δυσθυμοῦν, εὐλαβή, ἄνηρ, as a form of address and before substantives, are also characteristic of Luke.
17. Some Latin words are used by Luke: λεγέων (vii. 30), ὠνάγκας (x. 35), σωθάχον (xii. 20), κολωνία (Acts xvi. 12).

On comparing the Gospel with the Acts it is found that the style of the latter is more pure and free from Hebrew idioms; and the style of the former portion of the Acts is more pure than that of the latter. Where Luke used the materials he derived from others, oral or written, or both, his style reflects the Hebrew idioms of them; but when he comes to scenes of which he was an eye-witness and describes entirely in his own words, these disappear.

VII. Quotations from the Old Testament. — In the citations from the O. T., of the principal of which the following is a list, there are plain marks of the use of the Septuagint version: —
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Luke vii. 27. Mat. iii. 1.
" vii. 10. Is. vi. 9.
" x. 27. Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 18.
" xvii. 29. Ex. xx. 12.
" xix. 46. Is. xvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.
" xx. 17. Ps. cviii. 22, 23.
" xx. 28. Deut. xxv. 5.
" xx. 42, 43, Ps. cx. 1.
" xxi. 37. Is. liii. 12.
" xxi. 45. Ps. xxxvi. 5.

VIII. Integrity of the Gospel — the first two Chapters. — The Gospel of Luke is quoted by Justin Martyr and by the author of the Clementine Homilies. The silence of the apostolic fathers only indicates that it was admitted into the canon somewhat later, which was probably the case. The result of the Marcionite controversy is, as we have seen, that our Gospel was in use before A. D. 120. A special question, however, has been raised about the two first chapters. The critical history of these is best drawn out perhaps in Meyer's note. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marciou's Gospel, who omits the two first chapters, and connects i. 3 immediately with vi. 1. (So Tertullian, "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiburtianus prope Deum descendisse in civitatem Galliae Cypriamnum," cont. Marc. iv. 7.) But any objection founded on this would apply to the third chapter as well; and the history of our Lord's childhood seems to have been known to and quoted by Justin Martyr (see Apology, i. § 53, and an allusion, Dial. cum Tryph. 100) about the time of Marciou. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the two first chapters and the rest; and the arguments for the genuineness of St. Luke's Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it (see Meyer's note; also Volkmar, p. 130).

IX. Contents of the Gospel. — This Gospel contains 1. A preface, i. 1-4. 2. An account of the time preceding the ministry of John, i. 5 to ii. 52. 3. Several accounts of discourses and acts of our Lord, common to Luke, Matthew; and Mark, related for the most part in their order, and belonging to Capernaum and the neighborhood, iii. 1 to ix. 50. 4. A collection of similar accounts, referring to a certain journey to Jerusalem, most of them peculiar to Luke, ix. 51 to xviii. 14. 5. An account of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus, common to Luke with the other Evangelists, except as to some of the accounts of what took place after the resurrection, xviii. 15 to the end.

Sources. — Works of Irenaeus (ed. Stieren); Justin Martyr (ed. Otto); Tertullian, Origé, and Epiphanius (ed. Dindorf); Hippolytus (ed. Miller); and Eusebius (ed. Vaësionis); Marciou's Michaelis; De Wette, Einleitung; Meyer, Kommentar; the works of Hahn, Ritschl, Baur, and Volkmar, quoted above; Grether, Kühn; Dunn Alford's Commentary; Dictionaries of Winer and Herzog; Commentaries of Kui, Weitsen, and others; Thiersch, Church History (Eng. Trans.); Olsphan, Echbeher; Hug, Einleitung; Weisse, Evangelienfrage; Greek Testament, Tischendorf, ed. viii., and notes there. W. T.*

* The most important works on the Gospel of Luke will be found referred to in the addition to the art. Gospels, p. 539 ff. Others worthy of notice are the following: Patristic: Origé, Homilies, excerpt in Jerome's Latin translation, with a few Greek fragments (Migne's Patrologia Graeca, vol. xii).
Matt. iv. 24, the "lunatics" are distinguished from the demoniacs; in Matt. xvii. 15, the name is applied to a boy who is expressly declared to have been possessed. It is evident, therefore, that the word itself refers to some disease, affecting both the body and the mind, which might, or might not, be a sign of possession (see on this subject DEMONIACS). By the description of Mark ix. 17-26, it is concluded that this disease was epilepsy (see Winer, "Realw.", p. 658). The origin of the name (as of σελενίακας and σελενίατης in earlier Greek, "lunatics" in Latin, and equivalent words in modern languages) is to be found in the belief that diseases of a paroxysmal character were affected by the light, or by the changes of the moon.

A. B. *LUST, not restricted formerly to one passion, but any strong desire or inclination. It occurs in the A. V. in the narrower and the wider sense. It is employed to translate ἐρωταεία, ἐρωταεία, ἐρωταεία, and εἰσία, εἰσία, εἰσία, διστάσεις, πάθος. In Ex. xxv. 9 (in the A. V. "inst") denotes strictly the soul as the seat of the desires. The meaning of "lust" as a verb (found six times in the A. V.) fluctuates in like manner.

H. *LUSTY. Judg. iii. 29, archaic for "stout," "vigorous"; but in the marg., "fat," as the A. V. renders "fatter" elsewhere, except Is. xxx. 23, where it is "plenteous." H.

LUX (לְעֵץ), and perhaps הָלַע, a. i. Luzah (luminares, Ges. see below), which is also the reading of the Samar. Codex and of its two versions: of the LXX. and Eusebius, Λωταί and Λουαται; b [Vat. once in Josh. xviii. 13 Κουαθαί] and the Vulgate Luzai. The uncertainty which attends the name attaches in a greater degree to the place itself. It seems impossible to discover with precision whether Luz and Bethel represent one and the same town — the former the Canaanite, the latter the Hebraic name — or whether they were distinct places, though in close proximity.

The latter is the natural inference from two of the passages in which Luz is spoken of. Jacob called the name of the place Bethel, but the name of the city was called Luz in the beginning "(Gen. xxviii. 19); as if the spot — the "certain place" — on which he had "lighted," where he saw his vision and erected his pillar, were outside the walls of the Canaanite town. And with this agree the terms of the specification of the common boundary of Ephraim and Benjamin. It ran from "from Bethel to Luz" (Josh. xvi. 2), or "from the wilderness of Bethaven ... to Luz, to the southward of Luzah southward, that is Bethel" (xviii. 13); as if Bethel were on the south side of the hill on which the other city stood.

Other passages, however, seem to speak of the

a. In one case only do the LXX. omit the termination, namely, in Gen. xxviii. 19, and here they give the name as Ολαμαμαίων, Ολαμαμαίων [so in many MSS., but Rom. Ολαμαμαίων, Alex. Olaamamwv], incorporating with it the preceding Hebrew word Ulaam, as they have also done in the case of Laish (see p. 1581, note c). The eagerness with which Judea attack this monstrous name at every possible opportunity is very curious and characteristic.

b. The ground for this suggestion, besides the remarkable agreement of the ancient versions as given above, is Josh. xvii. 13, where the words הָלַע הָלַע are used twice in the N. T. In the enumeration of...
two as identical — "Luz in the land of Canaan, that is Bethel" (Gen. xxxv. 6); and in the account of the capture of Bethel, after the conquest of the country, it is said that "the name of the city before was Luz" (Judg. i. 23). Nor should it be over-looked that, in the very first notice of Abram's arrival in Canaan, Bethel is mentioned without Luz (Gen. xiii. 18, xiv. 13), just as Luz is mentioned by Jacob without Bethel (xlviii. 3).

Perhaps there never was a point on which the evidence was so curiously contradictory. In the passages just quoted we find Bethel mentioned in the most express manner two generations before the occurrence of the event which gave it its name; while the patriarch to whom that event occurred, and who made there the most solemn vow of his life, in recurring to that very circumstance, calls the place by its heathen name. We further find the Israelite name attached, before the conquest of the country by the Israelites, to a city of the building of which we have no record, and which city is now in the possession of the Canaanites.

The conclusion of the writer is that the two places were, during the times preceding the con- quest, distinct. Luz being the city and Bethel the pillar and altar of Jacob: that after the destruction of Luz by the tribe of Ephraim the town of Bethel arose: that the close proximity of the two was sufficient to account for their being taken as identical in cases where there was no special reason for discriminating them, and that the great subsequent reputation of Bethel will account for the occurrence of its name in Abram's history in reference to a date prior to its existence, as well as in the records of the conquest.

2. When the original Luz was destroyed, through the treachery of one of its inhabitants, the man who had introduced the Israelites into the town went into the "land of the Hititites" and built a city, which he named after the former one. This city was standing at the date of the record (Judg. i. 28). But its situation, as well as that of the "land of the Hititites," has never been discovered since, and is one of the favorite puzzles of Scripture geographers. Eusebius (Onom. Agaè) mentions a place of the name as standing near Shechem, nine (some, three) miles from Nepolis (Nablaion).

The objection to this is the difficulty of placing in central Palestine, and at that period, a district exclusively Hititic. Some have imagined it to be in Cyprus, as if Chittim were the country of the Hitites; others in Arabia, as at Lyba, a Roman town in the desert south of Palestine, on the road to Akabah (Rob. i. 187).

The signification of the name is quite uncertain. It is usually taken as meaning "hazel," and denoting the presence of such trees; but the latest lexicographer (Farré, Enchirid. 693) has returned to the opinion of an earlier scholar (Onom. 70), that the notion at the root of the word is rather "beeding" or "sinking," as of a valley. G.

* The difficulties suggested in this article and in that on Bethel as to the use of the two names, are removed by careful attention to the narrative. There seems to have been no town in the locality in the time of Abraham; but he pitched his tent and built his altar in a place which Moses can only describe by means of the names of the places nearest thereto at the time of his writing (Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3). Nor had any town yet been built at the time of Jacob's first (Gen. xxviii. 11-19), nor of his second (xxxv. 6) visit, the narrative implying that it was a solitary place. At his first visit Jacob named the place Bethel; but he remained there only thirteen days, and there was neither an angel to hear or give currency to the designation. At his second visit therefore, with his numerous household ("he and all the people that were with him") when he apparently sojourned there for some time, he repeated it, and it became thenceforward his descendants the rightful name of the locality.

When he removed thence, it again became an uninhabited place, and the Canaanites built a town which they called by their own name of Luz, and which continued quite down to the conquest. During the interval between the building of the town and the conquest there were therefore to the Israelites two names, that of fiecio of the town, Luz; and that of yere, of the locality (there was yet no such town, Bethel). Either name is used to describe the place. (Gen. xxxv. 6; Judg. i. 23, etc.) The Canaanite town was built in the interval between Jacob's second visit and the time of his death—probably before his going down to Egypt. This second visit having been before the birth of Benjamin (xxxv. 6, 10), there was ample time for the building. When Jacob speaks of the place at a later time (xlvii. 3), he naturally calls it by its existing name: while in Judges i. 23, after it had been destroyed and replaced by an Israelite town, it is as naturally called by the latter, with parenthesis mention of the former name. The suggestion in the above article, that the later town did not precisely cover the site of the earlier, in explanation of Josh. xvi. 2, seems altogether probable.

F. G.

LYCAONIA (Lycaonia). This is one of those districts of Asia Minor, which, as mentioned in the N. T., are to be understood rather in their ethnological than a strictly political sense. From what is said in Acts xiv. 11 of "the speech of Lycaonia," it is evident that the inhabitants of the district, in St. Paul's day, spoke something very different from ordinary Greek. Whether this language was some Syriac dialect [CAPPAONIAC], or a corrupt form of Greek, has been much debated (Jabalonsky, Opusc. iii. 3; Gnilka, De Ling. Ly- caon. 1726). The fact that the Lycaonians were familiar with the Greek mythology is consistent with either supposition. It is deeply interesting to see these rude country people, when Paul and Barnabas worked miracles among them, rushing to the conclusion that the strangers were Mercury and Jupiter, whose visit to this very neighborhood forms the subject of one of Ovid's most charming stories (Ovid. Metam. viii. 625). Nor can we fail to notice how admirably St. Paul's address on the occasion was adapted to a simple and imperfectly civilized race (xiv. 15-17). This was at Lystra, in the heart of the country. Further to the east was Derga (ver. 65), not far from the chief pass which leads up through Taurus, from Lystra and the east, to the central table-land. At the western limit of Lycaonia was Iconium (ver. 1), in the direc-

The likeness of men." They were ignorant of the language in which this was spoken. It does not appear that the Apostles possessed any permanent gift of tongues to all them in preaching the Gospel. II.
LYCIA

The Lycaonians, who had been responsible for the construction of the road, were

LYCIA (LYCIA: [Logion], Acts xxvii. 5.) is the name of that southwestern region of the peninsula of Asia Minor which is immediately opposite the island of Rhodes. It is a remarkable district both physically and historically. The last eminences of the range of Taurus come down here in majestic masses to the sea, forming the heights of Cragus and Anticragus, with the river Xanthus winding between them, and ending in the long series of promontories called by modern sailors the "23 capes," many of which are deep inlets favorable to seafaring and piracy. In this district are those curious and very ancient architectural remains, which have been so fully illustrated by our English travellers, Sir C. Fellows, and Messrs. Spratt and Forbes, and many specimens of which are in the British Museum. Whatever may have been the political history of the earliest Lyceans, their country was incorporated in the Persian empire, and their ships were conspicuous in the great war against the Greeks (Herod. vii. 91, 92). After the death of Alexander the Great, Lycia was included in the Greek Seleucid kingdom, and was a part of the territory which the Romans forced Antiochus to cede (Livy. xxvii. 55.). It was made in the first place one of the continental possessions of Rhodes [CARIACI: but before long it was politically separated from that island, and allowed to be an independent state. This has been called the golden period of the history of Lycia. It is in this period that we find it mentioned (1 Macc. xvi. 23) as one of the countries to which the Romans sent deputies in favor of the Jews under Simon Macaeans. It was not till the reign of Claudius that Lycia became part of the Roman provincial system. At first it was combined with Pamphylia, and the governor bore the title of "Proconsul Lyciae et Pamphyliae" (Gruter, Thes. p. 458.);

LYCIA (Acts xxi. 1) and MYRA (Acts xxvii. 5). At a later period of the Roman empire it was a separate province, with Myra for its capital.

LYDIA

LYDDA (Lydha): The Greek form of the name which originally appears in the Hebrew records as LID. It is familiar to us as the scene of one of St. Peter's acts of healing, on the paralytic Aenas, one of "the saints who dwelt at Lydda" (Acts ix. 32), the consequence of which was the conversion of a very large number of the inhabitants of the town and of the neighboring plain of Sharon (ver. 35.). Here Peter was residing when the disciples of Joppa fetched him to that city in their distress at the death of Tabitha (ver. 38.).

Quite in accordance with these and the other scattered indications of Scripture is the situation of the modern town, which exactly retains its name, and probably its position. Lidii (Tobler, 36 Anc. Welt. pp. 69, 450), or Lidjfell (Robinson, Bibl. Res. ii. 244), stands in the Meyr, or meadow, of Ion on the part of the great maritime plain which anciently bore the name of Sharon, and which, when covered with its great crops of corn, reminded the traveler of the rich wheat-fields of our own Lincolnshire (Rob. iii. 145; and see Thomson, Land and Book, ch. xxiv.). It is 9 miles from Joppa, and is the first town on the northermost of the two roads between that place and Jerusalem. Within a circle of 4 miles still stand Ono (Ono Antur), Hadid (el-Haditeh), and Nebalat (Beit-Nabalah), three places constantly associated with Lod in the ancient records. The watercourses outside the town is still to bear the name of Abit Batturus (Peter), in memory of the Apostle (Rob. ii. 248; Tobler, 471). Lying so surprisingly in this fertile plain, and upon the main road from the sea to the interior, Lydda could hardly escape an eventful history. It was in the time of Josephus a place of considerable size, which gave its name to one of the three (or four, xi. 57) "governments" or topharchies (see Joseph. B. J. ii. iii. 3, § 5) which Demetrius Soter (v. c. cir. 152), at the request of Jonathan Macaeans, released from tribute, and transferred from Samaria to the estate of the Temple at Jerusalem (1 Mace. xi. 34; comp. x. 30, 38; xi. 28, 57); though by whom these districts were originally defined does not appear (see Melchis, Bib. für Umgel.). A century later (n. c. cir. 45) Lydda, with Gophna, Emmas, and Thamna, became the prey of the insatiable Cassius, by whom the whole of the inhabitants were sold into slavery to raise the exorbitant taxes imposed (Joseph. Anti. xiv. 11, § 2). From this they were, it is true, soon released by Antony; but a few years only elapsed before their city (A.D. 66) was burnt by Cestius Gallus on his way from Caesarea to Jerusalem. He entered it when all the people of the place but fifty were absent at the feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem (Joseph. B. J. ii. 19, § 1). He must have passed the hardly cold ruins not more than a fortnight after, when flying for his life before the infuriated Jews of Jerusalem. Some repair appears to have been immediately made, for in less than two years, early in A.D. 68, it was in a condition to be again taken by Vespasian, then on his way to his campaign in the south of Judea. Vespasian introduced fresh inhabitants from the prisoners lately taken in Galilee (Joseph. B. J. iv. 8, § 1). But the substantial rebuilding of the town — lying as it did in the road of every invader and every countermove — can hardly have been effected till the disorders of this unhappy country were somewhat composed. Hadrian's reign, after the suppression of the revolt of Bar-Cocheba (A.D. cir. 136), when Paganism was triumphant, and Jerusalem rebuilding as Elia

1. a + Lydda (as ascertained by leveling) is somewhat over 11 miles from Joppa (Ordinance Survey of Jerusalem, p. 21).
LYDDA

Capitolina, would not be an improbable time for this, and for the bestowal on Lydda of the new name of Diospolis — City of Zeus — which is stated by Jerome to have accompanied the rebuild- ing. (See Quirinus, P. E. Grec. i., lib. 4, cap. 3.) We have already seen that this new name, as is so often the case in Palestine, has disappeared in favor of the ancient one. [Accio; K. X. X. T., etc.]

When Eusebius wrote (A. D. 326-330) Diospolis was a well-known and much-frequented town, to which he often refers, though the names of neither it nor Lydda occur in the actual catalogue of its Omomanticon. In Jerome's time (Epitaph. Palaiae, § 8), A. D. 404, it was an episcopal see. Tradition reports that the first bishop was "Zenodas the lawyer" (Tit. iii. 13), originally one of the seventy disciples (Dorotheus, in Eusebius, 879); but the first historical mention of the see is the signature of "Actus Lydensis" to the acts of the Council of Nicea (A. D. 325; Eusebius, 878). After this the name is found, now Diospolis, now Lydda, amongst the lists of the Councils down to A. D. 518 (Rob. ii. 245; Vis. 149). The bishop of Lydda, originally subject to Caesarea, became at a later date suffragan to Jerusalem (see the two lists in Von Ramer, 401): and this is still the case. In the latter end of 415 a Council of 14 bishops was held here, before which Pelagius appeared, and by whom, after much tumultuous debate, and in the absence of his two accusers, he was acquitted of heresy, and received as a Christian brother (Milner, Hist. of Ch. of Christ, Cent. V. ch. iii.). St. George, the patron saint of England, was a native of Lydda. After his martyrdom his remains were buried there (see quotations by Robinson, ii. 245), and over them a church was after wards built and dedicated to his honor. The erection of this church is commonly ascribed to Justinian, but there seems to be no real ground for the assertion, and at present it is quite uncertain by whom it was built. When the country was taken possession of by the Saracen in the early part of the 9th century, the church was destroyed; and in this ruined condition it was found by the Crusaders in A. D. 1099, who reinstated the see, and added to its endowment the neighboring city and lands of Remleh. Apparently at the same time the church was rebuilt and strongly fortified (Rob. ii. 247). It appears at that time to have been outside the city. Again destroyed by Saladin after the battle of Hattin in 1191, it was again rebuilt, if we are to believe the tradition, which, however, is not so consistent or trustworthy as one would desire, by Richard Cœur-de-lion (Will. Tyr.; but see Rob. ii. 245, 246). The remains of the church still form the most remarkable object in the modern village. A minute and picturesque account of them will be found in Robinson (ii. 244), and a view in

LYDDA — Ruins of the Church of St. George. — Van de Velde.

Van de Velde's Pays d'Israel (plate 55). The town is, for a Mohammedan place, busy and prosperous (see Thomson, Land and Book; Van de Velde, Hist. of P. i. 244). Buried in palms, and with a surge well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of persons, old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind or afflicted with both some diseases of the eyes. Indeed it is proverbial for this; and the writer was told on the spot in 1858, as a common saying, that in Lyd every man has either but one eye or none at all.

Lydda was, for some time previous to the de- struction of Jerusalem, the seat of a very famous Jewish school, scarcely second to that of Jaffa. About the time of the siege it was presided over by Labbi Granadi, second of the name (Lightfoot, Chor. Cent. xvi.). Some curious anecodes and short notices from the Talmuds concerning it are

a Was this the Diospolis mentioned by Josephus Ant. xv. 5, § 1, and B. J. i. § 6? But it is difficult to discover if the two places are not intended, possibly neither of them identical with Lydda.

Can there be any connection, etymological or other, between the two names? In the Dict. of Geog. i. 778, a modern Egyptian village is mentioned named Lydda, of which the ancient name was also Diospolis.

b Jerome is wrong here in placing the raising of Dorcas at Lydda. So also Ritter (Palestina, p. 551) describes the miracle to St. Paul.

c "Hic miserrima Synagoga Diospolitana" (Jerome, Ep. ad Afr. c. Aug. § 2). The church which Justinian built to St. George was in Biuma (Bo'arata), somewhere in Armæn Asia Procesam, de Ec. Jus. i. 3; in Rob. p. 241). See the remarks of Robinson against the possibility of Constantine having built the church at Lydda. But were there not probably two churches at Lydda, one dedi- cated to St. George, and one to the Virgin? See Ro- land, p. 575.
preserved by Lightfoot. One of these states that "Queen Helena celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles there!"

As the city of St. George, who is one with the famous personage el-Khadir, Lydda is held in hunch honor by the Muslims. In their traditions the gate of the city will be the scene of the final conflict between Christ and Antichrist (Sale's Koran, note to ch. 45; and Pocc. Diciz. iv. § 4; also Jalil ad-Din. Temple of Jerusalem, p. 424). G.

LYDIA (Ἀδηια: [Lydiq]), a maritime province in the west of Asia Minor, bounded by Mysia on the N., Phrygia on the E., and Caria on the S. The name occurs only in 1 Macc. viii. 8 (the rendering of the A. V. in Ez. xxx. 5 being incorrect for Ludim); it is there enumerated among the districts which the Romans took away from Antiochus the Great after the battle of Magnesia in B.C. 199, and transferred to Eumenes II., King of Pergamum. Some difficulty arises in the passage referred to from the names "India and Mela" found in connection with it: but if we regard these as incorrectly given either by the writer or by a copyist for "Ionia and Mysia," the agreement with Livy's account of the same transaction (xxxvii. 56) will be sufficiently established, the notice of the maritime provinces alone in the book of Maccabees being explicable on the ground of their being best known to the inhabitants of Palestine. For the connection between Lydias and the Lul and Ludim of the O. T., see Ludin. Lydia is included in the "Asia" of the N. T.

W. L. B.

LYDIA (Ἀδηια: [Lydiq]), the first European convert of St. Paul, and afterwards his hostess during his first stay at Philippi (Acts xvi. 14, 15, also 40). She was a Jewish proselyte (σεβομένη τον Θεόν) at the time of the Apostle's coming; and it was at the Jewish Sabbath-worship by the side of a stream (ver. 19) that the preaching of the Gospel reached her heart. She was probably only a temporary resident at Philippi. Her native place was Thyatira, in the province of Asia (ver. 14; Rev. ii. 18), and it is interesting to notice that through her, indirectly, the Gospel may have come into that very district, where St. Paul himself had recently been forbidden directly to preach it (Acts xvi. 6). Thyatira was famous for its dyeing-works; and Lydia was connected with this trade (πυρωποίησις), and was a seller of dye, or a dyer's goods.

We infer that she was a person of considerable wealth, partly from the fact that she gave a home to St. Paul and his companions, partly from the mention of the conversion of her "household," under which term, whether children are included or not, slaves are no doubt comprehended. Of Lydia's character we are led to form a high estimate, from her candid reception of the Gospel, her urgent hospitality, and her continued friendship to Paul and Silas when they were persecuted. Whether she was one of those women who lathed with Paul in the Gospel" at Philippi, as mentioned afterwards in the Epistle to that place (Phil. iv. 2), it is impossible to say. As regards her name, however, it is certainly curius that Thyatira was in the district anciently called "Lydia," there seems to reason for doubting that it was simply a proper name, or for supposing with Grotius that she was "its dieta a solo natali." J. S. H.

LYSANIAS (Λυσάνιας: [Lyssanias]), mentioned by St. Luke in one of his chronological passages (iii. 1) as being tetrarch of Abilene (i. e. the district round Abila) in the 15th year of Tiberius, at the time when Herod Antipas was tetrarch of Galilee, and Herod Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and Trachonitis. It happens that Josephus speaks of a prince named Lysanias who ruled over a territory in the neighborhood of Lebanon in the time of Antony and Cleopatra, and that he also mentions Abilene as associated with the name of a tetrarch Lysanias, while recounting events of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius. These circumstances have given to Strauss and others an opportunity for accusing the Evangelist of confusion and error: but we shall see that this accusation rests on a groundless assumption.

What Josephus says of the Lysanias who was contemporary with Antony and Cleopatra (i. e. who lived 60 years before the time referred to by St. Luke), is that he succeeded his father Polymy, the son of Menneas, in the government of Chaldea, under Mount Lebanon (B. J. i. 13, § 1; Ant. xiv. 7, § 4); and that he was put to death at the instance of Cleopatra (Ant. xv. 4, § 1), who seems to have received a good part of his territory. It is to be observed that Abila is not specified here at all, and that Lysanias is not called tetrarch.

What Josephus says of Abila and the tetrarchy in the reigns of Caligula and Claudius (i. e. about 20 years after the time mentioned in St. Luke's Gospel), is that the former emperor promised the "tetrarchy of Lysanias" to Agrippa (Ant. xviii. 6, § 10), and that the latter actually gave to him "Abila of Lysanias" and the territory near Lebanon (Ant. xiv. 5, § 1, with B. J. ii. 12, § 8).

Now, assuming Abilene to be included in both cases, and the former Lysanias and the latter to be identical, there is nothing to hinder a prince of the same name and family from having reigned as tetrarch over the territory in the intermediate period. But it is probable that the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus in the second instance is actually the prince referred to by St. Luke. Thus, instead of a contradiction, we obtain from the Jewish historian a confirmation of the Evangelist; and the argument becomes very decisive if, as some think, Abilene is to be excluded from the territory mentioned in the story which has reference to Cleopatra.

Fuller details are given in Davidson's Introduction to the N. T. i. 214-220; and there is a good brief notice of the subject in Rawlinson's Eusebium Lectures for 1859, p. 203 [p. 290, Amer. ed.], and note 113.

J. S. H.

LYSIAS (Λυσιας), a nobleman of the blood-royal (1 Macc. iii. 32; 2 Macc. xi. 1), who was entrusted by Antiochus Epiphanes (cir. B. C. 166) with the government of southern Syria, and the guardianship of his son Antiochus Eupator (1 Macc. iii. 32; 2 Macc. x. 11). In the execution of his office Lysias armed a considerable force against Judas Maccabaeus. Two detachments of this army under Nicanor (2 Macc. vi. 7; and Gorgias were defeated by the Jews near Emmaus (1 Macc. iv. 11), and in the following year Lysias himself met with a much more serious reverse at Bethsura (B. C. 165), which was followed by the purification of the Temple. Shortly after this, Antiochus Epiphanes died B. C. 164, and Lysias assumed the government as guardian of his son, who was yet a child (App. Syr. 46; Ant. xiv. 6; 1 Macc. vi. 17). The war against the Jews was renewed, and, after a severe struggle, Lysias, who took the young king
with him, captured Bethsura, and was besieging Jerusalem, when he received tidings of the approach of Philip, to whom Antiochus had transferred the guardianship of the prince (1 Macc. vi. 18 ff.; 2 Macc. xiii.). He defeated Philip (v. c. 160), and with his army and a train of his wife, togetherto with his warband, fell into the hands of Demetrius Soter [Demetrius I.], who put them both to death (1 Macc. vii. 2–4; 2 Macc. xiv. 2; Jos. Ant. xii. 12, §§ 15, 16; App. Syr. ce. 45–47; Polyb. xxxi. 15, 19).

There are considerable differences between the first and second books of Maccabees with regard to the campaign of Gogebas and the subsequent conduct of Lyias: the former places the defeat of Lyias in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes before the purification of the Temple (1 Macc. iv. 20–35), the latter in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes after the purification (2 Macc. x. 10, xi. 1, &c.). There is no sufficient ground for believing that the events recorded are different (Patrocinium, De Consecrat. Masee. §§ xvii. xviii.), for the mistake of date in 2 Maccabees was due to a possible misinterpretation (comp. Wermndorf, De julo Masee. § xvi.; Grimm, Grund 2 Masee. xi. 1). The idea of Grotius that 2 Macc. xi. and 2 Mace. xii. are duplicate records of the same event, in spite of Ewald's support (Geschichte, iv. 305 note), is scarcely tenable, and leaves half the difficulty unexplained.

B. F. W.

*LYSIAS* (Λυσίας) summoned CLAUDIUS (Κλαύδιος) was the Roman filledarch (chief captain), A. V. who commanded the garrison at Jerusalem in the procuratorship of Felix (A.D. 50). See Wiewsekr's Chronology, p. 88. He was who rescued Paul from the Jewish mob when they were about to kill him for alleged profanation of the Temple (Acts xxii. 32 f.). Of his two names, LYSIAS reminds us of his Greek origin, and CLAUDIUS of his assumption of the rights of a Roman citizen, which (see Acts xxii. 28) he had acquired by purchase. [CITIZENSHIP.]

We have no knowledge of this Lyias out of the Acts: but what we learn there is not, on the whole, unfavorable to him. He arrested the scourging of Paul as soon as he knew that he was a Roman citizen. He allowed him to speak to his countrymen in self-defense, and rescued him from their rage on hearing his declaration that God had sent him to preach the Messiah to the heathen. He lodged him for safety in the castle, took him out of the hands of the Jewish Council when they were about to tear him in pieces, and on being informed of a conspiracy to kill him, sent him by night, under an escort of Roman soldiers, to Felix at Caesarea.

Luke has preserved to us the letter which Lyias wrote to Felix on that occasion (Acts xxii. 26–30). The letter contains, on one point, a palpable misstatement, proceeding of course not from Luke who copied the letter, but from Lyias by whom it was written. Lyias states as his reason for rescuing Paul with such promptness from the Jews that he learned (μαθημάτων, etc.) that he was a Roman citizen; whereas, in fact, he knew nothing of Paul's rank till after he had taken him into custody, and was even on the point of putting him to torture. Meyer very properly points out this deceit as a mark of the genuineness of the letter (Apostelgeschichte, p. 450). It was natural that the subject should wish to gain as much credit as possible with his superior. It might be presumed that the minute circumstances would be unknown to Felix.

We detect the inconsistency because we have in our hands Luke's narrative as well as the letter. It is impossible to say how Luke obtained a copy of this document. It pertained to a judicial process concerning which Felix might have to give account. It would therefore be preserved. Luke no doubt did so at Cesarea during the two years that Paul was confined there. He would naturally wish to know how the Apostle's case had been represented to the procurator, and may even at that time have formed his purpose to write the Acts. Considering his inquisitive habits (mentioned at the beginning of his Gospel) we can easily believe that he would find means, in some way, to see the letter, or at all events to learn its purport (Acts xxiii. 25). Luke's expression (ἐπιστ. περιευχέως τού πόσον τούτο) intimates that it is the substance rather than the full words of the letter, that he reports to us.

An incidental value of the document is that it transmitted to us an official Roman testimony to the integrity of Paul's character.

II.

LYSIMACHUS (Λυσιμάχος, [wreter of of strife, peace-maker: Lysimachus].) 1. A son of Ptolemaeus of Jerusalem "(Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἴον ἰερουσαλήμ) the Greek translator of the book of Esther (Arristol. Comp. Esth. ix. 20), according to the subscription of the LXX. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the translator was also the author of the additions made to the Hebrew text (Exekiel). 2. A brother of the high-priest Menahem, who was left by him as his deputy (διάκονος) during his absence at the court of Antiochus. His tyranny and sacrilege excited an insurrection, during which he fell a victim to the fury of the people cir. n. c. 170 (2 Macc. xx. 19–42). The Valgate, by a mistranslation ("Menahem anatus est a sacrificio, succedente Lysimacho fratre suo") makes LYSIMACHUS the successor instead of the deputy of Menahem.

B. F. W.

LYSTRA (Λυστρα [mender pl. Acts xiv. 8 and 2 Tim. iii. 11, but not sing., Acts iv. 6, 21, and xvi. 1; Lystro, also sing. and pl.) has two points of extreme interest in connection respectively with St. Paul's first and second missionary journeys — (1) as the place where divine honors were offered to him, and where he was presently stoned; (2) as the home of his chosen companion and fellow-missionary TIMOTHYES.

We are told in the 14th chapter of the Acts, that Paul and Barnabas, driven by persecution from Iconium (ver. 2), proceeded to Lystra and its neighborhood, and there preached the Gospel. In the course of this service a remarkable miracle was worked in the healing of a lame man (ver. 8). This occurrence produced such an effect on the minds of the ignorant and superstitious people of the place, that they supposed that the two gods, Merkury and Jupiter, who were said by the poets to have formerly visited this district in human form [LYSIMOIX] had again bestowed on it the same favor, and consequently were proceeding to offer sacrifice to the strangers (ver. 13). The Apostles

---

*a To evade this conclusion some resolve ἐπιστήμων into xαί, ἐπιστήμονα, as if the chiasm thus learned the fact of the citizenship after the arrest. But there is no example of such a use of the participle in the N. T. (See Winer, N. T. Gram. § 65, 2.)

H.
rejected this worship with horror (ver. 14), and St. Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minin, to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christian doctrine is not mentioned, but it is implied, inasmuch as a church was founded at Lystra. The adoration of the Lystrians was rapidly followed by a change of feeling. The persecuting Jews arrived from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (ver. 19). On his recovery he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (ver. 20), but before long retracted his steps through Lystra (ver. 21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast.

It is evident from 2 Tim. iii. 10, 11, that Timotheus was one of those who witnessed St. Paul's sufferings and courage on this occasion: and it can hardly be doubted that his conversion to Christianity resulted partly from these circumstances, combined with the teaching of his Jewish mother and grandmother, Eunice and Lois (2 Tim. i. 5). Thus, when the Apostle, accompanied by Silas, came, on his second missionary journey, to this place again (and here we should notice how accurately Derbe and Lystra are here mentioned in the inverse order), Timotheus was already a Christian (Acts xvi. 1). Here he received circumcision, because of the Jews in those parts (ver. 3); and from this point began his connection with St. Paul's travels. We are doubly reminded here of Jewish residents in and near Lystra. Their first settlement, and the ancestors of Timotheus among them, may very probably be traced to the establishment of Babylonian Jews in Phrygia by Antiochus three centuries before (Joseph. Ant. xii. 3, § 4). Still it is evident that there was no significant Jewish population at Lystra; no mention is made of any synagogue; and the whole aspect of the scene described by St. Luke (Acts xiv.) is thoroughly heathen. With regard to St. Paul, it is not absolutely stated that he was ever in Lystra again, but from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (Acts xvii. 23) it is almost certain that he was.

Lystra was undoubtedly in the eastern part of the great plain of Lyceania; and there are very strong indications for regarding it as the ruin of an ancient city, called Egin-ter-Kilise, at the base of a conical mountain of volcanic structure, named the Kavurdagh (Hamilton, Res. in A. M. ii. 313). Here are the remains of a great number of churches: and it should be noticed that Lystra has its post-apostolic Christian history, the names of its bishops appearing in the records of early councils.

Pilny (v. 42) places this town in Galatia, and strong statements are quite consistent with its being placed in Lyceania by St. Luke, as it is by Hierocles (Synecd.)

a Gesenius (Thes. 811 n) suggests that the name may have been originally נְדָבָר, the נ having changed into י, in accordance with Phoenician custom. (See also Furst, Htrab. 708 b; though he derives the name itself from a root signifying depression—low-land.) It is perhaps some support to this idea, that Ephesus in the Oecumenicon gives the name Mysaâ, and that the LXX. read in one passage " Amalek," as above. Is it not also possible that in 2 Sam. viii. 12 " Amalek " may more accurately be Mysaâ? At least, no campaign against Amalek is recorded in these "—since that before the death of Saul (P. 675). As to its condition in heathen times, it is worth while to notice that the words in Acts xiv. 13 (τοῦ Δως τοῦ ὑπὸ πῦρ τῆς πλάκας) would lead us to conclude that it was under the tutelage of Jupiter. Wacher, in his Spicilegium Antiquitatis Lystraensium (Disc. in Acta Apostolorum, Jena 1766, vol. iii.), thinks that in this passage a statue not a temple, of the god is intended. J. S. H. 

* The Apostle in his speech to the Lystrians addressed heathen and idolaters. It is interesting to compare the line of thought hinted here in regard to the means of knowledge furnished by the light of nature concerning the existence of God and his attributes with the fuller reasoning on this subject in Rom. i. 19 ff. The similarity (see also Acts xvii. 24 ff.) is precisely such as we should expect on the supposition that he who wrote the epistle delivered the speech. There is also some diversity, but of the kind which arises from applying the same system of truth to different occasions. Luke assigns the speech to its proper place in the history. Among the Lyceanians, whose local traditions were so peculiar, it is less surprising that the gross antropomorphism should show itself, which called forth the Apostle's remonstrance and led him to correct the error. The reader will find a good analysis of the argument, with exegetical remarks, in Stier's Reden der Apostel, ii. 1-23.

M.

MA'ACAH (מָאָכָה) [perh. depression, First:] Maâkâ; Alex. Maâkâh: Myâhâ. 1. The mother of Absalom = MAACAH 5 (2 Sam. iii. 5).

2. MA'ACAH, and (in Chron.) MAACHAH: in Samuel 'MAÂCÂKH, and so Josephus; in Chron. [Vat. FA.]: Maâkh and Maâkahh: Alex. in both [rather, in 2 Sam.] Maâkâh, [in Chron. Myâkâh, Maâkâ] Morechi, Maâkâh. A small kingdom in close proximity to Palestine, which appears to lie half inside ArgoL (Deut. i. 14) and Bashan (Josh. xii. 5). These districts, probably answering to the Lejoh and Jabin of modern Syria, occupied the space from the Jordan on the west to the Orontes (Sulhâh) and eastward to Mount Hermon on the north. There is therefore no alternative but to place Maâkah somewhere to the east of the Lejoh, in the country that lies between that remarkable district and the Sûfa, namely the stony desert of et-Krâ'dh (see Kiepert's map to Wetzstein's Hebräirn, etc., 1890), and which is to this day thickly studded with villages. In these remote eastern regions was also probably situated Tëlhadh, Têluch, or Bethach, which occurs more than once in connection with Maâkah [1 Chr. xvi. 18; Gen. xxii. 24; 2 Sam. (1 Sam. xxx.), which can hardly be referred to in this catalogue.

* The reading Maâkh instead of Maâkah is adopted by Jarso and Parthey in their edition of the Onomasticon of Eusebius (Berlin, 1852) on the authority of the Codex Leidensis.

b This is probably the origin of the name as attached to the great stony plain north of Mâdresdâ, in the ancient eastern districts.

c The ancient versions do not assist us much in fixing the position of Maâkah. The Syrian Peshito in 1 Chr. xix has Charr̄ā, Maâkâ'. If this could be identified with et Charr̄a, the district east of Sulhâh,
MAACHAH

viii. 8). Maachah is sometimes assumed to have been situated about ABIEL-BETH-MAACHAH; but, if Abil be the modern representative of that town, this is hardly probable, as it would bring the kingdom of Maachah west of the Jordan, and within the actual limits of Israel. It is possible that the town was a colony of the nation, though even this is rendered questionable by the conduct of Job towards it (2 Sam. xx. 22). That implacable soldier would hardly have left it standing and unharmed had it been the city of those who took so prominent a part against him in the Ammonite war.

That war was the only occasion on which the Maacathites came into contact with Israel, when their king assisted the Ben-Ammon [sons of A.] against Josh with a force which he led himself (2 Sam. x. 6, 8; 1 Chr. xix. 7. In the first of these passages, "of" is inaccurately omitted in the A. V.). The small extent of the country may be inferred from a comparison of the number of this force with that of the people of Zolah, Isdob, and Rebob (2 Sam. x. 6), combined with the expression "his people" in 1 Chr. xix. 7, which perhaps imply that a thousand men were the whole strength of his army. [MAACHATHI.]

To the connection which is always implied between Maachah and Geshur we have no clue. It is perhaps illustrated by the fact of the daughter of the king of Geshur—wife of David and mother of Absalom—being named Maachah. G.

MA'ACHAH (מַאָ'ָכָּה) [as above]: Ma'ah: Alex. Mayy: [Machalah]. 1. The daughter of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (Gen. xxii. 21). Ewald connects her name with the district of Maachach in the Hermon range [Grosch., i. 414, note 1].

2. (Mas'ah: [Vat. Moad].) The father of Achish, who was king of Gath at the beginning of Solomon's reign (1 K. ii. 39). [Machich.]

3. [Vat. in 1 Chr. xi. 21, Ma'azar.]. The daughter, or more probably grand-daughter, of Absalom, named after his mother: the third and favorite wife of Rebah, and mother of Absijah (1 K. xxv. 2; 2 Chr. xi. 20-22). According to Josephs (Ant. viii. 10, § 1) her mother was Tamar, Absalom's daughter. But the mother of Absijah is elsewhere called "Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gilead" (2 Chr. xiii. 2). The LXX and Syriac, in the latter passage, have Maachah, as in xix. 2. The name of Michalina is a mere variation of Maachah, as has been asserted (the resemblance in English characters being much more close than in Hebrew), it would be easy to understand that Uriel of Gilead married Tamar the daughter of Absalom, whose grand-daughter therefore Maachah was. But it is more probable that "Michaiah" is the error of a transcriber, and that "Maachah" is the true reading in all cases (Cepeli G. Crit. Socr., vii. 7, § 4). Houbrigan proposed to alter the text, and to read "Maachah, the daughter of Absi'el (or Absalom, the son of Uriel." During the reign of her grandson Asa she occupied at the court of Judah and south of the Saph (see Wetstein, and Cyril Graham; it would support the view taken in the text, and would also fall in with the suggestion of Ewald [Gesen. iii. 167], that the Sapha is connected with Zolah. In Josh. xiii. the Peishita has Kema, כִּמֶּאֶדָּה, of which the writer can make nothing. The Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, and Jerusalem have Apukeros, אַפּוּקְרָא with some slight variations in spelling) the high position of King's Mother" (comp. 1 K. ii. 19), which has been compared with that of the Saltana Valide in Turkey. It may be that at Absi'el's death, after a short reign of three years, Asa was left a minor, and Maachah acted as regent, like Athaliah under similar circumstances. If this conjecture be correct, it would serve to explain the influence by which she promoted the practice of idolatrous worship. The idol or "horror" which she had made for Asaheb (1 K. xx. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 16) is supposed to have been the emblem of Priapus, and was so understood by the Vulgate. [Eisel. vol. ii. p. 1118 b.] It was swept away in A's reformation, and Maachah was removed from her dignity. Josephus calls Maachah May'ah, perhaps a corruption of May'ah, and makes Ass the son of May'aia. See Burdington's Genealogies, i. 222-228, where the two Maacahs are considered distinct.

4. (May'ah.) The concubine of Caleb the son of Hezron (1 Chr. ii. 48).

5. (May'ah.) The daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, and mother of Absalom (1 Chr. iii. 2): also called MA'ACHAH in A. V. of 2 Sam. iii. 9. Josephus gives her name May'ahiai (Ant. vii. 1, § 4). She is said, according to a Hebrew tradition recorded by Jerome (Qu. Hebr. in Reg.), to have been taken by David in battle and added to the number of his wives.

6. (May'ah: Alex. May'ah.) The wife of Machir the Manassean, the father or founder of Gilead, and sister of Huppim and Shupham (1 Chr. vii. 15, 16), who were of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chr. vii. 12). In the Peshito Syriac Maacah is made the mother of Machir.

7. (May'ah: [May'ah: [Ath. i. 41-vii. 8].) The wife of Jehiel, father or founder of Gileon, from whom was descended the family of Saul (1 Chr. viii. 29, ix. 35).

8. (May'ah: Alex. May'ah.) The father of Hanan, one of the heroes of David's body-guard (1 Chr. xi. 43), who is classed among the warriors selected from the eastern side of the Jordan. It is not improbable that Maachah in this instance may be the same as Saria-Maachah in 1 Chr. xix. 6, 7.

9. May'ah: [Vat. May'ah:] A Simeonite, father of Shephatiah, prince of his tribe in the reign of David (1 Chr. xxii. 16). W. A. W.

* MA'ACHATH (מַאָ'ָכָּת) Ma'ath (Lat.): Alex. May'ah: [Machaeth], Josh. xiii. 13, probably a variation of MA'ACHAH (which see), though Fuerst suggests that it may be abbreviated from מַאָ'ָכָּת. It occurs only as above, and there as patronymic (in the A. V., * Maachethites.*).  1. MA'ACHATH, and  2. MA'ACHATHTHITES, THE (מַאָ'ָכָּתִיתִּים) [patronymic]: [Rom. May'ath, May'ah, May'ath, etc.; Vat.]

This is probably intended for the Tanaimos of Pumbedita, which he mentions in company with Libinius, Calheneus, and Jocaster (*). [See Reimund, Pli., p. 422; and compare the expression of Josephus with regard to Machærum, B. J. vii. 6, § 2.) But this would surely be too far south for Maachah. The Targum Pseudo- Jonathan has Anteros, אֲנֵרְוָא, which remains obscure. It will be observed, however, that every one of these names contains krat or Chr.
MADAI, the Mazai, o Madai, [etc. — Alex. Madaya], [Mada, etc.] Madachi, Machuel, [Machuel], two words — the former taking the form of the Hebrew — which denote the inhabitants of the small kingdom of MADAIH (Deut. iii. 15; Josh. xii. 15, xiii. 11, 13). Individual Madachites were not unknown among the warriors of Israel. One, named simply, son of the Madachi, or possibly "Eliphlet, son of Alaadah the Machachi" (see Kennicott, Dissertation, 205, 206), was a member of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii. 34). Another, Jezeiah, was one of the chiefs who rallied round Geshlah the superintendent, after the first destruction of Jerusalem (Jer. xl. 8; 2 K. xxv. 23). Estemouo the Machachi (1 Chr. iv. 19) more probably derives that title from the confluence of Caleb (i. 48) than from the Syrian kingdom, (MA'ACHAI, 2.)

MA'ADAI [3 syl.] (תַּמַּדְיָא) [work of Jehovah]: MA'ADAI (36), sus C'hap^ had who Maavo Gese.: and or Vat.

MA'AILI (תַּמַּאי) [as above]: om. in Vat. Ms. and so in Rom. Alex. F.A.]: Alex. [rather F.A.]: MA'AILI; (Moli, one of the priests, or rather kings, who returned with Zabadiah and Jeshua (Neh. xii. 5); elsewhere (ver. 17) called MA'DAII.

MA'AALI [2 syl.] (תַּמַּאי) [work of Jehovah]: MA'AALI (xix.): [Vat. Alex. F.A. emit: Rom. Alex.,] A'ai; [V.A. MA'AILI] (Moli, one of the Bene Asiph [sons of A.], who took part in the solemn musical service by which the wall of Jerusalem was dedicated after it had been rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh. xii. 36).

MA'ALEH - ACHRAB'IM (תַּמַּאֵלְיָה - אֲכַרְבּ ה') (ascent of scorpions); הַפְּרַמְדַּבְסִים. (Acharabim [Rom. -bim: Alex. Acherabim]: ascen- sus Scorpionis). The full form of the name which in its other occurrences (in the current identical with the above) is given in the A. V. as the ascent of; [Num. xxxiv. 4], or "the going up to [Judg. i. 30], Achrabim." It is found only in Josh. xv. 5. For the probable situation of the pass, see ACHRAB- BIM.

* In Judg. i. 36 the marginal reading (A. V.) is Maale-Achrabim, with "the going up to Achrab- bim" in the text. The same place is always meant, and the expression is as much a proper name in one passage as another.

H.

MA'ANI (Banni [Vat. -rei; Ald. Maan1: Banni], 1 Esdr. ix. 34 identical with Bani, 4.

MA'ARATH (תַּמַּארָת) [waked place, i.e. without trees, etc.]: MA'ARATH; Alex. Abk. MA'ARATH; Comp. MA'ARATH: Marath, one of the towns of Judah, in the district of the mountains, and in the same group which contains Halam, Bet- zuin, and Gedor (Josh. xv. 50). The places which occur together, and have been identified at a short distance to the north of Hebron, but Maarath has hitherto eluded examination. It does not seem to have been known to Eusebius or Jerome, although

a The LXX. here represent the Hebrew Aid by γ; compare Gomorrah

its name is mentioned by them (Qumostenon = Maroth").

By Gesenius (Thea. 1069 a) the name is derived from a root signifying openness or barreness, but may it not with equal accuracy and greater plausibility be derived from that which has pro- duced the similar word, morath, a cave? R. R. is, by a characteristic feature of the mountainous districts of Palestine, one of which, the Mearath-Adullam, or cave of Adullam, was probably at no great distance from this very locality. G.

MA'ASAI (3 syl.) [work of Jehovah]: MA'SASAI (36). 1. (Vat. Mea- sar:]: Alex. Maasria: FA. Maasria.) A descendant of Jeshua the priest, who in the time of Ezra had married a foreign wife, and was divorced from her (Ezr. x. 18). He is called MATTHEIAS in 1 Esdr. x. 19, but in the margin, MAASAI.

2. (FA. Maasria: [Comp. Maasia:)] A priest, of the sons of Harim, who put away his foreign wife at Ezra's command (Ezr. x. 21). He is called MAASAI in 1 Esdr. ix. 19.

3. (Vat.) FA. Maasria: A priest of the sons of Pashur, who had married a foreign wife in the time of Ezra (Ezr. x. 22). He is called MAASAI in 1 Esdr. ix. 22.

4. (Alex. F.A.): Vat. F.A. Maasria: [Comp. MAARASAI: [Meesiri.]) One of the levites, a descendant of Phatsh-Moab, who put away his foreign wife in the time of Ezra (x. 30). Apparently the same as MASIAS in 1 Esdr. ix. 31.

5. (Maasia: [Vat. FA. Maasia: [Meesiri.): The father of Azariah, one of the priests from the city of the Jordan, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 30).

6. (Vat. M. Maasria;]: FA. Maasria: One of those who stood on the right hand of Ezra when he read the law to the people (Neh. viii. 4). He was probably a priest, but whether one of those mentioned in ch. xii. 41, 42, is uncertain. The corresponding name in 1 Esdr. ix. 43 is BALSA- MUS.

7. (Om. in LXX. [but Comp. MAARASAI:]); A Levite who assisted on the same occasion in ex- pounding the Law to the people (Neh. viii. 7). He is called MAIANES in 1 Esdr. ix. 48.

8. (Alex. MAARASAI: FA. MAARASAI: One of the heads of the people whose descendants signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 35).

9. (Vat. FA. Maaria: [Comp. MAA'I: FA. Maasia: [FA. Maaria: Son of Harach and descendant of Pharez, the son of Judah. His family dwelt in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. x. 5). In the corresponding narrative of 1 Chr. ix. 5 he is called ASSAN.

10. (Maasia: [FA. Maaria:]; Maasia: A Benjamite, ancestor of Saul, who dwelt at Jerus- alem after the Captivity (Neh. x. 7).

11. (Om. in Vat. Ms.; also Rom. Alex. F.A.]: Alex. [rather F.A.]: MAARASAI: Two priests of this name are mentioned (Neh. xii. 41, 42) as taking part in the musical service which accompanied the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem under Ezra. One of them is probably the same as 6.
MAASIAI

12. (Basarasz; [Vat. Manuscr. Alex. MacCAT. Comp. Manuscr.,] F.A. Manuscr. in Jer. xxiv. 1; Manuscr, Alex. Manuscr., Jer. xxxvii. 3; [Manuscr, Alex. Manuscr., F.A. Manuscr., Jer. xxix. 25.]) Father of Zephaniah, who was a priest in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer. xxix. 23).

13. (Osm. in LXX.) The father of Zedekiah the false prophet, in the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah (Jer. xxxix. 21).

14. (םע"ם: Manuscr. [Manuscr; Vat. Manuscr. Manuscr.], Alex. Manuscr, [Manuscr; F.A. in rev. 24, Manuscr.]: Moa't, one of the Levites of the second rank, appointed by David to sound "with pipes on the ark," while the ark was brought from the house of Obed-edom. He was also one of the "porters" or gate-keepers for the ark (1 Chr. x. 18, 20).

15. (1 Rom. Manuscr: Vat. Manuscr.) Alex. Manuscr. The son of Adibah, and one of the captains of hundreds in the reign of Josiah king of Judah. He assisted Jehoiada in the revolution by which Josiah was placed on the throne (2 Chr. xxiii. 11).

16. (Macat. [Vat. Amurras:] Alex. Manuscr.) An officer of high rank (shokir) in the reign of Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 11). He was probably a Levite (comp. 1 Chr. xxiii. 4, and engaged in a semi-military capacity, corresponding to the civic functions of the judges, with whom the shokirim are frequently coupled.

17. (Manuscr. [Manuscr.]: Alex. Manuscr.) The "king's son," killed by Zekhri the Ephraimite hero in the invasion of Judah by Pekah king of Israel, during the reign of Alaz (2 Chr. xxvii. 7). The personage thus designated is twice mentioned in connection with the "governor of the city" (1 K. xxvii. 26; 2 Chr. xviii. 25), and appears to have held an office of importance at the Jewish court (perhaps acting as viceroy during the absence of the king), just as the queen dowager was honored with the title of "king's mother" (comp. 2 K. xxi. 2 with Jer. xxix. 2), or gebi'hot, i.e., "mistress," or "powerful lady." [MACRILLAM, 8.] For the conjecture of Geiger, see Joash, 4.

18. (Maoraz; [Alex. Manuscr.]:) The governor of Jerusalem in the reign of Josiah, patronized by the king, in conjunction with Shaphan and Joash, to superintend the restoration of the Temple (2 Chr. xxviii. 8).

19. (Manuscr; Alex. Manuscr.; [F.A. Manuscr.]: Manuscr.) The son of Shalum, a Levite of high rank, and one of the gatekeepers of the Temple in the reign of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxiv. 4; comp. 1 Chr. ix. 19).

20. (ויע"נ: Manuscr; Alex. Manuscr. Manuscr.); Jer. xxiv. 12; Alex. Manuscr. Manuscr, Jer. ii. 58.) A priest; ancestor of Baruch and Neriah, the sons of Neriah.

MAASIAI [properly MAASIAI, 3 syll.] (םע"ם: [Jehovih's work]; Manuscr. Alex. Manuscr. Manuscr.): Manuscr. a priest who after the return from Babylon dwelt in Jerusalem (1 Chr. ix. 12). He is apparently the same as AMASIAI in Neh. xi. 13.

* The forms MAASAI and MAASAI (the latter being the reading of the A.V. in the original edition of 1611 and other early editions) are doubtless both misprints for MAASAI. This is the reading of the Genevan version, and corresponds with the Hebrew וע"ם, the word being thus pointed in four MSS. collated by Michaelis (see his Bibl. Hebr. in loc.), and also by Gesenius and Furst.

MAASIAI (Manuscr. Manuscr.): The same as MAASIAI, 20, the ancestor of Baruch (Bar. i. 1).

* MAATH (Maath: Mahath), an ancestor of Jesus, according to the genealogy in Luke (iv. 26).

MAZ [ם"ם] (enger) Manuscr. Mose, son of Ram, the firstborn of Jerahmeel (1 Chr. ii. 27).

MAAIAH (ם"ם: [Jehovah's consolation]; Manuscr. [Vat. Na'as:] FA. AQA. Manuscr.) One of the priests who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 8). From the coincidence between many of the names of the priests in the lists of the twenty-four courses established by David, of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x.), and those who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii.), it would seem either that the names were hereditary in families, or that they were applied to the families themselves. This is evidently the case with the names of the "heads of the people" enumerated in Neh. x. 14-27.

2. (ם"ם see above): Manuscr. Alex. Manuscr. Manuscr. A priest in the reign of David, head of the twenty-fourth course (1 Chr. xxiv. 18). See the preceding.

MABDAI [2 syll.] (Ma'bdai; [Vat. Ioan. Manuscr.]: Manuscr. Manuscr. Ioan. Manuscr. Manuscr.) The same as BENALAIH (1 Esdr. ix. 34; see Ezra. x. 35).

MACALON (Manuscr., in both MSS. BENAIM, 1 Esdr. v. 21). This name is the equivalent of MAHOMAS in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

MACCABEES, THE (of Maccabaios; Manuscr.) This title, which was originally the surname of Judas, one of the sons of Mattathias (infra. § 2), was afterwards extended to the heroic family of which he was one of the noblest representatives, and in a still wider sense to the Palestinian patriots in the persecution of Antiochus Eupator [4 Maccabees], and even to the Alexandrine Jews who suffered for their faith at an earlier time [3 Maccabees]. The original term Maccabaios (or MacCABAEUS) has been variously derived. Some have maintained that it was formed from the combination of the initial letters of the Hebrew sentence, "Who among the gods is like unto thee, Jehovah?" (Exx. xv. 11, Heb. י"ע). Others, on the other hand, have supposed that it was formed from the lettering of the Hebrew, ו'ם, which is supposed to have been inserted upon the banners of the priests; or, again, of the initials of the simply descriptive title, "Mattathias, a priest, the son of Johanan." But even if the custom of forming such words was in use among the Jews at this early time, it is obvious that such a title would not be an individual title in the first instance, as MacCabeus undoubtedly was (1 Mac. ii. 4), and still remains among the Jews (Raphall, Hist. of Jews, i. 249). Moreover the orthography of the word in Greek and Syriac (Ewald, Gesch. iii. 532, note) points to the form ו'ם, and not ו'ם. Another derivation has been proposed, which, although direct evidence is wanting, seems satisfactory. According to this, the word is formed from...
Maccabees, the

Maccabees, the

Johannes Aristobulus. "Aronaucoz, comp. Ges. Thes. 534 b), great grandfather of Mattathias, seems certainly correct. How it came to pass that a man, otherwise obscure, gave his name to the family, cannot now be discovered; but no stress can be laid upon this difficulty, nor upon the fact that in Jewish prayers (Hersfeld, Gesch. d. Jud. i. 264) Mattathias himself is called Huskmonia.\(^a\)

The connection of the various members of the Maccabean family will be seen from the accompanying table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johannan('the sons of Joirob, comp. 1 Chron. xxiv. 7).</th>
<th>Simeon (Thassili, Simon. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 1).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mattathias (Matthias, Joseph. B. J. l. 1, § 8).</td>
<td>107 b.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judas</th>
<th>Hyperaneus I</th>
<th>Mattathias</th>
<th>Daughter = Polemeus (1 Macc. xvi. 11, 12).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td>† 135 b.c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyraneus II</th>
<th>Aristobulus II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>† 78 b.c.</td>
<td>† 49 b.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexandra = Alexander.</th>
<th>Antigonus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>† 26 b.c.</td>
<td>† 49 b.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mariamne = Herod the Great.</th>
<th>Aristobulus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>† 29 b.c.</td>
<td>† 35 b.c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original authorities for the history of the Maccabees are extremely scanty; but for the course of the war itself the first book of Maccabees is a most trustworthy, if an incomplete witness. [Maccabees, Books of.] The second book adds some important details to the history of the earlier part of the struggle, and of the events which immediately preceded it; but all the statements which it contains require close examination, and must be received with caution. Josephus follows 1 Macc., for the period which it embraces, very closely, but slight additions of names and minute particulars indicate that he was in possession of other materials, probably oral traditions, which have not been elsewhere preserved. On the other hand there are cases, in which, from haste or carelessness, he has misinterpreted his authority. From other sources little can be gleaned. Hebrew and classical literature furnishes nothing more than a few trifling fragments which illustrate Maccabean history. So long an interval elapsed before the Hebrew traditions were committed to writing, that facts, when not embodied in rites or precepts, became wholly distorted. Classical writers, again, were little likely to chronicle a conflict which probably they could not have understood. Of the great work of Polybius—who alone might have been expected to appreciate the importance of the Jewish war—only fragments remain which refer to this period; but the omission of all mention of the Maccabean campaign in the corresponding sections of Livy, who follows very closely in the track of the Greek historian, seems to prove that Polybius also omitted them. The account of the Syrian kings in Appian is too meagre to make his silence remarkable; but indifference or contempt must be the explanation of a general silence which is too wide-spread to be accidental. Even when the fall of Jerusalem had directed unusual attention to the past fortunes of its defenders, Tacitus was able to dismiss the Maccabean conflict in a sentence remarkable for scornful carelessness. "During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews," he says, "were the most abject of their dependent subjects. After the Macedonians obtained the supremacy of the East, King Antiochus endeavored

\(^{a}\) Hersfeld derives the name from חמד, "to temper steel," "so that it becomes in sense a synonym of 'Maccabees.'
to do away with their superstition, and introduce Greek habits, but was induced by a Parthian war from earlier and later times. [Hist. i. 2.] Shortly afterwards Antiochus Epiphanes, whose resources had been impoverished by the war (1 Macc. iii. 27-31) left the government of the Palestinian provinces to Lysias, while he himself undertook an expedition against Persia in the hope of recruiting his treasury. Lysias organized an expedition against Judas; but his army, a part of which had been separated from the main body to effect a surprise, was defeated by Judas at Beth-horon (v. c. 109) after the Jews had kept a solemn fast at Mizpah (1 Macc. iii. 40-53), and in the next year Lysias himself was routed at Bethbura. After this success Judas was able to occupy Jerusalem except the "tower" (1 Macc. vi. 18, 19), and he purified the Temple (1 Macc. iv. 36, 41-53) on the 25th of Ikelon, exactly three years after its profanation (1 Macc. i. 50 [DEDICATION]; ii. 10). The next year was spent in wars with frontier nations (1 Macc. v.); but in spite of continued triumph the position of Judas was still precarious. In v. c. 163 Lysias, with the young king Anti- oehus Epiphanes, took Bethbura, which had been fortified by Judas as the key of the Idumean border (1 Macc. iv. 61), after having defeated the patriots who came to its relief; and next kid came to Jeru- salem. The city was on the point of surrendering, when the approach of Philip, who claimed the guardianship of the king, induced Lysias to guar- antee the Jews complete liberty of religion. The compact thus made was soon broken, but shortly afterwards Lysias fell into the hands of Demetrius, a new champion of the throne, and was put to death. The accession of Demetrius brought with it fresh troubles to the patriot Jews. A large party of their countrymen, with Alcilius's head, gained the ear of the king, and he sent Ni- cander against Judas. Nicander was defeated, first at Capharsalama, and again in a decisive battle at Adasa, near to the glorious field of Beth-horon (v. c. 161, on the 13th Adar; 1 Macc. vii. 49; 2 Macc. xv. 36), where he was slain. This victory was the greatest of Judas's successes, and practi- cally put an end to his successful career. The next year, 160, but it was followed by an unexpected reverse. Judas employed the short interval of peace which followed in negotiating a favorable league with the Romans. But in the same year, before the senate was returned, a new invasion under Bac- chides took place. The Roman alliance seems to have alienated many of the extreme Jewish party from Judas (Mids. Hanania, quoted by Raphall, Hist. of Jews, i. 327), and he was able only to gather a small force to meet the sudden danger. Of this a large part deserted him on the eve of the battle; but the courage of Judas was unshaken and he fell at Elkasa, the Jewish Thermopylae, fighting at desperate odds against the invaders. His body was recovered by his brothers, and buried at Modin in the sepulchre of his fathers (v. c. 101).a

a The short notice of the Jews in Dioscorus Alcius [Lib. xi., Ed. 1] is singularly free from popular mis- representations, many of which, however, he quotes as used by the counselors of Antiochus to urge the king to extirpate the nation (Lib. xxxiv., Ed. 1).

b The later tradition, by a natural exaggeration, make him high-priest. Comp. Hefele, Gr. hist. i. 544, 270.
3. After the death of Judas the patriotic party seems to have been for a short time wholly disorganized, and it was only by the pressure of unparalleled sufferings that they were driven to renew the conflict. For this purpose they offered the command to Jonathan, surnamed Apphianus (Μάκαβειος, the wary), the youngest son of Mattathias. The policy of Jonathan shows the greatness of the loss involved in his brother's death. He made no attempt to maintain himself in the open country, but retired to the lowlands of the Jordan (1 Macc. x. 42), where he gained some advantage over Baccides (v. c. 161), who made an attempt to hem in and destroy his whole force. Not long afterwards Alexander Maccus died (v. c. 160), and Baccides losing, as it appears, the active support of the Grecizing party, retired from Palestine. Meanwhile Jonathan made such use of the interval of rest as to excite the fears of his Jewish enemies; and after two years Baccides, at their request, again took the field against Jonathan (v. c. 158).

This time he seems to have been but feebly supported, and after an unsuccessful campaign he accepted terms which Jonathan proposed; and after his departure Jonathan "judged the people at Michmass" (1 Macc. ix. 73), and gradually extended his power. The claim of Alexander Balas to the Syrian crown gave a new importance to Jonathan and his adherents. Demetrius I. empowered him to raise an army, a permission which was followed by the evacuation of all the outposts occupied by the Syrians except Bethsura, but Jonathan suspended the cause of Alexander, and refused the liberal offers which Demetrius made, when he heard that the Jews had resolved to join his rival (v. c. 153). The success of Alexander led to the elevation of Jonathan, who assumed the high-priestly office after the royal nomination at the Feast of Tabernacles (1 Macc. x. 21), "the greatest and holiest feast." (Joseph. Ant. viii. 4, § 1); and not long after he placed the king under fresh obligations by the defeat of Apollonius, a general of the younger Demetrius (1 Macc. x.). [APOLLONIUS.] On the death of Alexander, Demetrius II., in spite of the reverse which he had experienced, sought to gain the support of the Jews (v. c. 145); but after receiving important assistance from them he failed to fulfill his promises, and on the appearance of Antiochus VI., Jonathan attached himself to his party, and though he fell into a position of great peril gained an important victory over the generals of Demetrius. He then strengthened his position by alliances with Rome and "the Laconominius" [SPARTANS], and gained several additional successes in the field (v. c. 144); but at last fell a victim to the treachery of Tryphon (v. c. 144), who feared that he would prove an obstacle to the design which he had formed of usurping the crown after the murder of the young Antiochus (1 Macc. xi. 8-xii. 4).

4. As soon as Simon, the last remaining brother of the Maccabæan family, heard of the detention of Jonathan in Ptolemæis by Tryphon, he placed himself at the head of the patriot party, who were already beginning to despond, and effectually opposed the progress of the Syrians. His skill in war had been proved in the lifetime of Judas (1 Macc. v. 17-23), and he had taken an active share in the campaigns of Jonathan, when he was intrusted with a distinct command (1 Macc. xi. 59). He was soon enabled to consummate the object for which his family had fought gloriously, but in vain. Tryphon, after carrying Jonathan about as a prisoner for some little time, put him to death, and then, having murdered Antiochus, seized the throne. On this Simon made overtures to Demetrius II. (v. c. 143), which were favorably received, and the independence of the Jews was at length formally recognized. The long struggle was now triumphantly ended, and it remained only to reap the fruits of victory. This Simon hastened to do. In the next year he reduced "the tower" at Jerusalem, which up to this time had always been occupied by the Syrian faction; and during the remainder of his command extended and confirmed the power of his countrymen on all sides, in spite of the hostility of Antiochus Sidetes, who after a time abandoned the policy of Demetrius. [ΚΕΝΔΕΒΕΙΟΣ.] The prudence and wisdom for which he was already distinguished at the time of his father's death (1 Macc. ii. 65) gained for the Jews the active support of Rome (1 Macc. xv. 16-21), in addition to the confirmation of earlier treaties. After settling the external relations of the new state upon a sure basis, Simon regulated its internal administration. He encouraged trade and agriculture, and secured all the blessings of peace (1 Macc. xiv. 4-18). But in the midst of successes abroad and prosperity at home, he fell a victim to domestic treachery. Ptolemæus, the governor of Jericho, his son-in-law, aspired to usurp the supreme power, and having invited Simon and two of his sons to a banquet in his castle at Dok, he murdered them there (v. c. 135, 1 Macc. xvi. 11-16).

5. The treason of Ptolemæus failed in its object. JOHANNES HYRCANUS, one of the sons of Simon escaped from the plot by which his life was threatened, and assumed the government (v. c. 135). At first he was hard pressed by Antiochus Sidetes, and only able to preserve Jerusalem on condition of dismantling the fortifications and submitting to a tribute, v. c. 133. The foreign and civil wars of the Seleucæids gave him afterwards abundant opportunities to retrieve his losses. He reduced Idumæa (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 9, § 1), confirmed the alliance with Rome, and at length succeeded in destroying Samarias, the hated rival of Jerusalem, v. c. 109. The external splendor of his government was marred by the growth of internal divisions (Jos. Ant. xiii. 10, §§ 5, 6); but John escaped the fate of all the other members of his family, and died in peace v. c. 106-5. His eldest son Aristobulus I., who succeeded, was the first who assumed the kingly title, though Simon had enjoyed the fullness of the kingly power.

6. Two of the first generation of the Maccabæan family still remain to be mentioned. These, though they did not attain to the leadership of...
their countrymen like their brothers, shared their fate—Eleazar [Eleazar, 8] by a noble act of self-devotion, John [John, 2], apparently the eldest brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was complete, and probably history offers no parallel to the unflinching courage with which such a band dared to face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The Maccabees inspired a subject-peoples with independence; they found a few personal followers, and they left a nation.

7. The great outlines of the Maccabean contest, which are somewhat hidden in the annals thus briefly epitomized, admit of being traced with fair distinctness, though many points must always remain obscure from our ignorance of the numbers and distribution of the Jewish population, and of the general condition of the people at the time. The disputed succession to the Syrian throne (n. c. 153) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two great periods. During the first period (n. c. 158-153) the patriots maintained their cause with varying success against the whole strength of Syria: during the second (n. c. 153-139), they were counted by rival factions, and their independence was acknowledged. In the first period, though sometimes they were driven from town to town, they seldom gave in; in the second, though the danger was more often broken, when the danger was over. The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrillas, issuing from "the mountains" or "the wilderness," to make sudden forays on the neighboring towns. But the first aspect of the war (2 Macc. vii. 1-7; comp. 1 Macc. ii. 45) and the scene of the early exploits of Judas was the hill-country to the N. E. of Jerusalem, from which he drove the invading armies at the famous battle-fields of Beth-horon and Emmaus (Nicopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem closed the first act of the war (n. c. 165); and after this Judas made rapid attacks on every side—in Idumaea, Ammon, Gilead, Gadara—reconnoitring for a permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Bethshemesh was fortified as a defense of Jerusalem on the S.; but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the influence of his name extended more widely (1 Macc. vii. 50, 51 Ἰερουσαλημ). On the death of Judas the patriots were reduced to as great distress as at their first rising; and as Racchis held the keys of the "mountains of Ephraim" (ix. 50) they were forced to find a refuge in the lowlands near Jericho, and after some slight successes Jonathan was allowed to settle at Michmas undisputed, though the whole country remained absolutely under the sovereignty of Syria. So far it seemed that little had been gained, when the contest between Alexander Balas and Demetrius I. (Antiochus, n. c. 153) was renewed, and Judas was empowered to raise troops: the Jewish hostagings were restored; many of the fortresses were abandoned; and apparently a definite district was assigned to the government of the high-priest. The former unfruitful conflicts at length produced their full harvest. The defeat at Elasa, like the Swiss St. Jacob, had shown the worth of men who could face all odds, and no price seemed too great to secure their aid. When the Jewish leaders had once obtained legitimate power they proved able to maintain it, though their general success was checked by some reverses. The solid power of the national party was seen by the striking effect which was produced by the treacherous murder of Jonathan. Simon was able at once to occupy his place, and carry out his plans. The Syrian garrison was withdrawn from Jerusalem; Joppa was occupied as a seaport: and "four governments" (τεσσαράς ουαλι, x. 57, xii. 37)—probably the central districts of the old kingdom—were, with three districts taken from Samaria (x. 58, 39)—were subjected to the sovereign authority of the high-priest.

8. The war, thus brought to a noble issue, if less famous is not less glorious than any of those in which a few brave men have successfully maintained the cause of freedom or religion against overpowering might. The answer of Judas to those who counselled retreat (1 Macc. ix. 10) was true-hearted as that of Leonidas; and the exploits of his followers will bear favorable comparison with those of the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans. It would be easy to point out parallels in Maccabean history to the noblest traits of patriotism and martyrs in other countries; but it may be enough here to claim for the contest the attention which it deserves. Nothing in the annals of classical writers were perpetuated in our own days, though there is no struggle—not even the wars of Joshua or David—which is more profoundly interesting to the Christian student. For it is not only in their victory over external difficulties that the heroism of the Maccabees is conspicuous: their real success was as much imperilled by internal divisions as by foreign force. They had to contend on the one hand against open and subtle attempts to introduce Greek customs, and, on the other against an extreme Pharisaic party, which is seen from time to time opposing their counsels (1 Macc. vii. 12-18; comp. § 2, end). And it was from Judas and those whom he inspired that the old faith received its last development and final impress before the coming of our Lord.

9. For that view of the Maccabean war which regards it only as a civil and not as a religious conflict, is essentially one-sided. If there were no other evidence than the book of Daniel—whatever opinion be held as to the date of it—that alone would show how deeply the noblest hopes of theocracy were centred in the success of the struggle. When the feelings of the nation were thus again turned with fresh power to their ancient faith, we might expect that there would be a new creative epoch in the national literature; or, if the form of Hebrew composition was already fixed by sacred types, a prophet or psalmist would express the thoughts of the new age after the models of old time. Yet in part at least the leaders of Maccabean times felt that they were separated by a red chasm from the times of the kingdom or of the exiles. If they looked for a prophet in Judah (there they assumed that the spirit of prophecy was not among them), the volume of the prophetic writings was completed, and, as far as appears, no one ventured to imitate its contents. But the Hagiographa, though they were already long fixed as a definite collection (1 Macc.), were not equally far removed from imitation. The apocalyptic visions of Daniel (Daniel, § 1) served as a pattern for the visions incorporated in the book of Enoch (Enoch, Book of); and it has been commonly supposed that the Psalter contains compositions of the Maccabean date. This supposition, which is
at variance with the best evidence which can be obtained on the history of the Canon, can only be regarded as the inner light of the Spirit, and it may well be questioned whether the hypothesis is not as much at variance with sound interpretation as with the history of the Canon. The extreme forms of the hypothesis, as that of Hitzig, who represents Ps. 1, 2, 44, 60, and all the last three books of the Psalms (Ps. 73-150) as Maccabean (Grénon, 1 Macr. Einl. § 9, 3), or of Duss. Oke- 
hausen (quoted by Ewald, Jodav. 1853, p. 259 f.), who is inclined to bring the whole Psalter, with very few exceptions, to that date, need only be mentioned as indicating the kind of conjectures which find currency on such a subject. The real controversy is confined to a much narrower field; and the psalms which have been referred to the greatest show of reason to the Maccabean age are Ps. 44, 60, 74, 79, 80, 83. It has been argued that all these speak of the dangers to which the house and people of God were exposed from heathen enemies, at a period later than the Captivity; and the one ground for referring them to the time of the Maccabees is the general coincidence which they present with some features of the Greek oppression. But if it be admitted that the psalms in question are of a later date than the Captivity, it by no means follows that they are Maccabean. On the contrary, they do not contain the slightest traces of those internal divisions of the people which were the most marked features of the Maccabean strugg-
le. The dangers then were as much from within as from without; and party jealousies brought the divine cause to the greatest peril (Ewald, Psalm. p. 355). It is incredible that a series of Maccab-
bean psalms should contain no allusion to a system of enforced idolatry, or to a temporeorizing priesthood, or to a faithless multitude. And while the ob-
scurity which hangs over the history of the Persian supremacy from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the inva-
sion of Alexander makes it impossible to fix with any precision a date to which the psalms can be re-
ferred, any one glimpse which is given of the state of Jerusalem in the interval (Joseph. Ant. xi. 7) is such as to show that they may well have found some sufficient occasion in the wars and dis-
orders which attended the decline of the Persian power (Ewald). It may, however, be doubted whether the arguments for a post-Babylonian date are conclusive. There is nothing in the psalms themselves which may not apply to the circum-
stances which attended the overthrow of the king-
dom; and it seems incredible that the desolation of the Temple should have given occasion to no hymns of praise.  

10. The collection of the so-called Psalms of Solomon furnishes a strong confirmation of the belief that all the canonical psalms are earlier than the Maccabean era. This collection, which bears the clearest traces of unity of authorship, is, almost beyond question, a true Maccabean work. There is every reason to believe (Ewald, Geschichte, iv. 144) that the book was originally composed in Aramaic, and some of the present intro-
istics which are wanting in the other (conjectural) Maccabean Psalms. "The holy ones" (οἱ ἄγιοι, 
τοὺς ἅγιους [Ass. ηραβάνα]: 10 φόβοι τῶν κύριων) appear throughout as a distinct class, strug-
gling against hypocrites and non-pleasers, who make the observance of the Law subservient to their own interests (Ps. Sol. iv., xiii.-xv.). The sanc-
tuary is polluted by the abominations of professing 

servants of God before it is polluted by the heathen (Ps. Sol. i. 8, ii. 1 ff., viii. 8 ff., xvii. 15 ff.). Na-
onal unfaithfulness is the cause of national pun-
ishment: and the end of trial is the " justification" of God (Ps. Sol. i. 16, iii. 3, iv. 9, viii. 7 ff., x.). On the other hand there is a holiness of works set up in some passages which violates the divine mean of Scripture (Ps. Sol. i. 2, 3, iii. 9): and, while the language is full of echoes of the Old Testament, it is impossible not to feel that it wants something which we find in all the canonical writings. The historical allusions in the Psalms of Solomon are as unequivocal as the description which they give of the state of the Jewish nation. An enemy "threw down the strong walls" of Jerusalem, and " Gentiles went up to the altar" (Ps. Sol. ii. 1-3; comp. 1 Macr. i. 31). In his pride "he brought all things in Jerusalem, as the Gentiles in their cities do for their gods" (Ps. Sol. xvi. 16). "Those who loved the assemblies of the saints (συναγωγάς ἰεών) wandered (λειτόμαατον) in deserts" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 1; comp. 1 Macr. i. 44, ii. 28); and there "was no one in the midst of Jerusalem who did mercy and truth" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 17; comp. 1 Macr. i. 38). One psalm (viii.) appears to refer to a somewhat later period. The people brought wickedly, and God sent upon them a spirit of error. He brought one "from the extremity of the earth" (viii. 19; comp. 1 Macr. vii. 1. — "Demetrius from Rome"). "The princes of the land met him Maccab. with joy" (viii. 15; comp. Macr. vii. 5-8); and he entered the land in safety (1 Macr. vii. 9-12; — Bunsen, this general,) "as a father in peace" (1 Macr. vii. 15). Then "he slew the princes and every one wise in counsel" (1 Macr. vii. 16) and "poured out the blood of those who dwelt in Jerusalem" (1 Macr. vii. 17). The purport of these evils, as a retiba-
tive and purifying judgment, leads to the most remarkable feature of the Psalms, the distinct ex-
pression of Messianic hopes. In this respect they offer a direct contrast to the books of Maccabees (1 Macr. xiv. 41). The sorrow and the triumph are seen together in their spiritual aspect, and the ex-
pectation of "an anointed Lord" (χριστὸς Κύριος, 
Ps. Sol. xvii. 30 (xviii. 8); comp. Luke ii. 11) fol-
ows directly after the description of the inju-
sious assaults of Gentile enemies (Ps. Sol. xvi.; comp. 
Dan. xi. 45, xii.). "Blessed," it is said, "are they 

by ἐργαζόμενοι, which is variously altered by different au-
thorities.  

c. The prominence given to the slaughter of the 
Ratingenists both in 1 Macr. and in the psalm, and the 
share which the Jews had directly in the second 
pollution of Jerusalem, seem to fix the events of 
the psalm to the time of Demetrius; but the close sim-
ilarity (with this exception) between the invasions of 
Apollonius and Bacchides may leave some doubt as to 
the identification. (Compare 1 Macr. i. 28-38, with 
Ps. Sol. vii. 19-24.)
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who are born in those days, to see the good things which the Lord shall do for the generation to come. [Verse 17] Then shall the covenant of an appointed Lord [or the Lord's appointed, הַנְּפָדָה וְאֵין יְוָדָא יָשָׁרָא חַיָּל] in the fear of his God, in wisdom of spirit and of righteousness and of might. Then there shall be a good generation in the fear of God, in the days of mercy. [P's. Sol. viii. 6-10.]

11. Elsewhere there is little which marks the distinguishing religious character of the era. The notice of the Maccabean heroes in the book of Daniel is much more general and brief than the corresponding notice of their great adversary; but it is not on that account less important as illustrating the relation of the famous chapter to the simple history of the period which it embraces. Nowhere is it more evident that facts are shadowed forth by the prophet only in their typical bearing on the development of God's kingdom. In this aspect the passage itself (Dan. xi. 29-35) will supersede in a great measure the necessity of a detailed comment. *At the time appointed [in the spring of 168 B.C.] he [Antiochus Epiph.] shall return and come towards the south [Egypt]: but it shall not be as the first time, nor also the last time [though his first attempts shall be successful, in the end he shall fail]. For the ships of Chittim [the Romans] shall come again against him, and he shall be cut down, and return, and he shall be weak against the holy covenant; and he shall do [his will]; yet he shall return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant (comp. Dan. viii. 24, 25). And forces from him [at his bidding] shall stand [remain in Judaea as garrisons; comp. 1 Macc. i. 33, 34]; and they shall pollute the sanctuary, the stronghold, and shall take away the daily [sacrifice]; and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate (1 Macc. i. 45-47). And such as are wickedly against (or rather such as condemn) the covenant shall be corrupt [to apostasy] by smooth words; but the people that know their God shall be strong and do [exploits]. And they that understand [know God and his law] among the people, shall instruct many; yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity and by spoil [some copy (1 Macc. i. 32) read 'by spoil for them']. And they shall be helped with a little help (1 Macc. i. 28; 2 Macc. v. 27; Judas Macc. with nine others ...); and many shall cleave to them [the faithful followers of the Law] with hypocrisy [drawing the process of Judas, 1 Macc. ii. 46, and yet ready to fall away at the first opportunity, 1 Macc. vii. 6]; and some of them of understanding shall fall, to make trial among them, and to purify and to make white, unto the time of the end: because [the end is] yet for a time appointed.' From this point the prophet describes in detail the godlessness of the great oppressor (ver. 36-39), and then his last fortunes and death (ver. 40-45), but says nothing of the triumph of the Maccabees or of the restoration of the Temple, which preceded the last event by some months. This omission is scarcely intelligible unless we regard the facts as symbolizing a truth wrongly held by those who from early times referred 2 Macc. 26-45 only to Antichrist, the antitype of Antiochus—in which that recovery of the earthly temple had no place. And at any rate it shows the imperfection of that view of the whole chapter by which it is regarded as a mere transcription of history.

12. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much which illustrates in detail the religious history of the people of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called out elements which were latent in them. One doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection (2 Macc. xiv. 46), was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. *It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by Him* (Acts xxiv. 9, 14), that is the substance of the martyr's answer to his judge: *as for thee, shall not have resurrection to life* (Acts xxiv. 26). And as it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2 Macc. xii. 43-45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is in no way implied in it. On the other hand it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been expected to be put forward more prominently (2 Macc. xvii. 17, 19, 55, &c.), though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve (vi. 26). The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with his neglect of other nations, is one of the motifs of the whole of the Maccabean period, and of the wider history of the world, which is characteristic of the epoch (2 Macc. iv. 16, 17, v. 17-20, vi. 12-16, &c.). The lessons of the Captivity were reduced to moral teaching; and in the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchical times [2 Maccabees]. It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the prospect of a hope which had been cherished in a material form; and a pause, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

13. The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period show on the whole

* The Psalms of Solomon were first published in Greek with a Latin translation by the Jesuit La Cerda at the end of his Adversaria Sacra, Lugd. 1581, afterwards by Faberius in his Opera Latina, T. v. Leiden, 1694; then by Moreau, Dibgen, and Wolf; and recently by S. M. Soggin, in the Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol. 1888, p. 133 ff. He supposes the Psalms to have been written in Greek, not Hebrew, soon after the death of Pompey (in c. 48); comp. Ps. Sol. ii. 39 f. Moreau, Dibgen, and Wolf agree with him in referring them to a date subsequent to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey (n. c. 63): on the other hand, Ewald, Grimm, and Buhnemann in Herzog's Real-Encyk. vii. 360 assign them to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.
a steady adherence to the Mosaic Law. Probably the Law was never more rigorously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the Canon of the Old Testament has been already noticed. [Canova, vol. i. p. 658.] The books of the Law are found in the right hand section (1 Macc. i. 56, 57, iii. 48); and their distinctive value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Macc., "the holy books" (τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια τὰ ἐν χειρὶ ἡμῶν) were felt to give all comfort supernatural (1 Macc. xii. 9). The strict observance of the Sabbath (1 Macc. iii. 32; 2 Macc. vi. 11, viii. 26, &c.) and the observance of the law of the Nazarites (1 Macc. iii. 49), and the exemptions from military service (1 Macc. iii. 56), the solemn prayer and fastings (1 Macc. iii. 47; 2 Macc. x. 25, &c.), carry us back to early times. The provision for the mainled, the aged, and the bereaved (2 Macc. viii. 28, 39), was in the spirit of the Law; and the new Feast of the Dedication was a homage to the old rites (2 Macc. i. 9) while it was a proof of increasing popularity of the succession to the high-priesthood was the most important innovation which was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Jozachak (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabean leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joarib, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king (1 Macc. x. 29), whose will was confirmed, as it appears, by the voice of the people (comp. 1 Macc. xiv. 35).

14. Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect which was established after the return: this was "their own language." (2 Macc. viii. 21, 27, xii. 37); but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian officers. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Medin in memory of his family (1 Macc. xiii. 27-30) is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some features the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and the Curitii (Plin. H. N. xxxvi. 13), and perhaps to one still found in Idumea. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 6, § 3), supported seven cylinders in a line ranged one against another, "equal in number to the members of the Maccabean family, including Simon himself. To these he added "other works of art (μαγνηταρία) placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing trophies of arms, and sculptured ships, which might be visible from the sea below." The language of 1 Macc. and Josephus implies that these were originally placed upon the basement; otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement, supporting the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much at least is evident, that the characteristics of this work—and probably of later Jewish architecture generally—bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than of Egypt or the East, a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the commerce which Simon opened by his Mediterranean (1 Macc. xiv. 34). 15. The only recognized relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of "Simon," or "Simon Prince (Nasi) of Israel" in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus VII. Sidetes (1 Macc. xxv. 6, κοίμα τινα γνώμη τη χρύψ). and numerous examples occur which have the dates of the Simonian (21, third, and fourth) or the Seleucid (20) period. After the liberation of Jerusalem (Israel, Zion); and it is a remarkable confirmation of their genuineness, that in the first year the name Zion does not occur, as the citadel was not recovered till the second year of Simon's supremacy, while after the second year Zion alone is found (Bayer, de Numismis, 171). The privilege was first definitely accorded to Simon in n. C. 140, while the first year of Simon was n. C. 143 (Livy, xiv. 43); but this discrepancy is of little difficulty, as it is not unlikely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the four last years of his life. The evidences which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history—a vine-leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of nanna?); a triad, flowering rod, a palm branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre (1 Macc. xiii. 34), a bundle of branches symbolic of the feast of tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war of independence by Bar-cochba repeat many of these emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabean coins was impugned by Tychsen (Die Cinscheldt d. jüd. Münzen ... beiessen ... O. G. Tychsen, 1779), but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays (De Numismis Iudea, Samariaeis, Val. Ed. 1781; T-Jassie ... 1790) give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabean. Eckhel (Doctt. Numm. iii. p. 455 sq.) has given a good account of the controversy, and an accurate description of the chief types of the coins. Comp. De Saulcy, Numism. Judæae; Ewald, Gesch. vii. 366, 476. [Money.] The authorities for the Maccabean history have been given already. Of modern works, that of Ewald is by far the best. Herzfeld has collected a mass of details, chiefly from late sources, which are interesting and sometimes valuable; but the student of the period cannot but feel how difficult it is to realize it as a whole. Indeed, it seems that the instinct was true which named it from one chief hero. In this last stage of the history of Israel, as in the first, all life came from the leader; and it is the greatest glory of the Maccabees that while they found at first all turn upon their personal fortunes, they left a nation strong enough to preserve an independent faith till the typical kingdom gave place to a universal Church.

B. F. W.

MACCABEES, BOOKS OF (Makkabaim a γραφή etc.). Four books which bear the common title of "Maccabees" are found in some MSS. of the LXX. Two of these were included in the early current Latin versions of the Bible, and hence
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passel into the Vulgate. As forming part of the Vulgate they were received as canonical by the Council of Trent, and retained among the apocrypha by the reformed churches. The two other books obtained no such wide circulation, and have only a secondary connection with the Maccabean history. But all the books, though they differ most widely in character and date and worth, possess points of interest which make them a fruitful field for study.

If the historic order were observed, the so-called third book would come first, the fourth would be an appendix to the second which would retain its place, and the first would be placed last. It will be more convenient to examine the books in the order in which they are found in the MSS., which was probably decided by some vague tradition of their relative antiquity.

The controversy as to the mutual relations and historic worth of the first two books of Maccabees has given rise to much very ingenious and partial criticism. The subject was very nearly exhausted by a series of essays published in the last century, which contain in the midst of much unfair reasoning the substance of what has been written since.

The discussion was occasioned by F. Frölich's Anweld of Syria (Anmeld. . . . Syria . . . nunna exeretidus illustrati. Viandob. 1744). In this great work the author, a Jesuit, had claimed paramount authority for the books of Maccabees. This claim was denied by E. F. Wernsdorff in his Pseudos de fontibus historiac Syrie in Libris Macc. (Lips. 1745). Frölich replied to this essay in another, De fontibus hist. Syrie in Libris Macc. proditio . . . . in encom: vocato (Viandob. 1746); and then the argument fell into other hands. Wernsdorff's brother (Gib. Wernsdorff) undertook to support his cause, which he did in a Commentatio historicc critica de jide Librorum Macc. (Wrsitb. 1747); and nothing has been written on the same side which can be compared with his work. By the vigor and freedom of his style, by his surprising erudition and unwavering confidence — almost worthy of Bentley — he carries his reader often beyond the bounds of true criticism, and it is only after reflection that the littleness and sophistry of many of his arguments are apparent. But in spite of the injustice and arrogance of the book, it contains very useful facts which are the greatest value, and no abstract can give an adequate notion of its power.

The reply to Wernsdorff was published anonymously by another Jesuit: Auctorita utriusque Libri Macc. canonico-historica obtenta . . . . a quodam Soe. Jesu secludite (Viandob. 1749). The authorship of this was fixed upon J. Koll (Welt. Lex. p. 26, note); and while, in many points Koll is unequal to his adversary, his book contains some valuable information for the history of the canon. In more recent times, F. X. Patri- ticius (another Jesuit) has made a fresh attempt to establish the complete harmony of the books, and, on the whole, his essay (De Compendio utriusqve Libri Macc. Rome, 1856), though far from satisfactory, is the most able defense of the books which has been published.

The First Book of Maccabees.— I.

The first book of Maccabees contains a history of the patriotic struggle, from the first resistance of Mattathias to the settled sovereignty and death of Simon, a period of thirty-three years (B. C. 168-135). The opening chapter gives a short summary of the conquests of Alexander the Great as laying the foundations of the Greek empire in the East, and describes at greater length the oppression of Antiochus Epiphanes, culminating in his desperate attempt to extirpate Judaism. The great subject of the book begins with the enumeration of the Maccabean family (ii. 1-5), which is followed by an account of the part which the aged Mattathias took in running and guiding the spirit of his countrymen (ii. 6-70). The remainder of the narrative is occupied with the exploits of his five sons, three of whom in succession carried on with varying fortunes the work which he began, till it reached its triumphant issue. Each of the three divisions, into which the main portion of the book thus naturally falls, is stamped with an individual character derived from its special hero. First Judas, by a series of brilliant successes, and scarcely less noble reverses, fully roused his countrymen to their work, and then fell at a Jewish Thermopylae (iii. 1-ix. 22, n. c. 167-161). Next Jonathan confirmed by policy the advantages which his brother had gained by chivalrous daring, and fell not in open field, but by the sword, earlier in the same century (iii. 10-15, n. c. 161-143). Last of all Simon, by wisdom and vigor, gave shape and order to the new state, and was formally installed in the priestly office. He also fell, but by domestic and not by foreign treason; and his son succeeded to his power (xii.-xvi. n. c. 143, 135). The history, in this aspect, presents a kind of epic unity. The passing allusion to the achievements of after-times (xvi. 25, 26) relieves the impression caused by the number of Simon. But at his death the victory was already won — the life of Judaism had mastered the tyranny of Greece.

2. While the grandeur and unity of the subject invests the book with almost an epic beauty, it never loses the character of history. The earlier part of the narrative, including the exploits of Judas, is cast in a more poetic mould than any other part, except the brief eulogy of Simon (xiv. 4-15); but when the style is most poetical (i. 37- 40, ii. 7-13, 49-68, iii. 3-9, 18-22, iv. 8-11, 30-33, 38, vi. 10-13, vili. 37, 38, 41, 42) — and this poetical form is chiefly observable in the speeches — it seems to be true in spirit. The great marks of trustworthiness are everywhere conspicuous. Victory and failure and dependency are, on the whole, clearly indicated, and the author's method is a genuine attempt to bring into open display the working of Providence. In speaking of Antiochus Epiphanes (i. 10 f.) the writer betrays no unjust violence, while he marks in one expressive phrase (i. 10, μου διαμεμάχησε) the character of the Syrian type of Antichrist (cf. Is. xi. 10; Dan. xi. 36); and if no mention is made of the reckless profanity of Alexander Balas, it must be remembered that the treachery of a monarch to whom the book is under the dominion of Greece, and that alone fall within the scope of the history. So far as the circumstances admit, the general accuracy of the book is established by the evidence of other authorities; but for a considerable period it is the single source of our information. And, indeed, it has little need of external testimony to its worth. Its whole character bears adequate witness to its essential truthfulness; and neither — nor any other — judge expressed himself as not disbelieved, on internal grounds, to see it "reckoned among the books of Holy Scripture." (Nic. Buch . . . .

first eine gleiche Weise hait mit Reiden und Worten wie andere heilige Bücher und nicht unwürdig gewest wäre, hineinzurechen, wel es ein selig thing und mütlich Buch zu verstehen den
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Propheten Daniel im 11 Kapitel." Werke, von
Walch, xiv. 94, ap. Grimm, p. xxii.).

3. There are, however, some points in which the
writer appears to have been imperfectly informed,
especially in the history of foreign nations; and
some, again, in which he has been supposed to have
magnified the difficulties and successes of his coun-
trymen. Of the former class of objections two,
which turn upon the description given of the founda-
tion of the Greek kingdom of the East (1 Macc. i.
5-9), and of the power of Rome (viii. 1-10) deserve
notice from their intrinsic interest. After giving
a rapid survey of the exploits of Alexander—
the reading and interpretation of ver. 1 are too
uncertain to allow of objections based upon the
common text— the writer states that the king,
conscious of approaching death, divided his king-
don among his servants who had been brought up
with him from his youth (1 Macc. i. 6, δι&£λεν
αυτός τίνα βασιλιανα άυτού, έτι [σωτον αυτου],
...and after his death they all put on
crowns). Various rumors, it is known (Curt. x.
10), prevailed about a will of Alexander, which
decided the distribution of the provinces of his
kingdom, but this narrative is evidently a different
and independent tradition. It may rest upon some
former indication of the king's wishes, but then in
the absence of all corroborative evidence it can
only be accepted as a historic fact (Patriotis, De Cont.
Macc. pref. viii.), though it is a remarkable proof of
the desire which men felt to attribute the constitu-
tion of the Greek power to the immediate counsels of
its great founder. In this instance the author
has probably accepted without inquiry the opinion
of his countrymen; in the other it is distinctly said
that the account of the greatness of Rome was
brought to Judas by common report (1 Macc. viii.
1. 2, έκκοσεν ..., διήγησαν). The state-
ments made give a lively impression of the popular
estimation of the conquerors of the West, whose char-
acter and victories are described chiefly with open or
covet allusion to the Greek powers. The subju-
gation of the Galatians, who were the terror of the
neighboring people (Livy xxviii. 37), and the con-
quest of Spain, the Tarshish (comp. ver. 4) of
Philip, and the other events notably historically
natural from the immediate interest of the events;
but the wars with Carthage are wholly omitted
(Josephus adds these in his narrative, Ant. xii.
10, § 6). The errors in detail — as the capture of
Antiochus the Great by the Romans (ver. 7), the
numbers of his armament (ver. 6), the constitutions
of the Roman Senate (ver. 15), the one supreme
yearly officer at Rome (ver. 16; comp. xiv. 16) —
are only such as might be expected in oral accounts;
and the endurance (ver. 4, μακροσθαιμια), the good
faith (ver. 12), and the simplicity of the republic
(ver. 14, ούκ ἐπεθέτο οὐδες αυτών διάχαι μη
καὶ πειρεφάλλων πορφυρίες ὅστε διρυθνοίαν εν
αυτή, contrast i. 9), were features likely to arrest
the attention of Orientals. The very imperfection
of the writer's knowledge — for it seems likely
(ver. 11) that he remodels the rumors to suit his
own time — is instructive, as affording a glimpse of
the extent and manner in which the reputation of
the Romans in the scene of their future conquests.
Nor are the mistakes as to the condition of foreign
countries calculated to weaken the testimony of the
book to national history. They are perfectly consistent
with good faith in the nar-
mator: and even if there are inaccuracies in record-
ning the relative numbers of the Jewish and Syrian
forces (xi. 45-47, vii. 48), these need cause little
surprise, and may in some degree be due to errors
of transcription.4

4. Much has been written as to the sources from
which the narrative was derived, but there does not
seem to be evidence sufficient to indicate them with
any certainty. In one passage (ix. 22) the author
implied that written accounts of some of the actions
of Judas were in existence (τα περασα ..., οἱ
κατεγραφη:); and the pathetic character of the
first section of the book, due in a great measure to
the introduction of speeches, was probably bor-
rowed from the writings on which that part was
based. It appears, again, to be a reasonable con-
clusion from the mention of the official records of
the life of Hyrcanus (xvi. 24, ηάηηα γηγηαίγηα
επί βιβλίων ηηαιιαι άριχηρωτίθη αυτού), that
similar records existed at least for the high-priest-
hood of Simon. There is nothing certainly to
indicate that the writer designed to fill up any gap
in the history; and the notice of the change of
reclining which attended the elevation of Simon
(xii. 42) seems to suggest the existence of some
kind of public register. The constant appeal to
official documents is a further proof both of the
preservation of public records and of the sense of
importance of the history. Many documents are
inserted in the text of the history, but even when
they are described as "copies" (ἀντίγραφα,)
it is questionable whether the writer designed to
give more than the substance of the originals.
Some bear clear marks of authenticity (viii. 22-32,
xiv. 3-18), while others are open to grave diffi-
culties and suspicion: but it is worthy of notice
that the letters of the Syrian kings generally appear
to be genuine (x. 19-24, 25-45, xi. 30-37, xii. 30-44,
xiv. 2-24). What has been said will show the
extent to which the writer may have used written
authorities, but while the memory of the events
was still recent it is not possible that he should
have confined himself to them. If he was not himself
engaged in the war of independence, he must have
been familiar with those who were, and
their information would supplement and connect
the narratives which were already current, and
which in themselves naturally bore the stamp of the
isolated passages in the history. But whatever were the sources
of different parts of the book, and in whatever way
written, oral, and personal information was com-
bined in its structure, the writer made the materials
which he used truly his own; and the minute
exactness of the geographical details carries the
conviction that the whole finally rests upon the
evidence of eye-witnesses.

5. The language of the book does not present
any striking peculiarities. Both in diction and
structure it is generally simple and unadorned,
with a marked and yet not harsh Hebraistic character.
The number of peculiar words is not very con-
siderable, especially when compared with those
in 2 Macc. Some of these are late forms, as:
ψογέω (ψογώ), x. 5, 11, ἐξεδινώοις, i. 39;
ἡπολύσωμεν, xiv. 32: ἀπενενάθε, iv. 37: δειλάμα
iv. 8, 21, xvii. 6: ὁμορα. vii. 7, ix. 39, δὲ;
κοιμουμαι, ἀπεσενατοθεῖον, xii. 39: ἔχω
κειμαι. x. 70: or compounds, such as ἀπαραγειοτίον,
x. 55: ἐπιστορεύομαι, xiv. 44: διελθεσθαι.
vi. 15, 51: φονεκτομαι, x. 24. Other words are

4 The relation of the history of Josephus to that of
1 Macc. is carefully discussed by Grimm, Zeits.
Histw. Entw. § 9 (b).
used in new or strange senses, as ἀδιάφορος, viii. 14; παράδειγμα, xv. 32; διασταθή, vii. 7. Some phrases clearly express a semantic idiom (i. 48 διούσι κέρας τῷ ἀκρατ. vi. 23, x. 62, xii. 23), and the influence of the LXX. is continually perceptible (e. g. i. 54, ii. 63, vii. 17, ix. 23, xiv. 9); but in the main (comp. § 6) the Hebraisms which exist are such as might have been naturalized in the Lord-Greek of Palestine. Josephus undoubtedly made use of the Greek text (Jos. ii. 19, etc.); and apart from external evidence, this might have been supposed to be the original. But,

6. The testimony of antiquity leaves no doubt but that the book was first written in Hebrew. Origen, in his famous catalogue of the books of Scripture (ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25), after enumerating the contents of the O. T. according to the Hebrew canon, adds: "But without (i. e. excluded from the number of) these is the Maccabean history τα Macedonia, which is entitled κορινθίαντα, "of giving the names of the books of the O. T. he had subjoined the Hebrew to the Greek title in exactly the same manner, and there can be therefore no question but that he was acquainted with a Hebrew original for the Maccaebaei, as for the other books. The term Macedonian is, however, somewhat vague, though the analogy of the other parts of the list requires that it should be referred to one Greek, but the statement of Jerome is quite explicit: "The first book of the Maccabees," he says, "I found in Hebrew: the second is Greek, as can be shown in fact from its style alone" (Fest. Gall. ed Libr. Reg.). Admitting the evidence of these two fathers, who were alone able to speak with authority on a subject of Hebrew literature during the first four centuries, the fact of the Hebrew original of the book may be supported by several internal arguments which would be in themselves insufficient to establish it. Some of the Hebraisms are such as suggest rather than the immediate influence of a Hebrew text but the free adoption of a Hebrew idiom (i. 4, εὐγένετο εἰς φόρον; 18, ἠπόθανεν ὁ βασιλ. 21, δυο θύγαμος; 36, εἰς διάβολον πνεύματος. 58, ἐν πατρὶ μυρί και μυρίν, etc.; ii. 57, iii. 9, ἀπελευθεροῦν; iii. 2, v. 37, μετὰ τὰ βίαμα τίτων etc.), and difficulties in the Greek text are removed by a recurrence to the words which may be supposed to have been used in the original (i. 28, ἔτι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἥτα, ii. 26, ii. 8, iv. 13, xvi. 3). A question, however, might be raised whether the book was written in Biblical Hebrew, or in the later Aramaic (Chaldee); but it seems almost certain that the writer took the canonical histories as his model; and the use of the original text of Scripture by the learned class would preserve the Hebrew as a literary language which it had ceased to be the language of common life. But it is by no means unlikely (Grimm, L. c., § 4) that the Hebrew was corrupted by later idiom, as in the most recent books of the

O. T. It seems almost incredible that any one should have imagined that the worthless "Megilloth Antiochus," of which Bartolecit's Latin translation is printed by Fabricius (Col. Isceral. V. T. i. 1155-74), was the Hebrew original of which Origen and Jerome spoke. This tract, which occurs in some of the Jewish services for the Feast of Dedication (Fabricius, l. c.), is a perfectly unhistorical narrative of some of the incidents of the Macabean War, in which Judas the high-priest, and not Judah, plays by far the most conspicuous part. The order of events is so entirely disregarded in it that, after the death of Judah, Mattathias is represented as leading his other sons to the decisive victory which precedes the purification of the Temple.

7. The whole structure of 1 Macc. points to Palestine as the place of its composition. This fact itself is a strong proof for a Hebrew original, for there is no trace of a Greek Palestinian literature during the Hasmonean dynasty, though the wide use of the LXX. towards the close of the period, prepared the way for the apocryphal writings. But though the country of the writer can be thus fixed with certainty, there is considerable doubt as to his date. At the close of the book he mentions, in general terms, the acts of "Johannes Hyrcanus as written in the chronicles of his priesthood from the time that he was made high-priest after his father" (xvi. 23, 24). From this it has been concluded that he must have written after the death of Hyrcanus, n. c. 100; and the note in xiii. 30 τὰς ὑπαρχόντας τοιαύτας implies the lapse of a considerable time since the accession of Simon (n. c. 144). On the other hand, the omission of all mention of the close of the government of Hyrcanus, when the note of its commencement is given, may be urged as an argument for placing the book late in his long reign, but before his death. It cannot certainly have been composed long after his death; for it would have been almost impossible to write a history so full of simple faith and joyous triumph in the midst of the troubles which, early in the succeeding reign, threatened too distinctly the continuation of the state. Of the two limits, we may place the date of the original book between n. c. 120-100. The date and person of the Greek translator are wholly undetermined; but it is unlikely that such a book would remain long unknown or untranslated at Alexandria.

8. In a religious aspect the book is more remarkable negatively than positively. The historical instinct of the writer confines him to the bare recital of facts, and not even to the words of others which he records, it might seem that the true-ecumene aspect of national life had been lost. Not only does he relate no miracle, such as occur in 2 Macc., but he does not even refer the triumphant successes of the Jews to divine interposition. It is a characteristic of the same kind that he passes over without any clear notice the Maccabean hopes, which, as appears from the Psalms of Solomon and
the Book of Enoch, were raised to the highest pitch by the successful struggle for independence. Yet he preserves faint traces of the national belief. He mentions the time from which "a prophet was not seen among them" (I Mcx. ix. 27, αὐτὸς ἀπόκεφαλεῖ προφήτης) as a marked epoch: and twice he anticipates the future coming of a prophet as of one who should make a direct revelation of the will of God to the people (iv. 45, ἀληθεία τῶν παραγωγικῶν προφήτων τοῦ αποκαλύφθαι περὶ πιστῶν), and super sede the temporary arrangements of a merely civil dynasty (xiv. 41, τῶν εἰσι Χιασσα ἡγομένων καὶ ἀρχιερεῖ εἰς τῶν αἰωνῶν ἦσαν ἡ ἀναπτύσσεσα προφήτης πιστῶν). But the hope or belief occupies no prominent place in the book; and, like the book of Esther, its greatest merit is, that it is throughout inspired by the faith to which it gives no definite expression, and shows, in deed rather than in word, both the action of Providence and a sustaining trust in his power.

9. The book does not seek to have been much used in early times. It offered far less for rhetorical purposes than the second book; and the history itself lay beyond the ordinary limits of Christian study. Fertilelll alludes generally to the conduct of the Maccabees was "mero.

10. The books of the Maccabees were not included by Jerome in his translation of the Bible. "The first book," he says, "is found in Hebrew" (Prod. Gall. in Resp.), but he takes no notice of the Latin version, and certainly did not revise it. The version of the two books which has been incorporated in the Roman Vulgate was consequently derived from the old Latin, current before Jerome's time. This version was obviously made from the Greek, and the main goal is closely. Besides the common text, Sabatier has published a version of a consderable part of the first book (ch. i.-xiv. 1) from a very ancient Paris MS. (S. Germ. 15) (enwos salio nonpentorin, in 1541), which exhibits an earlier form of the text. Grimm, strangely misquoting Sabatier (Eebez. Hundl. § 10), inverts the relation of the two versions; but a comparison of the two, even for a few verses, can leave no doubt but that the St. Germain MS. represents the most ancient text, following the Greek words and idioms with a slavish fidelity (Sabatier, p. 1014, "Quaenadmodum antem etiam unum invenire possit MSS. codices qui Psalmos ante omnes Hieronymi correctionem exhibent, ita pariter inventus est a nobis codex qui libri primi Maccihaeorum pariet continet majorem, minime quidem correctum, sed quilibet in omnibus MSS. antiquis reperiesatur"). Mai (Spicil. Rom. ix. App. 10) has published a fragment of another Latin translation (ch. ii. 49-64), which differs widely from both texts. The Syriac version given in the Polyglotts is, like the Latin, a close rendering of the Greek. From the rendering of the proper names, it has been supposed that the translator lived while the Semitic forms were still current (Grimm, Einl. § 10); but the arguments which have been urged to show that the Syriac was derived directly from the Hebrew original are of no weight against the overwhelming proof of the influence of the Greek text.

11. Of the early commentaries on the first two books of Maccabees, the most important are Drusius and Grotius, whose notes are reprinted in the Critici Sacri. The annotations of Calmet (Commentaire literal, etc., Paris, 1734) and Michaelis (Ueber den ersten Band. B. mit Anmerk., Leipzig, 1778), are of permanent interest; but for practical use the manual of Grimm (Kurzgefasste exeg. Handb. zu den Apokryphen, etc., Leipzig, 1854 §57) supplies everything which the student can require.

The Second Book of Maccabees. — 1. The history of the Second Book of the Maccabees begins some years earlier than that of the First Book, and closes with the victory of Judas Maccabees over Nicanor. It thus embraces a period of twenty years, from B. C. 180 (?) to B. C. 161. For the few events noticed during the earlier years, it is the chief authority: during the remainder of the time the narrative goes over the same ground as I Macc., but with very considerable differences.

The first two chapters are taken up by two letters supposed to be addressed by the Palestinian to the Alexandrian community, and by a sketch of the author's plan, which proceeds with the narrative from the close of the second letter. The main narrative occupies the remainder of the book. This presents several natural divisions, which appear to coincide with the five books" of Jason on which it was based. The first (xii. i.) contains the history of Heliodorus, as illustrating the fortunes of the Temple before the schism and apostasy of part of the nation (cir. B. C. 180). The second (iv.—xvii.) gives varied details of the beginning and course of the great persecution — the murder of Onias, the crimes of Menelaus, the martyrdom of Eleazar, and of the mother with her seven sons (B. C. 157—167). The third (viii.—x. 9) follows the fortunes of Judas to the triumphant restoration of the Temple service (B. C. 165, 164). The fourth (x. 10—to) includes the reign of Antiochus Eupator (B. C. 164—192) and the fifth (xiv.—xx.) records the treachery of Alexander, the death of Nicanor, and the beginning of the long success of Judas (B. C. 162, 161). Each of these divisions is closed by a phrase which seems to mark the end of a definite subject (iii. 40, vii. 42, x. 9, xii. 36, xiv. 37); and they correspond in fact with distinct stages in the national struggle.

2. The relation of the letters with which the book opens to the substance of the book is extremely obscure. The first (i. 1-9) is a solemn invitation to the Egyptian Jews to celebrate "the feast of tabernacles in the month Caslu" (i.e. the Feast of the Dedication, i. 9), as before they had sympathized with their brethren in Judea in "the extremity of their trouble" (i. 7). The second (i. 10—ii. 18, according to the received division), which bears a formal salutation from "the council and Judas" to "Aristobulus . . . and the Jews in Egypt," is a strange, rambling collection of legendary stories of the death of "Antiochus," of the preservation of the sacred fire and its recovery by Nehemiah, of the hiding of the vessels of the sanctuary by Jeremiah, ending — if indeed the letter can be said to have any end — with the same exhortation to observe the Feast of Dedication (ii. 10—18).

For it is impossible to point out any break in the construction or style after ver. 18, so that the writer passes insensibly from the epistolary form in ver. 16 to that of the epistologist in ver. 29 (Soaca). I or this
Jason probably extended no farther than the epitome, for the description of its contents (2 Mac. ii. 19-22) does not carry us beyond the close of 2 Mac. The "brethren" of Judas, whose exploits he related, were already distinguished during the lifetime of "the Maccabees" (1 Mac. v. 17 ff., 21 ff. vi. 42-45; 2 Mac. viii. 22-29).

4. The Maccabean period of Cyrenae was most closely united with that of Alexandria. In both, the predominance of Greek literature and the Greek language was absolute. The work of Jason — like the poems of Callimachus — must therefore have been composed in Greek; and the style of the epitome, as Jerome remarked, proves beyond doubt that the Greek text is the original (Proef. Gill. = Scholia [Machabaeorum] Greeks est; quod ex ipsa quaque fabulae probat potius). It is scarcely less certain that 2 Mac. was compiled at Alexandria. The characteristics of the style and language are essentially Alexandrine; and though the Alexandrine style may have prevailed in Cyrenaica, the form of the allusion to Jason shows clearly that the compiler was not his fellow-countryman. But all attempts to determine more exactly who the compiler was are mere groundless guesses, without even plausible evidence of physical identity.

5. The style of the book is extremely uneven. At times it is elaborately ornate (iii. 15-29, v. 20, vi. 12-16, 23-28, vii. etc.); and again, it is so rude and broken, as to seem more like notes for an epitome than a finished composition (xii. 19-25); but it nowhere attains to the simple energy and pathos of the first book. The vocabulary corresponds to the style. It abounds in new or unusual words. Many of these forms which belong to the decay of a language, as: ἀλλοφυλεῖα, iv. 13, vi. 24; ἐλαλεῖμαι, iv. 13 (ἐλαλεῖμαι, iii. 9); ἐπαναταχθὲς, vii. 35; ἐρασκόμενος, vii. 9; ἐπικοινωνία, vi. 7, 21, vii. 42; or compounds which betray a false pursuit of emphasis or precision: διεπιστημόνω, iv. 9; ἑπεταλείπτης, xiv. 18; κατευθυνόμενος, xiv. 43; προσωπαλετηθέν, xv. 19; προσωποτριβηθέν, xix. 9; συνεκοπηθέν, x. 26.

Other words are employed in novel senses, as: διευρυτολογία, xii. 22; εἰκοσικελείπθης, ii. 24; εἰσαχαντισμός, xiv. 9; περιφερεύοντος, xi. 8; ψυχικός, iv. 35, vi. 24. Others bear a sense which is common in late Greek, as: ἀλλοκοτία, xiv. 8; ἀναλογία, ix. 2, xii. 2; διαλογία, iii. 32; ἐπειρεῖα, ix. 4; φωνησόιμα, vii. 31; περιπεβάλλει, vi. 4. Others appear to be peculiar to this book, as: διεπηρείζω, xii. 25; διεπεπιθέτω, v. 29; προσποιηθεῖς, x. 11; πολεμομακροπαθος, x. 14, 15; ἐπικεφαλεύω, vii. 27, 31; ἐπικεφαλεύω, vi. 28; δομίζω, viii. 35; ἀνυδρολογία, xii. 44. Hebraisms are very rare (vii. 15, ix. 5, xiv. 24). Idiomatic Greek phrases are much more common (iv. 40, xii. 22, xv. 12, &c.): and the writer evidently had a considerable command over the Greek language, though his taste was deformed by a love of rhetorical effect.

6. In the absence of all evidence as to the person of Jason — for the conjecture of Herzfeld (§ 3) is wholly unsupported by proof — there are no data which fix the time of the composition of his original work, or of the epitome given in 2 Mac., within very narrow limits. The superior limit of the age of the epitome, though not of Jason's work is determined by the year 121 B.C., which is too e

---

a The subscriptio in Cod. Al. c. is Βαρθολομαω προετοιμαζων εκπεμπτων.

tioned in one of the introductory letters (i. 10); but there is no ground for assigning so great an antiquity to the present book. It has, indeed, been concluded from xv. 57, ἂν ἔλεγεν τῶν καιρῶν κρατήρεις τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐβραίων — which is written in the person of the epimelon, that it was written in the last days of the life and death of Judas; but the import of the words appears to be satisfied by the religious supremacy and the uninterrupted celebration of the Temple service, which the Jews maintained till the final ruin of their city; for the destruction of Jerusalem is the only inferior limit, below which the book cannot be placed. The supposed reference to the book in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xi. 55, “and others were tortured”) comp. vi. 18—20; it may perhaps be rather a reference to the current tradition than to the written text; and Josephus in his history shows no acquaintance with its contents.

On the other hand, it is probable that the author of 2 Macc. used either 1 Macc, or the work of Jason; but this at most could only determine that the book was written before the destruction of Jeru-

salem, which is already clear from xv. 57. There is no explicit mention of the book before the time of Clement of Alexandria (Strum. v. 14, § 98).

Internal evidence is quite insufficient to settle the date, which is thus left undetermined within the limits 124 b. c. — 70 a. C. If a conjecture be ad-

missible, I should be inclined to place the original work of Jason not later than 100 B. C., and the epistle half a century later. It is quite credible that a work might have been long current at Alexandria before it was known to the Jews of Palestine.

7. In order to estimate the historical worth of the book it is necessary to consider separately the two divisions into which it falls. The narrative in iii.—vii. is in part anterior (iii.—iv. 6) and in part (iv. 7—vii.) supplementary to the brief summary in 1 Macc. i. 10—64: that in vii.—xv. is, as a whole, parallel with 1 Macc. iii.—vii.

In the first section the book itself is, in the main, the sole source of information: in the second, its contents can be tested by the trustworthy records of the first book. It will be best to take the second section first, for the character of the book does not vary much; and if this can once be determined from sufficient evidence, the result may be extended to those parts which are independent of other testimony. The chief differences between the first and second books lie in the account of the campaigns of Lysias and Timotheus.

Differences of detail will always arise where the sources of information are partial and separate; but the differences alleged to exist as to these events are more serious. In 1 Macc. iv. 24—35 we read of an invasion of Judaea by Lysias from the side of Idumea, in which Judas met him at Bethsura and inflicted upon him a severe defeat. In consequence of this Lysias retired to Antioch to make greater preparations for a new attack, while Judas undertook the restoration of the sanctuary. In 2 Macc. the first mention of Lysias is on the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes (v. 11). Not long after this he is said to have invaded Judaea and suffered a defeat at Bethsura, in consequence of which he made peace with Judas, giving him favorable terms (xi.). A later invasion is mentioned in both books, which took place in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. vi. 17—50; 2 Macc. viii. 2 ff.), in which Bethsura fell into the hands of Lysias. It is then necessary either to suppose that there were three distinct invasions, of which the first is mentioned only in 1 Macc., the second only in 2 Macc., and the third in both; or to con-

sider the narrative in 2 Macc. x. 1 ff. as a mis-

placed version of one of the other invasions (for the history in 1 Macc. iv. 29—61 bears every mark of truth and the position which is occupied by the character of the details, and the difficulty of recon-

ciling the supposed results with the events which immediately followed. It is by no means equally clear that there is any mistake in 2 Macc. as to the history of Timotheus. The details in 1 Macc. v. 11 ff. are quite reconcilable with those in 2 Macc. xii. 2 ff., and it seems certain that both books record the same events; but there is no sufficient reason for supposing that 1 Macc. v. 6 ff. is parallel with 2 Macc. x. 24—37. The similarity of the names Jason and Gazar probably gave rise to the confusion of the two events, which differ in fact in almost all their circumstances; though the identifi-

cation of the Timotheus mentioned in 2 Macc. x. 24, with the one mentioned in vii. 30, seems to have been determined to distinguish him from some other of the same name. With these exceptions, the general outlines of the history in the two books are the same; but the details are almost always independent and different. The numbers given in 2 Macc. often represent incredible results: c. g. viii. 29, 30: x. 23, 31; xi. 11; xii. 16, 19, 23, 26, 23; xv. 27. Some of the statements are obviously incorrect, and seem to have arisen from an erroneous interpretation and embellishment of the original source: vii. 5 (the presence of Antiocbus at the death of the Jewish martyrs); ix. (the death of Antiocbus in 257 b. c. by his father-in-law, etc.); vi. (the relation of Antiocbus the Younger to Lysias); xv. 31, 35 (the recovery of Acre); xiv. 7 (the forces of Demetrius). But on the other hand many of the peculiar details seem to be such as must have been derived from immediate testimony: ix. 29—50 (the intrigues of Menelaus); vi. 2 (the temple at Gerizim); x. 12, 13; xiv. 1 (the landing of Demetrius at Tripolis); viii. 1—7 (the character of the first exploits of Judas). The relations between the two books must be incom-

parably represented by that existing between the books of Kings and Chronicles. In each case the later book was composed with a special design, which regulated the character of the materials employed for its construction. But as the design in 2 Macc. is openly avowed by the compiler, so it seems to have been carried out with considerable license. Yet his errors appear to be those of one who interprets history to support his cause, rather than of one who falsifies its substance. The groundwork of facts is true, but the dress in which the facts are presented is due in part at least to the narrator. It is not at all improbable that the error with regard to the first campaign of Lysias arose from the mode in which it was introduced by Jason as an introduction to the more important measures of Lysias in the reign of Antiocbus Epiphanes. In other places (as very obviously in xii. 19 ff.) the compiler may have disregarded the historical de-

pendence of events while selecting those which were best suited for the support of his theme. If these remarks are true, it follows that 2 Macc. viii.—xv. is to be regarded not as a connected and complete history, but as a series of special incidents from the life of Judas, illustrating the provential interference of God in behalf of his people, true in substance, but embellished in form; and this view of the book is supported by the character of the
earlier chapters, in which the narrative is un-
checked by independent evidence. There is not
any ground for questioning the main facts in
the history of Heliodorus (ch. iii.) or Meneelas (iv.); and while it is very probable that the narratives of the sufferings of the martyrs (vi., vii.) are highly
colored, yet the grounds of the accusation, the
forms of torture, in their essential characteristics, seem perfectly
authentic.  

8. Besides the differences which exist between
the two books of Maccabees as to the sequence and
details of common events, there is considerable
difficulty as to the chronological data which they
give.  

All follow that the Seleucid era is the era of
contracts; " "of the Greek kingdom" ; 1 Macc. i.
, in brief ...  and in some cases in which the two books give the date of
the same event, the first book gives a date one year
later than the second (1 Macc. vi. 16 | 2 Macc. xi.
21, 34; 1 Macc. vi. 20 | 2 Macc. xiii. 11); yet on
the other hand they agree in 1 Macc. vii. 1 | 2
Macc. iv. 4. This discrepancy seems to be due
to a mere error, but to a difference of reckon-
ing for all attempts to explain away the discrepancy
are untimely. The true era of the Seleucidae
began in October (Bris) n. c. 312; but there is
evidence that considerable variations existed in
Syria in the reckoning by it. It is then
reasonable to suppose that the discrepancies in the books of
Maccabees, which proceeded from independent and
widely-separated sources, are to be referred to this
confusion; and a very probable mode of explaining
(at least in part) the origin of the difference has
been supported by most of the learned chroniclers.

Though the Jews may have reckoned two begin-
nings to the year from the time of the Exilus
[Chronology, vol. i. p. 436], yet it appears that
the Biblical dates are always reckoned by the
so-called ecclesiastical year, which began with Nisan
(April), and not by the civil year, which was after-
wards in common use (Jos. Ant. i. 3, § 3), which
began with Tisri (October; comp. Patriarchus, De
Cons. Macc. p. 33 ff.). Now since the writer of 1
Macc. was a Palestinian Jew, and followed the
ecclesiastical year in his reckoning of months (1
Macc. iv. 52), it is probable that he may have con-
menced the Seleucid year not in autumn (Tisri),
but in spring (Nisan).  

The narrative of 1 Macc.
x. in fact demands a longer period than could be
obtained (1 Macc. x. 1, 21, fourteen days) on the
hypothesis that the year began with Tisri. If,
however, the year began in Nisan (reckoning from
spring 312 n. c.); the events which fell in the last
month of the true Seleucid year would be dated a
year forward, while the true and the Jewish dates
would agree in the first half of the year. Nor is
there any difficulty in supposing that the two events
assigned to different years (Wernsrold, De Fide
Macc. § 9) happened in one half of the year. On

a The following is the parallelism which Patriarchus
(De cons. vers. lib. Macr. 175-246) endeavors to estab-
lish between the common narratives of i. and ii. Macc.
When two or more passages are placed opposite to one,
the first only has a parallel in the other narrative; —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Macc.</th>
<th>2 Macc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 11-10.</td>
<td>... iv. 7-12; 13-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 17.</td>
<td>... iv. 23a; 21; 59-50; v. 1-44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 18-20.</td>
<td>... v. 5-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 21-24a.</td>
<td>... v. 11-16; 17-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 24b.</td>
<td>... v. 21; 22-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 30-32; 33-39.</td>
<td>... v. 24-25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 49b; 49c-42.</td>
<td>... v. 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 63; 64.</td>
<td>... v. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 65-67.</td>
<td>... v. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 1-30.</td>
<td>... v. 3-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 31; 32-37.</td>
<td>... v. 8-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 38.</td>
<td>... v. 10; 12-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 59-70.</td>
<td>... v. 16-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 1-9; 19-37.</td>
<td>... v. 22-26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 38; 39; 40, 41.</td>
<td>... v. 27-30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 42.</td>
<td>... v. 31-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 43-54.</td>
<td>... v. 35-42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 55; 56-60.</td>
<td>... v. 43-44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 1-12.</td>
<td>... v. 45-57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 13-16; 17-22.</td>
<td>... v. 57-68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 23-25.</td>
<td>... v. 68-69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 1; iv. 25, 27.</td>
<td>... vi. 70-72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 28-31.</td>
<td>... vi. 73-76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 35-43a; 43b-45.</td>
<td>... vi. 77-80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 47-61.</td>
<td>... vi. 81-91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 6-9.</td>
<td>... vi. 92-98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 1-1.</td>
<td>... x. 1-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 5-8.</td>
<td>... x. 11-14; 19-22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 24-34.</td>
<td>... x. 23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This arrangement, however, is that of an apologist for the books; and the succession of passages, no less
than the large amount of passages peculiar to each
book, indicates how little real parallelism there is between them.

b In 2 Macc. xv. 36 the same reckoning of months
occurs, but with a distinct reference to the Palestinian
decree.

c It is, however, possible that the years may have
been dated from the following spring (311 n. c.); in
which case the Jewish and true years would coincide
for the last half of the year, and during the first half
the Jewish date would fall six short by one year (Hebr. 
(Gr. d. Volk) i. 41)).
... grounds, indeed, it is not unlikely that the difference in the reckoning of the two books is still greater than is thus accounted for. The Chaldaeans, as is proved by good authority (Pol. Met. cpi. ap. Clinton, II. ii. 111, 350, 370), dated their Seleucid era one year later than the true from 311 c. c., and probably from October (Dios. com. c. v. 21) from the beginning of the year. If, therefore, the writer of 2 Macc. — or rather Jason of Cyrene, whom he epitomized — used the Chaldaean dates, there may be a maximum difference between the two books of a year and half, which is sufficient to explain the difficulties of the chronology of the events connected with the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (Heclus, i. 531-534, quoted and supported by Browne. Osio Schol. 439, 490. Comp. Clinton, P. R. H. iii. 377 ff., who takes a different view; Patritius, l. c.; and Wernsfurth, § xx. ff., who states the difficulties with great acuteness).

9. The most interesting feature in 2 Macc. is its marked religious character, by which it is clearly distinguished from the first book. "The manifestations (ἐμφάνια) made from heaven on behalf of those who were zealous to manifold in defense of Judaism." (v. Macc. ii. 21) form the subject of the book. The events which are related historically in the former book are in this regarded theologically, if the word may be used. The calamities of persecution and the desolation of God's people are definitely referred to a temporary visitation of his anger (v. 17-20, vii. 12-17, vii. 32, 33), which shows itself even in details of the war (xii. 40; comp. Jos. vii. Before his great victory Judas is represented as addressing his god that "wrought two wonders" (σημαραγμον), thus, once his angels slew the host of the Assyrians, so then he would "send a good angel before his armies for a fear and dread to their enemies" (xx. 22-23; comp. 1 Macc. vii. 41, 42). A great "manifestation" wrought the punishment of Helioborus (iii. 24-21): a similar vision announced his cure (iii. 32, 31). Heavenly portents for forty days (σημαραγμον, v. 4) foreshadowed the coming judgment (v. 2). When three strong five comely men upon horses appear, of whom two cover Maccabeus from all danger (x. 23, 30). Again, in answer to the supplication of the Jews for a "good angel to deliver them," there appeared before them on horseback one in white clothing, and "they marched forward" to triumph, "having an helper from heaven" (vi. 6-11). And there no special vision is recorded, the rest of the enemy is still referred to "a manifestation of Him that seeth all things" (xii. 22). Closely connected with this belief in the active energy of the beings of the unseen world, is the importance assigned to dreams (xv. 11, άνευρου αξιοπιστου άπα: and the distinct assertion, not only of a personal "resurrection to life" (vi. 14, ανάστασις είς ζωήν; v. 9, ανάστασις ζωής), but of the influence which the living may yet exercise on the condition of the dead (xii. 44-45). The doctrine of Providence is carried out in a most minute parallelism of great crimes and their punishment. Thus, Andronicus was put to death on the very spot where he murdered Onias (iv. 38, του Κυπρου την άξιαν ύπερ ολοκληρως ανάστατον): Jason, who had "driven many out of their country," died an exile, without "solemn funeral," as he had "cast out many assembled" (v. 9, 10): the torments suffered by Antiochus are likened to those which he had inflicted (ix. 5, 6); Menelaus, who "had committees many sins about the altar," received his death in ashes" (xiii. 4-8): the hand and tongue of Nicaon, with which he had blasphemed, were hung up "as an evident and manifest sign unto all of the help of the Lord" (xv. 32-43). On a larger scale the same idea is presented in the contrasted martyrdoms of the two Valerius, and their vindication by the Divine Power. The former is "God's people," "God's portion" (v εις, l. 26; xiv. 15), who are cherished in love: the latter are left unpunished till the full measure of their sins ends in destruction (vi. 12-17). For in this book, as in I Macc., there are no traces of the glorious visions of the prophets, who foresaw the time when all nations should be united in one bond under one Lord.

10. The history of the book, as has been already noticed (§ 6), is extremely obscure. It is first mentioned by Clemens of Alexandria (L. c.); and Origen, in a Greek fragment of his commentaries on Exodus (Philoc. 26), quotes vi. 12-16, with very considerable variations of text, from "the Maccabean history" (τά Μακαβαίας: comp. I Macc. § 6). At a later time the history of the martyred brothers was a favorite subject with Christian writers (Cyp. Ep. iv. 6, &c.): and in the time of Jerome (Frg. Guliel.) and Augustine (D. Doct. Chri. ii. 8: De Cir. Dei, viii. 36) the book was in common and public use in the Western Church, where it maintained its position till it was at last definitely declared to be canonical at the council of Trent. [Canon, vol. i. p. 333.]

11. The Latin version adopted in the Vulgate, as in the case of the first book, is that current before the death of Jerome, who left wholly untaught in the apocryphal books, with the exception of Judith and Tobit. The St. German MS. from which Salatier edited an earlier text of 1 Macc., does not, unfortunately, contain the second book, being imperfect at the end; but the quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari (Salatier, ad Cyp. vi. 7) and a fragment published by Mai (Spicil. Rom. l. c. I Macc. § 10) indicate the existence and character of such an extant. The version is much less close to the Greek than in the former book and often gives no more than the sense of a clause (i. 13, vi. 21, vi. 5, &c.). The Syriac version is of still less value. The Arabic so-called version of 2 Macc. is really an independent work. [Fifth Book of Maccabees.]

12. The chief commentaries on 2 Macc. have been already noticed. [First Book of Maccabees, § 11.] The special edition of Hase (Jena, 1784) seems, from the account of Grimm, to be of no value. There are, however, many valuable historical observations in the essay of Patriicus (De Commen., etc. already cited).

III. The Third Book of the Maccabees contains the history of events which preceded the great Maccabean struggle. After the decisive battle of Raphia (v. c. 217), envays from Jerusalem, following the example of other cities, hastened to Ptolemy Philopator to congratulate him on his success. After receiving them the king resolved to visit the holy city. He offered sacrifice in the Temple, and was so much struck by its majesty that he urgently sought permission to enter the sanctuary. When this was refused he resolved to gratify his curiosity by force, regardless of the consequence with which his design was received (ch. 1.). On this Simon the high-priest, after the people had been with difficulty restrained from
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... the king fell paralyzed into the arms of his attendants, and on his recovery returned at once to Egypt without prosecuting his intention. But angry at his failure he turned his vengeance on the Alexandrine Jews. Hitherto these had enjoyed the highest rights of citizenship, but the king commanded that those only who were voluntarily initiated into the heathen mysteries should be on an equal footing with the Alexandrians, and that the remainder should be enrolled in the lowest class (אֶל פֶּסְאָל יַעֲשָׂה נֶאֶשׁ לְגִבְּרֹת מִשְׁרַת אֶלֶּה, ii. 28), and branded with an ivy-leaf (ch. ii.). [endencies.] Not content with this order, which was evaded or despised, he commanded all the Jews in the country to be arrested and sent to Alexandria (ch. iii.). This was done as well as might be, though the greater part escaped (iv. 18), and the gathered multitudes were confined in the Hippodrome outside the city (comp. Joseph. Ant. xvii. 6, § 5). The resident Jews, who showed sympathy for their countrymen, were imprisoned with them: and the king ordered the names of all to be taken down preparatory to their execution. Here the first marvel happened: the series to whom the task was assigned totaled for forty days from morning till evening, and at last remained but one set. The king's plan was defeated (ch. iv.). However, regardless of this, the king ordered the keeper of his elephants to drive the animals, five hundred in number, with wine and incense, that they might trample the prisoners to death on the morrow. The Jews had no help but in prayer; and here a second marvel happened. The king was overpowered by a deep sleep, and when he awoke the next day it was already time for the banquet which he had ordered to be prepared, so that the execution was deferred. The Jews still prayed for help; but when the dawn came, the multitudes were assembled to witness their destruction, and the elephants stood ready for their bloody work. There was then another marvel. The king was visited by deep forgetfulness, and called the keeper of the elephants for the preparations which he had made, and the Jews were to be trampled with the beasts. But at the evening banquet the king recalled his purpose, and with terrible threats prepared for its immediate accomplishment at daybreak (ch. v.). Then Eleazar, an aged priest, prayed for his people, and as he ended the royal train came to the Hippodrome. On this there was seen a heavenly vision by all but the Jews (vi. 18). The elephants trampled down their attendants, and the wrath of the king was turned to pity. So the Jews were immediately set free, and a great feast was prepared for them; and they resolved to observe a festival, in memory of their deliverance, during the time of their sojourn in strange lands (ch. vi.). A royal letter to the governors of the provinces set forth the circumstances of their escape, and assured them of the king's protection. Permission was given to them to take vengeance on their renegade countrymen, and papers were returned to their homes in great triumph, crowned with flowers, and singing praises to the God of their fathers."

2. The form of the narrative, even in this bold outline, sufficiently shows that the object of the book has modified the facts which it records. The writer, in his zeal to bring out the action of Providence, has colored his history, so that it has lost all scabcndence of truth. In this respect the book offers an instructive contrast to the book of Esther, with which it is closely connected both in its purpose and in the general character of its incidents. In both a terrible calamity is averted by faithful prayer; royal anger is changed to royal favor; and the punishment devised for the innocent is directed to the guilty. But here the likeness ends. The divine service which is the peculiar object of the book of Esther, is exchanged in 3 Macc. for rhetorical exaggeration; and once again the words of inspiration stand emblazoned by the presence of their later counterpart.

3. But while it is impossible to accept the details of the book as historical, some basis of truth must be supposed to lie beneath them. The yearly festival (vi. 36; vii. 19) can hardly have been a mere fancy of the writer; and the pillar and synagogue (πρωτεύχη) at Potemus (vii. 20) must have been connected in some way with a signal deliverance. Besides this, Josephus (c. Ap. ii. 5) relates a very similar occurrence which took place in the reign of Ptolemy VII. (Philus)." "The king," as he says, "exasperated by the opposition which Onias, the Jewish general of the royal army, made to his usurpation, scolded all the Jews in Alexandria with a terrible threatening, and exposed them to intoxicated elephants. But the animals turned upon the king's friends; and forthwith the king saw a terrible visage which forced him to injure the Jews. On this he yielded to the prayers of his mistress, and repented of his attempt; and the Alexandrine Jews observed the day of their deliverance as a festal day." The essential points of the story are the same as those in the second part of 3 Macc., and there can be but little doubt that Josephus has preserved the events which the writer adapted to his narrative. If it be true that Ptolemy Philopator attempted to enter the Temple at Jerusalem, and was frustrated in his design—a supposition which is open to no reasonable objection—it is easily conceivable that tradition may have assigned to him the impious design of his successor; or the writer which is the peculiar object of the book have combined the two events for the sake of effect.

4. Assuming rightly that the book is an adaptation of history, Ewald and (at greater length) Grimm have endeavored to fix exactly the circumstances by which it was called forth. The writings of Philo, occasioned by the oppressions which the Alexandrine Jews suffered in the reign of Caligula, offer several points of connection with it; and the point which was occasioned at Jerusalem by the attempt of the emperor to erect his statue in the Temple is well known, Joseph. Ant. xviii. 8, § 2). It is then argued that the writer designed to portray Caligula under the name of the sensual tyrant who had in earlier times held Egypt and Syria, while he sought to nerve his countrymen for their struggle with heathen power, by reminding them of the events of early days. While this is not necessary, it seems necessary to restrict the various details in which the parallel between the acts of Caligula and the narrative fail. Such differences may have been part of the writer's disguise; but it may be well questioned whether the position of the Jews in the early time of the empire, or under the later Ptolemies, was not generally such persecuting civil power would, perhaps, always present the same general features.
that a narrative like 3 Macc. would find a ready audience.

The language of the book betrays most clearly its Alexandrine origin. Both in vocabulary and construction it is rich, affected, and exaggerated. Some words occur nowhere else (αλογορία, ii. 28; προστάτευσαι, ii. 21; ἐφάρμοσ, vi. 20; χαρτία, iv. 29; βουθρεία, vi. 8; Ψυχοκενταρίον, v. 23; μετάφορά, vi. 9; πυότομα, vi. 4; μεγαλοκατάρτα, vi. 2; μυροβρυχία, iv. 6; πρωικαιπορικοποιηθείς, i. 1; απενεργηθέντως, i. 20); others are used in strange senses (λειτουργία, Met. iii. 22; παραδεισάγητον, vi. 24; αποτροπή, iv. 9). The form of the sentences is strained (e. g. i. 15, 17, ii. 31, ii. 23, iv. 11, vii. 17, 10, 46), and every description is loaded with metaphorical ornament (e. g. iv. 2, 5; vii. 45). As a natural consequence the meaning is often obscure (e. g. i. 9, 14, 19, iv. 3, 14), and the writer is led into exaggerations which are historically incorrect (vii. 2, 23; vi. 2; comp. Grimm).

6. From the abruptness of the commencement (δὲ δὲν Φιλόσωπος) it has been thought (Ewald, Geschichte, iv. 515) that the book is a mere fragment of a larger work. Against this view it may be urged that the tenor of the book is one and distinct, and brought to a perfect issue. It must, however, be noticed that in some MSS. (44, 125, Parsons) the beginning is differently worded: "Now in these days king Ptolemy;" and the reference in ii. 25 (τῶν πρωικαιπορικοποιών) is to some passage not contained in the present narrative. It is possible that the narrative may have formed the sequel to an earlier history, as the Υἱοθετέων continues, without break or repetition, the history of Thucydides (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Νεώ. Ηλλ. i. 1); or we may suppose (Grimm, Einl. § 4) that the introductory chapter has been lost.

7. The evidence of language, which is quite sufficient to fix the place of the composition of the book at Alexandria, is not equally decisive as to the date. It might, indeed, seem to belong to the early period of the empire (n. c. 40-70), when for a Jew all hope lay in the record of past triumphs, which assumed a fabulous grandeur from the contrast with present oppression. But such a date is purely conjectural: and in the absence of any direct proof it is unsafe to trust to an impression which cannot claim any decisive authority, from the very imperfect knowledge which we possess of the religious history of the dispersion. If, however, Ewald's theory be correct, the date falls within the limits which have been suggested.

8. The uncertainty of the date of the composition of the book corresponds with the uncertainty of its history. In the Apostolical Canons (Canon 85) " three books of the Maccabees " are mentioned (Μακαδαίων τρία, one MS. reads δέ), of which this is the third. But the third, the third, occupies the third place in the oldest Greek MSS. which contain also the so-called fourth book. It is found in a Syriac translation, and is quoted with marked respect by Theodoret (vol. Dm. xi. 7) of Antioch (died eir. D. 457). " Three books of the Maccabees " (Μακαδαίων γάρ) are placed at the head of the Bibliotheca of the 1. v. in the catalogue of Nicephorus; and in the Synopsis, falsely ascribed to Athanasius, the third book is apparently described as " Πολεμαία, " from the name of the royal hero, and reckoned doubtfully among the disputed books. On the other hand the book seems to have found no acceptance in the Alexandrine or Western churches, a fact which confirms the late date assigned to the Alexandrine narrative. It is not quoted, as far as we know, in any Latin writer, and does not occur in the lists of canonical and apocryphal books in the Galician Decretals.

No ancient Latin version of it occurs: and as it is not contained in the Vulgate it has been excluded from the canon of the Roman church.

9. In its modern form it has been translated into Latin (first in the Complutensian Polyglott); German (Dr. Wetzel and August, Biblical and Church History, 1st ed.; and in an earlier version "by Jo. Ciremberger, Wittenberg, 1554;" Cotton, Five Books, etc., p. xx); and French (Calmet). The first English version was appended to "A brief and compendious table... opening the way to the principal histories of the whole Bible... London, 1550." This version with a few alterations (Cotton, p. xx) was included in a folio Bible published the next year by J. Day; and the book was again published in 1563. A better translation was published by Whiston in his Authentic Documents (1727); and a new version, with short notes by Dr. Cotton (The Five Books of Maccabees in English... Oxford, 1821). The Commentary of Grimm (Kurze... Handbuch) gives ample notices of the opinions of earlier commentators, and supersedes the necessity of using any other.

IV. THE FOURTH BOOK OF MACCABEES (Μακαδαίων δ', εἰς Μακαδαίων λόγος) contains a rhetorical narrative of the martyrdom of Eleazar and of the "Maccabean family," following in the main the same outline as 2 Macc. The second title of the book, On the Supreme Sovereignty of Reason (περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογίσμον), explains the moral use which is made of the history. The author of the introduction assumes the Alexandrine manner of reason and the character of its supremacy, which he then illustrates by examples taken from Jewish history (§§ 1-3, Hudson). Then turning to his principal proof of the triumphant power of reason, he gives a short summary of the causes which led to the persecution of Antiochus (§ 4), and in the remainder of the book describes at length the death of Eleazar (§§ 5-7), of the seven brethren (8-14), and of their mother (15-22). The author would enforce the lesson which he would teach by the words of the martyrs and the reflections which spring from them. The last section (20) is evidently by another hand.

2. The book was ascribed in early times to Josephus. Eusebius (H. E. III. 10, πεποίηται δὲ καὶ Δαλό οἰκεῖ άγαθον σπουδασμα τῷ ανδρὶ e. μ. Ιωάννου — περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογίσμον, δ τρεῖς Μακαδαίων οικογένειας), and Jerome, following him (De Vir. ill. 12), "Alius quoque libri ejus, qui inscribatur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογίσμον vallab
6. The original Greek is the only ancient text in which the book has been published, but a Syrian version is said to be preserved in MS. at Milan (Grinn, Eisd. § 7). In recent times the work has hardly received so much attention as it deserves. The first and only complete commentary is that of Grinn, (Exeg. Handbuch), which errs only by extreme elaborateness. An English translation has been published by Dr. Cotton (The Fire Books of Maccabees, Oxf. 1832). The text is given in the best form by Bekker in his edition of Josephus (Lips. 1856-60).

7. Though it is certain that our present book is that which old writers described, Sixtus Sensus (Rik. Senes, p. 57, ed. 1575) gives a very interesting account of another fourth book of Maccabees, which he saw in a library at Lyons, which was afterwards burnt. It was in Greek, and contained the history of John Hyrcanus, continuing the narrative directly after the close of the first book. Sixtus quotes the first words: καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτηθῆναι τῶν Σίμωνος ἡγεμόνος ὑπὸ ἀστικὴς ἀρχῆς ἅπαντα ἀραβικαῖς ἀραβικά, but this is the only fragment which remains.

8. The history, he says, was nearly the same as that in Jos. xiii., though the style was very different from his, abounding in Hebrew idioms. The testimony is so exact and explicit, that we can see no reason for questioning its accuracy, and still less for supposing (withGainet) that Sixtus saw only the so-called fifth book, which is at present preserved in Arabic.

V. The Fifth Book of Maccabees just mentioned may call for a very brief notice. It is printed in Arabic in the Paris and London Polyglots, and contains a history of the Jews from the attempt of Helioborus to the birth of our Lord. The writer made use of the first two books of Maccabees and of Josephus, and has no claim to be considered an independent authority. His own knowledge was very imperfect, and he perpetuates the statements which he derives from others. He must have lived after the fall of Jerusalem, and probably out of Palestine, though the translation bears very clear traces of foreign authorship so that it has been supposed that the book was originally written in Hebrew, or at least that the tikkew was strongly modified by Hebrew influence. The book has been published in English by Dr. Cotton (Fire Books, etc.).

* MACCABEBUS, more correctly MACCAEBUS (Μακκαβαῖος; Maccabæus) occurs repeatedly in 1 and 2 Macc. as the surname of Judas the son of Matthias (1 Macc. ii. 4, iii. 1, v. 24, viii. 20; 2 Macc. ii. 19, v. 27, vii. 1, iv. 6), but more frequently alone, as the rendering of ὁ Μακκαβαῖος, "the Maccabee" (2 Macc. viii. 5, 16, x. 19, 21, 25, 39, 33, 35, xi. 6, 7, 15, xii. 19, 20, xxxi. 24, xxv. 27, 39, xx. 7, 21), Judas, however, being always referred to. In 2 Macc. x. 1 the article is omitted, and so in 1 Macc. x. 34 in the Roman edition (but Alex. δ. Mæcæbeus). On the name and family see the art. Maccabees.

A. MACEDONIA (Μακεδονία), the first part of Europe which received the Gospel directly from St. Paul, and an important scene of his subsequent missionary labors and the labors of his companions. So closely is this region associated with apostolic journeys, sufferings, and epistles, that it has truly been called by one of our English travellers a kind of Holy Land (Clarke's Travels, ch. xi.). For details see NEAROS, PHILIPPA, AMMIDON.
Macedonia

ATOLLONIA, THESSALONICA, and BEREA. We confine ourselves here to explaining the geographical and political import of the term "Macedonia" as employed in the New Testament, with some allusion to its earlier use in the Apocrypha, and one or two general remarks on St. Paul's journeys through the district, and the churches which he founded there. In a rough and popular description it is enough to say that Macedonia is the region bounded inland by the range of Haemus or the Balkan northwards, and the chain of Pindus westwards, beyond which the streams flow respectively to the Haliacmon and the Adriatic; that it is separated from Thessaly on the south by the Cambodian hills, running easterly from Pindus to Olympus and the Egean; and that it is divided on the east from Thrace by a less definite mountain-boundary running southwards from Haemus. Of the space thus enclosed, two of the most remarkable physical features are two great plains, one watered by the Axios, which comes to the sea at the Thermaic gulf, not far from Thessalonica; the other by the Strymon, which, after passing near Philippi, flows out below Amphipolis. Between the months of these two rivers a remarkable peninsula projects, dividing itself into three points, on the farthest of which Mount Athos rises nearly into the region of perpetual snow. Across the neck of this peninsula St. Paul travelled more than once with his companions Demas and Titus. This general sketch would sufficiently describe the Macedonia which was ruled over by Philip and Alexander, and which the Romans conquered from Perseus. At first the conquered country was divided by Emilius Paulus into four districts, Macedonia Prima was on the east of the Strymon, and had Amphipolis for the capital. Macedonia Secunda stretched between the Strymon and the Axios, with Thessalonica for its metropolis. The third and fourth districts lay to the south and the west. This division was only temporary. The whole of Macedonia, along with Thessaly and a large tract along the Adriatic, was made one province and centralised under the jurisdiction of a procurator, who resided at Thessalonica. We have now reached the definition which corresponds with the usage of the term in the N. T. (Acts xvi. 9, 10, 12, xx. 23), employed in the N. T., with some allusion to its earlier use in the Apocrypha, and in xxv. 1-2, xxvi. 2, xxi. 2, xvii. 3, xxvii. 1, 3, xxviii. 7, Rom. xxvii. 1; I Cor. viii. 5; 2 Cor. xliii. 5; vii. 2, viii. 1, 2, 4, vi. 9; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Thess. i. 7, 8, iv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 3). Three Roman provinces, all very familiar to us in the writings of St. Paul, divided the whole space between the basins of the Danube and Cape Matapan. The border-town of ILLYRICUM was Lissus on the Adriatic. The boundary-line of ACHIA nearly coincided, except in the western portion with that of the kingdom of modern Greece, and ran in an irregular line from the Acrocorinian promontory to the Bay of Thermopylae and the north of Euboea. By subtracting these two provinces, we define Macedonia. The history of Macedonia in the period between the Persian wars and the consolidation of the Roman provinces in the Levant is touched in a very interesting manner by passages in the Apocrypha. In Esdras iv. 10, the country is described as Macedon, and in xiv. 14 he is said to have contrived his plot for the purpose of transferring the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. This sufficiently betrays the late date and spurious character of these apocryphal chapters: but it is curious thus to have our attention turned to the early struggle of Persia and Greece. Macedonia played a great part in this struggle, and there is little doubt that Alexander is Nereus. The history of the Macedonians opens with vivid allusions to Alexander the son of Philip, the Macedonian king ("ΑΛέξανδρος ὁ τῶν Φιλαδέλφων ντός Ἡλλάδος ἡ Μακεδόνα"); who came out of the land of Chettim and smote Da- rius king of the Persians and Medes (1 Maced. i. 1), and who reigned first among the Grecians (ib. vi. 2). A little later we have the Roman conquest of Persia ("king of the Cithare") recorded (ib. viii. 5). Subsequently in these Jewish annals we find that Macedonians were used for the soldiers of the Seleucid successors of Alexander (2 Mace. vii. 20). In what is called the Fifth Book of Maccabees this usage of the word is very frequent, and is applied not only to the Seleucid princes at Antioch, but to the Ptolemies at Alexandria (see Cotton's Five Books of Maccabees, Oxford, 1832). It is evident that the words "Macedonia" and "Macedonian" were fearfully familiar to the Jew- ish mind; and this gives a new significance to the vision by which St. Paul was invited at Troas to the country of Philip and Alexander.

Nothing can exceed the interesting and impressive nature of the occasion (Acts xvi. 9) when a new and religious meaning was given to the well-known ἄνωπλος Μακεδονίας of Demosthenes (Phil. i. p. 43) and when this part of Europe was designated as the first to be trod by an Apostle. The account of St. Paul's first journey through Macedonia (Acts xvi. 10-xvii. 15) is marked by copious detail and well-defined incidents. At the close of this journey he returned from Corinth to Syria by sea. On the next occasion of visiting Europe, though he both went and returned through Macedonia (Acts xx. 1-6), the narrative is a very slight sketch, and the route is left uncertain, except as regards Philippi. Many years elapsed before St. Paul visited this province again; but from 1 Tim. i. 3 it is evident that he did accomplish the wish expressed during his first imprisonment. (Phil. ii. 24.)

The character of the Macedonian Christians is set before us in Scripture in a very favorable light. The canons of the Bishops are highly commended (Acts xvii. 11); the Thessalonians were evidently objects of St. Paul's peculiar affection (1 Thess. ii 17-20, iii. 10); and the Philippians, besides their devotedness to him and his work, were remarkable for their liberality and self-sacrifice. (Phil. iv. 10, 14-19; see 2 Cor. ix. 2, 10. It is worth noticing, as a fact almost typical of the change which Christianity has produced in the social life of Europe, that the female element is conspicuous in the records of its introduction into Macedonia. The Gospel was first preached there to a small congregation of women (Acts xvi. 13); the first convert was a woman (ib. ver. 14); and, at least at Philippi, women were prominent as active workers in the cause of religion (Phil. iv. 2, 3).

It should be observed that, in St. Paul's time, Macedonia was well intersected by Roman roads, especially by the great Via Egnatia, which connected Philippi and Thessalonica, and also led towards Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19). The antiquities of the country have been described and described by many travellers. The two best works are those of Cousinèr (Voyage dans la Macedoine, Paris, 1831) and Leake (Travels in Northern Greece, London, 1835).

* It is still a question whether Luke's usage distinguishes Macedonia and Thrace from each other or regards them as one. This depends on
part on the interpretation of the controverted ΜΑΧΑΡΙΟΣ (Macedonian) polis (Acts xvi. 12). Bettej (Querdenker Philippus) maintains that Thrace was not attached to Macedonia till the time of Vespasian, and that Luke, consistently with that fact, speaks of Philippis as the first city in Macedonia which Paul reached after crossing from Asia into Europe. Hence Neapolis (Kavodit), where he landed, belonged to Thrace and not to Macedonia, as was true at a later period. On one side see Lachter's Der Apostelgeschichte, p. 231 f. (Dr. Schaeffer's translation in Lange's Commentary, p. 304), and on the other, Meyer's Apostelgeschichte, p. 202 f. (1854). There is another supposition. Instead of speaking of Philippis as topographically "first" in Macedonia, because Luke meant to assign Neapolis to Thrace, he may have thought of the city and its harbor as one, whether this distinction of provinces existed at that time or not. That Luke was familiar with this identification of town and port is manifest for in Acts xvi. 11, he says that Paul and his companions sailed to Philippis (εφυλακτονεαμας), whereas they went thither by land from Neapolis, and in Acts xx. 6, that they sailed from Philippis (περαπλεομενοι), whereas they went down to the coast, and embarked at Neapolis.

Other references.—Forbes' Handbuch der alten Geog., iii. 1843-1871. Hoffmann, Griechenland u. die Griechen, i. 1-132. Paulus, Real-Encyklopädie, iv. 1132-1142. Holland, Travels in the Ionian Isles, Albanius, Theology, Macdonitha, etc. (1812 and 1813). Pourveuge, Voyage dans la Grece (1820). Recueil Archéologique (1860), two brief articles entitled Acteon, Neapolis, les mines de Philippe. Two numbers have appeared (1865) of the Mission Archéologique de Macédoine, by MM. Henne and Dammet (published by order of the French emperor). They relate chiefly to Kavodit, the ancient Neapolis, but contain also a map of Philippis and the neighborhood. See also A Journey to Neapolis and Philippi in the Bibl. Sacra, xviii. 866-888; and the article "Macedonien" in Herzog's Real-Encyk. viii. 663-638.

Coin of Macedonia.

MACEDONIAN (Μακεδος; [Macedo]) occurs in A. V. only in Acts xxii. 2. In the other cases (Acts xvi. 9, xix. 29, 2 Cor. ix. 2, 4), our translators render it "of Macedonia.

* "Macedonian" occurs also several times in the A. V. in the Apocrypha, namely, 1 Macc. i. 1, vi. 2; 2 Macc. viii. 29; Esth. xvi. 10, 14. For the wide sense in which it is used in 2 Macc. viii.

10, see the note of Grima in loc., and the remarks in the art. MACEDONIA, p. 1727 b. A.

* MACHERUS (Μαχαριος) is the name of the castle in which, according to Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5, § 2; B. J. vii. 6, §§ 1-4), John the Baptist was imprisoned and put to death by Herod Antipas. (See Matt. xiv. 3-5.) In 1860 Setzer identified the place with the ruins of the present Makher, east of the Dead Sea, on a lofty crag overlooking the southern Zulek-Moun. See Reise, ii. 374 f. It was originally a tower built by Alexander Jannaeus as a check on the Arab freebooters in that quarter. It is surrounded by ravines, at some points not less than 175 feet deep, and in addition to its natural strength, was strongly fortified. In Herod's time it was rendered still more attractive by its splendid porticos and reservoirs, and is known to have been a favorite retreat of this luxurious prince. Pliny speaks of it as "seconda quondam arx Judææ ab Hierosolymis" (Nat. Hist. v. 15). It has been said that Macherus, though transferred from one occupant to another, was never actually reduced by siege or taken by storm. Its supplies of water are almost unfailing. After the destruction of Jerusalem it fell into the hands of the Securit, a band of outlaws of whom we read in Acts xii. 38.

The Evangelists state that John was cast into prison, but do not mention where the prison was situated, or where the feast was held at which the order was given for his execution. As nothing in their narrative, however, contradicts that view, we may conclude that Josephus was well informed, and that John was incarcerated and beheaded in Macherus (Tiberias). His confinement was not so strict as to exclude the visits of friends (Matt. xi. 2 ff.; Luke vii. 18); and hence it was from this castle, in all probability, that he sent two of his disciples to Christ to inquire of him whether he was the Messiah, or they should look for another (Luke vii. 20). Into one of the deep ravines beneath the fortress the headless body of John (το πτωμα αιτω, Mark vi. 29) may have been cast, which his disciples took up and buried, and then went and told Jesus (Matt. xiv. 12; Mark vi. 29). It was from this castle that the Arab wife of Herod, repudiated by him for the sake of Herodias, fled to her father, Antes king of Arabia, out of which grew the war between Herod and Aretas, which culminated in the defeat of Herod (Ant. xviii. 5-1), and the capture of Damascus (alluded to in 2 Cor. xii. 32). The crag on which the old fortress stood is said to be visible from Jerusalem. (See Jerusalem, ii. 1278, note.) It was a saying of the Jews that the torches on Olicet announcing the appearance of the Passover moon could be seen from Tabor and the rocky heights of Macherus (Schwartz, Das heil. Land, p. 54).

The history of Macherus is well sketched by Gaus (Johannes der Tanner im Gegenstand, pt 50-82). For other notices, mainly historical or topographical, see Just's Geschichte der Juden, ii. 221 ff.; Sepp's Das Leben Christi, ii. 400-414, and Das heil. Land, i. 678; Milman's History of the

him, and not on the Evangelists. Some time elapsed between the flight and Herod's war with Aretas (which was before John's death), and during the interval Herod may in some way have become master of the fortress. John need not however be supposed to have been kept all the time in one place.
That the tribe was divided, and that only the inferior families crossed the Jordan. So great was their power that the name of Machir occasionally supersedes that of Manasseh, not only for the eastern territory, but even for the western half of the tribe also; see Judges 11, where Machir occurs in the enumeration of the western tribes — "Gilgal" apparently standing for the eastern Manasseh in verse 17; and still more unmistakably in Joshua 21, compared with 29.

2. The son of Ammiel, a powerful shekh of one of the trans-Jordanic tribes, but whether of Manasseh — the tribe of his namesake — or of Gad, must remain uncertain till we know where Lo-debar, to which place he belonged, was situated. His name occurs but twice, but the part which he played was by no means an insignificant one. It was his fortune to render essential service to the cause of Saul and of David successively — in each case when they were in difficulty. Under his roof, when a cripple and friendless, after the death of his uncle and the ruin of his house, the unfortunate Mephibosheth found a home, from which he was summoned by David to the throne, and at the anxious solicitation of a resident at the court of Jerusalem (2 Samuel ix. 4, 5). When David himself, some years later, was driven from his throne to Mahanaim, Machir was one of the three great chiefs who lavished on the exiled king and his soldiers the wealth of the rich pastoral district of which they were the lords — "wheat, and barley, and flour, and parched corn, and beans, and lentiles, and parched pulse, and honey, and butter, and sheep, and cows' milk cheese" (2 Samuel xvii. 27—29). Josephus calls him the chief of the country of Gilead (Ant. vii. 9, § 8).

MACHIRITES, THE (הָאָמִית [str.]): & Mophri; [Vat. Alex. o Mophri: Machirites].

The descendants of Machir the father of Gilead (Num. xxvi. 29).

MACHMAS (Mophus: Machmum), 1 Macc. iv. 73. [MACHMASH].

MACHNAD'EBAI [3 syl.] (מַחְנַדְבוֹא] of the noble, Fürst; what like the liberal? Ges.]:

Mophabbi: Alex. o Mophabbi: Machnebebi; one of the sons of Baal who put away his foreign wife and burnt her image (Ezra x. 40). The marginal reading of A. V. is "Mehunadib", which is found in some copies. In the corresponding list of 1 Esdr. ix. 34 the place of this name is occupied by "of the sons of Ozora," which may be partly traced in the original.

MACHPELHAY (always with the article — בַּמֵּרְפֶלָה [the portion, lot]: to διαρροή, also το εύπαπλον το διαρροή: duplex, also speluncus duplex), the spot containing the timbered field, in the end of which was the cave which Abraham purchased from the Bene-Heth [sons of Heth],

stratagem by which the Phenician Diko obtained land enough for her city of Byrsa. "Ibrahim asked only as much ground as could be covered with a cow's hide; but after the agreement was concluded he cut the hide into pieces, and surrounded the whole of the new property with the same."

The story is remarkable, not only for its repetition of the older Semitic tale, but for its complete departure from the simple and open character of Abraham, as set forth in the Biblical narrative. A similar story is told of other places, but, like Byrsa, their names contain something suggestive of the hide. The writer has not been able.

a The Targum characteristically says "circumcised."

b There are several considerations which may lead us to doubt whether we are warranted by the Biblical narrative in attributing a personal sense to the name of Gilead, such as the very remote period from which that name as attached to the district dates (Gen. xxxix.), and also such passages as Num. xxxii. 39, and Deut. xi. 35. (See Ewald, Gehb. ii. 477, 478, 493.)

c The story of the purchase current amongst the modern Arabs of Hebron, as told by Wilson (Lett. &c., i. 311, is a counterpart of the legend of the
and which became the burial-place of Sarah, Abraham himself, Isaac, Rebekah, Leah, and Jacob. Abraham resided at Bethel, Hebron and Gerar, but the field which contained his tomb was the only spot which positively belonged to him in the Land of Promise. That the name applied to the general locality, and not to either the field or the cavern, is evident from Gen. xxiii. 17, "the field of Ephron which was in Machpelah . . . the field and the cave which was therein," although for convenience of expression both field and cave are occasionally called by the name. Its position is — with one exception uniformly — specified as "having 7Μ 7Μ<sup>ο</sup> Monre" (Gen. xxiii. 17, 19, xxv. 9, xlix. 30, I. 13). What the meaning of this ancient name — not met with beyond the book of Genesis — may be, appears quite uncertain. The older interpreters, the LXX., Vulgate, Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-jonathan, Peshito, Veneto-Greek, etc., explain it as meaning a double—the double cave or the double field — but the modern lexicographers interpret it, either by comparison with the

MACHPELAH

the Horon, or sacred precinct in which the sepulchres themselves are reported, and probably with truth, still to lie — and which is the only part at present accessible to Christians — is a monument certainly equal, and probably superior in age to anything remaining in Palestine. It is a quadrangular building of about 290 feet in length by 113 in width, its dark gray walls rising 50 or 60 in height, without window or opening of any description, except two small entrances at the S. E. and S. W. corners. It stands nearly on the crest of the hill which forms the eastern side of the valley on the slope and bottom of which the town is strung, and it is remarkable how this venerable structure, quite affecting in its heavy gray color and the archaic forms of its masonry, thus rising above the meaner buildings which it has so often beheld in ruins, dignifies, and so to speak accentuates, the

Mosque at Hebron.

MACHPELAH

the Horon, or sacred precinct in which the sepulchres themselves are reported, and probably with truth, still to lie — and which is the only part at present accessible to Christians — is a monument certainly equal, and probably superior in age to anything remaining in Palestine. It is a quadrangular building of about 290 feet in length by 113 in width, its dark gray walls rising 50 or 60 in height, without window or opening of any description, except two small entrances at the S. E. and S. W. corners. It stands nearly on the crest of the hill which forms the eastern side of the valley on the slope and bottom of which the town is strung, and it is remarkable how this venerable structure, quite affecting in its heavy gray color and the archaic forms of its masonry, thus rising above the meaner buildings which it has so often beheld in ruins, dignifies, and so to speak accentuates, the

to trace any connection of this kind in any of the names of Machpelah or Hebron.

the Horon, or sacred precinct in which the sepulchres themselves are reported, and probably with truth, still to lie — and which is the only part at present accessible to Christians — is a monument certainly equal, and probably superior in age to anything remaining in Palestine. It is a quadrangular building of about 290 feet in length by 113 in width, its dark gray walls rising 50 or 60 in height, without window or opening of any description, except two small entrances at the S. E. and S. W. corners. It stands nearly on the crest of the hill which forms the eastern side of the valley on the slope and bottom of which the town is strung, and it is remarkable how this venerable structure, quite affecting in its heavy gray color and the archaic forms of its masonry, thus rising above the meaner buildings which it has so often beheld in ruins, dignifies, and so to speak accentuates, the

The LXX. invariably attach the name to the cave: see xviii. 19, ει τη σπηλαια του άραν τη διπαλον. This is followed by Jerome.

This text is a discussion about the name and location of the field of Machpelah, which is associated with the patriarchs of the Bible and the site of Abraham's burial. The text explores the meaning of the name, its usage in ancient manuscripts, and its significance in the context of the Bible. It also describes the physical characteristics of the site, including its ancient architecture and its role as a sacred place for centuries. The text references specific passages from the Bible and other ancient manuscripts to support its claims and provides a detailed description of the site at Hebron.
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general monopoly of the town of Hebron. The ancient Jewish tradition ascribes its erection to David (Tichon ha-Abod in Hottinger, Cypel Heb. p. 30), thus making it coeval with the pool in the valley below; but, whatever the worth of this tradition, it may well be of the age of Solomon, for the masonry is even more antique in its character than that of the lower portion of the south and southwestern walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, and which many critics ascribe to Solomon, while even the severest allows it to be of the date of Herod. The date must always remain a mystery, but there are two considerations which may weigh in favor of fixing it very early. 1. That often as the town of Hebron may have been destroyed, this, being a tomb, would always be spared. 2. It cannot on architectural grounds be later than Herod's time, while on the other hand it is omitted from the catalogue given by Josephus of the places which he rebuilt or adorned. Had Herod erected the inclosure round the tombs of the fathers of the nation, it is hardly conceivable that Josephus would have omitted to extol it, especially when he mentions apparently the very structure now existing. His words on this occasion are “the monuments (μνημεία) of Abraham and his sons are still to be seen in the town, all of fine stone and admirably wrought” (Johann von der Schulenburg, Kil., iv. 9, § 7).

Of the contents of this inclosure we have only the most meagre and confused accounts. The spot is one of the most sacred of the Moslem sanctuaries, and since the occupation of Palestine by them it has been entirely closed to Christians, and partially so to Jews, who are allowed, on rare occasions only, to look in through a hole. A great part of the area is occupied by a building which is now a mosque, and was probably originally a church, but of its date or style nothing is known. The sepulchres of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah, are shown on the floor of the mosque, covered in the usual Mohammedan style with rich carpets; but the real sepulchres are, as they were in the 12th and 16th centuries, in a cave beneath the floor (Leyb. d'Abd el-Monon, p. 180). If you give them the semblance of a tomb of Aaron on Mount Hor. (See p. 1087.) The cave, according to the earliest and the latest testimony, opens to the south. This was the report of Monro's servant in 1833; and Arcul particularly mentions the fact that the bodies lay with their heads to the north, as they would do if deposited from the south. A belief seems to prevail in the town that the cave communicates with some one of the modern sepulchres at a considerable distance, outside of Hebron (Locae, in Zeitschrift des Judenh. June 1, 1839).

The accounts of the sacred inclosure at Hebron will be found collected by Ritter (Erkldrude Pal., edition, 219, &c., but especially 219-250); Wilson (Lands, etc., i. 363-367); Robinson (Bibl. Des. ii. 75-79). The chief authorities are Archi (A. D. 700); Benjamin of Tudela (A. D. cir. 1170); the Jewish tract Jichus ha-Abod (in Hottinger, Cypel Hebrei); and also in Wilson, i. 365; Ali Bey (Travels, A. D. 1807, ii. 232, 233); Giovanni Finati (Life by Bankes, ii. 236); Monro (Summer Remble in 1835, i. 243); Locae (in Zeitschrift des Judenh. 1839, pp. 272, 285). In a note by Asher to his edition of Benjamin of Tudela (ii. 52), mention is made of an Arabic MS. in the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris, containing an account of the condition of the mosque under Saladin. This MS. has not yet been published. The travels of Ibrahim el-Khijari in 1669-70—a small portion of which from the MS. in the Ducal Library at Goa, has been published by Tuch, with Translation, etc. (Leipzig, Vogel, 1830)—are said to contain a minute description of the Mosque (Tuch, p. 2).

A few words about the exterior, a sketch of the masonry, and a view of the town, showing the inclosure standing prominently in the foreground, will be found in Bartlett's Visits, etc., 216-219. A photograph of the exterior, from the East (?) is given as No. 63 of Palestine as it is, by Rev. G. W. Bridges. A ground-plan exhibiting considerable detail, made by two Moslem architects who lately superintended some repairs in the Haram, and given by them to Dr. Horner of Jerusalem, is engraved in Oskon's Pol. Post and Present, p. 364.

* It is since the above article was written that this Moslem sanctuary over the cave of Machpeleh was visited and entered by the Prince of Wales and some of his attendants. We are indebted to Dean Stanley, who accompanied the party on that occasion for an interesting report of this visit (Somea in to the East, etc., p. 141 ff.) of which we make the following abstract:—

To overcome the difficulties which the fanaticism of the inhabitants of Hebron might place in the way of even a royal approach to the inclosure, a Firman was first requested from the Porte. But the government at Constantinople cautiously gave them only a discretionary letter of recommendation to the Governor of Jerusalem. It was necessary therefore to obtain the sanction of this intermediate functionary. This was not easily done. The Turkish governor not only had his own scruples with reference to such a profanation of the sacred place, but feared the personal consequences which he might suffer from the bigotry of the Mohammedans. After a refusal at first and much hesitation he consented, as an act of national courtesy, that the Prince should make the attempt to enter the Mosque (to guarantee his safety was out of the question), but unaccompanied either by two or three of his suite who were specially interested as savans and antiquaries.

The day of the arrival at Hebron was the 7th of April, 1862. They passed into and through the town strongly escorted, through streets deserted of Jerusalem; the sunken part round the edges (absurdly called the "bevel") very shallow, with no resemblance at all to more modern "rustic work." (3) The cross-joints are not always vertical, but some are at an angle. (4) The wall is divided by pilaster about 22 ft. in. wide, and 5 ft. apart, running the whole height of the ancient wall. It is very much to be wished that careful large photographs were taken of these walls from a near point. The writer is not aware that any such ye'ar exist.
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except by the soldiery, whose presence was necessary to guard against any fanatical attempt to avenge the supposed sacrilegious act. Arriving within the enclosure, they were ceremoniously received by the representatives of the four hereditary guardians of the Mosque, into which they were immediately shown. The architecture of this plainly indicates its original use as a Christian church. The tombs, or rather cenotaphs which cover the actual sepulchres of the patriarchs, are inclosed each within a separate shrine closed with gates. On the right of the inner portico before entering the main building, is the shrine of Abraham, and on the left that of Sarah, each closed with silver gates. The shrine of Abraham, after some manifestations of dehoy and of grief on the part of the guardians, was thrash open. It is described as a coiff-like structure, about six feet high, built of plastered stone or marble, and hung with three green carpets embroidered with gold. The shrine of Sarah, as of the rest of the women, they were requested not to enter. Within the mosque are the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah, under separate chapels with windows in the walls, and inclosed with iron instead of silver gates. The shrines of Jacob and Leah in recesses corresponding to those of Abraham and Sarah, but opposite to the entrance of the mosque, are in a separate cloister inclosed with iron gates, through which may be seen two green banners resting against Leah's tomb, the meaning of which is unknown. The general structure of Jacob's tomb resembles that of Abraham, but the carpets are coarser.

The correspondence of these monuments with the Biblical narrative is remarkable, in view of Moslem ignorance and prejudice, and precludes the idea of a fanciful distribution of them. For, in the first place, the prominence given to Isaac is contrary to their prejudice in favor of Ishmael; and again, if they had followed mere probabilities, Rachel would have occupied the place of the less favored Leah.

Besides these six shrines, in a separate chamber reached by an aperture through the wall, is the shrine of Joseph, the situation of which varies from the Biblical account, but is in accordance with the tradition of the country, supported perhaps by an alleged tradition of Joseph himself. The effect that the body of Joseph, though first buried at Shechem, was afterwards brought to Hebron. There are also two ornamental shrines on the northern side of the mosque. But no traces of others were seen within the inclosure.

To the cave itself there was no access. One indication of it in the shape of a circular hole at the corner of the shrine of Abraham, about eight inches across, one of the upper part built of strong masonry, but the lower part of the living rock, was alone visible. This aperture has been left in order to allow the sacred air of the sepulchre to escape into the Mosque, and also to allow a lamp to be suspended by a chain and burn over the grave. Even this lamp was not lighted because, as they said, the saint did not like to have a lamp in his daylight." Whether the Moslems themselves are acquainted with any other entrance is doubtful.

The reader will find the same information also in Stanley's *Jerusalem* (Cres, i. Appendix ii. pp. 552 ff. A plan of the mosque accompanies the narrative. On the purchase of the cave of Machpehah, see *Ephraim* (Anmer. ed.). Of the antiquity of the site, says Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 385, "1 have no doubt."") We have the human remains of the identical cave, in which these patriarchs, with their wives, were reverently gathered "unto their people," one after another by their children. . . . Such a cave may last as long as the 'everlasting hills' of which it is a part; and from that to this day it has so come to pass, in the providence of God, that no nation or people has had possession of Machpehah who would have been disposed to disturb the ashes of the illustrious dead within it."

MACRON (Machair: Moser, the surname of Pourvoune, or Pollone, the son of Deymenes (1 Macc. iii. 38) and governor of Cyprus under Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc. x. 12).)

MADAI (2 syl. (מַדָּי Mada'i; Alex. Māḏān Ḫaθairi; Madai), which occurs in Gen. x. 2 (and 1 Chr. i. 5) among the list of the sons of Japhet, has been commonly regarded as a personal appellation: and most commentators call Madai the third son of Japhet, and the progenitor of the Medes. But it is extremely doubtful whether, in the mind of the writer of Gen. x., the term Madai was regarded as representing a person. That the genealogies in the chapter are to some extent ethnic is universally allowed, and may be seen even in our Authorized Version (ver. 16-18). And as Gezer, Megg. Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, which are conjoined in Gen. x. 2 with Madai, are elsewhere in Scripture always ethnic and not personal appellatives (Ex. xxvii. 13, xxxvii. 6, xxxix. 6; Dan. viii. 21; Joel iii. 6; Ps. cxv. 5; Is. lxvii. 19, &c.), so it is probable that they stand for nations rather than persons here. In that case no one would regard Madai as a person; and we must remember that it is the exact word used elsewhere throughout Scripture for the well-known nation of the Medes. Probably therefore all that the writer intends to assert in Gen. x. 2 is, that the Medes, as well as the Gomerites, Greeks, T uberai, Moschi, etc., descended from Japhet. Modern science has found that, both in physical type and in language, the Medes are to be regarded as the family of the Gimir of the Assyrians, which embraces the Cymri and the Greco-Romans. (See Pritchard's *Phys. Hist. of Mankind*, iv. 6-50; Ch. x. § 24-1; and comp. the article on the Medes.)

G. R.

MADIAN (Madi: Madioun; Alex. Isaou Madioun; [Ab]. Madioun). The sons of Madian, according to 1 Esdr. v. 59, were among the Levites who superintended at the restoration of the Temple under Zorobabel. The name does not occur in the para. narrative of Ezr. iii. 9, and is also omitted in the Vulgate; nor is it easy to conjecture the origin of the interpolation. Our translators followed the reading of the Alیدine edition.


MADMANNAH (מַדָּם מַדָּם: Madama; [Ab]. Madiam; Rom. Macada). This place, Madam, was the residence of the Amalekites, as was Madia (Judg. xiv. 5, 33), and is named closely the ordinary LXX. text: compare also MADMANNAH.
with Hornah, Zhikad, and other remote places, and therefore cannot be identical with the Madmanah of Isaiah. To Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon, * Medeian），it appears to have been well known. It was called in their time “Madmenah” and was not far from Gaza. The first stage southward from Gaza is now el-Minya (Rob. i. 692), which, in default of a better, is suggested by Kiepert (in his *Top., 1856) as the modern representative of Menoils, and therefore of Madmanah.

In the genealogical lists of 1 Chron., Madmanah is derived from Calh-ben-Hezron through his grandson Menahah, whose son Shuaah is recorded as the founder of the town (ii. 49).

For the termination compare the neighboring place Sansannah.

G.

MAD' MEN (מָדִמֶנָה) [dunghill]: a niu'esi, a place in Moab, threatened with destruction in the denunciations of Jeremiah (xlvii. 2), but not otherwise known, of which nothing is yet known.

G.

MADmenah (מָדִמֶנָה) [as above].

MAD'Nエン: Medeena, one of the Benjamite villages north of Jerusalem, the inhabitants of which were frightened away by the approach of Sennacherib along the northern road (Is. x. 31). Like others of the places mentioned in this list, Madmenah is not elsewhere named; for to MADMANAH and MADMEN it can have no relation. Gesenius (Jesuvi, p. 414) points out that the verb in the sentence is active — "Madmenah dies;" not, as in A. V., "is removed" (so also Michaelis, Bibel fur Ungelernten).

Madmenah is not improperly alluded to by Isaiah (xxv. 10) in his denunciation of Moab, where the word rendered in A. V. "dunghill" is identical with that name. The original text (or Cethib), by a variation in the preposition (בַּע and בַּע), reads the "waters of Madmenah." If this is so, the reference may be either to the Madmenah of Benjamin — one of the towns in a district abounding with corn and threshing-floors — or more appropriately still to MADMEN, the Moabite town. Gesenius (Jesuvi, p. 789) appears to have overlooked this. It was in this way that the name was probably derived, and in the favor of this suggestion there seems to have been first made by John Kitcheh.

G.

The places on the march of Sennacherib to Jerusalem have usually been supposed to occur in a direct line; on this supposition Madmenah must have stood between Gibeath of Saul and Nob. But the army possibly may have moved in parallel columns, and thus some of the places mentioned have been lateral to each other and not successive. [Note.] For an elaborate defense of this theory on topographical grounds, the reader may see Dr. Valentin’s art. entitled Beltragn zur Topographie des Stammes Benjamin, in Zeitschr. der Jeclach, Mayr, Geschicht, xii. 164 ff., 169). H.

MADNESS. The words rendered by "mad;" "madman;" "madness;" etc., in the A. V., vary considerably in the Hebrew of the O. T. In Deut. xxvii. 23, 34, 1 Sam. xxi. 13, 14, 15, &c. (Scripture, etc., in the LXX.), they are derivatives of the root פָּנַשׁ, "to be stirred or excited;" in Jer. xxv. 18, i. 38, ii. 7, Ex. i. 17, &c. (περιμασία, LXX.), from the root פָּנַשׁ, "to flash out," applied (like the Greek φανείον) either to light or sound; in Is. xlv. 23, from פָּנַשׁ, "to make void or foolish" (πανασθίου, LXX.); in Zech. xii. 4, from פָּנַשׁ, "to wander" (πανασθίου, LXX.). In the N. T. they are generally used to render μανιαίως or ἁπασθιός (as in John x. 20; Acts xxvi. 24; 1 Cor. iv. 23); but in 2 Pet. ii. 10 the word is παρασθιοιο, and in Luke vi. 11 ἁπασθιοι. These passages show that in Scripture "madness" is recognized as a derangement, proceeding either from weakness and misdirection of intellect, or from unoverseemly violence of passion; and in both cases it is spoken of, sometimes as arising from the will and action of man himself, sometimes as inflicted judicially by the hand of God. In one passage alone (John x. 20) is madness expressly connected with demoniacal possession, by the Jews in their evil against our Lord [see DEMONIACS]; in none is it referred to any physical causes. It will easily be seen how entirely this usage of the word is accordant to the general spirit and object of Scripture, proceeding from physical causes, and dwelling on the moral and spiritual influences, by which men's hearts may be affected, either from within or from without.

It is well known that among oriental, as among most semi-civilized nations, madmen were looked upon with a kind of reverence, as possessed of a quasi-sacred character. This arises partly no doubt from the feeling, that on whom God's hand is laid heavily, should be safe from all other harm; but partly also from the belief that the loss of reason and self-control opened the mind to supernatural influence, and gave it therefore a supernatural sacredness. This belief was strengthened by the enthusiastic expression of idolatrous worship (see 1 K. xviii. 26, 28), and (occasionally) of real inspiration (see 1 Sam. xix. 21-24; comp. the application of "mad fellow" in 2 K. ix. 11, and see Jer. xxix. 21; Acts ii. 13). An illustration of it may be seen in the record of David's pretended madness at the court of Achish (1 Sam. xxi. 13-15), which shows it to be not inconsistent with a kind of contemptuous forbearance, such as is often manifested now, especially by the Turks, towards real or supposed madmen.

A. B.

MADON (מַדּון) [contention, strife]: Rom. Μανόν; Vat.] Μανών: Alex. Μανόν, Μάνων [?]; Madon), one of the principal cities of Canaan before the conquest. Its king joined Jabin and his confederates in their attempt against Joshua at the waters of Merom, and like the rest was killed (Josh. xii. 1, xii. 19). No later mention of it is found, and beyond the natural inference drawn from its occurrence with Hazor, Shimron, etc., that it was in the north of the country, we have no clues to its position. Schweers (90) proposes to discover Madon at Kefer Menba, a village with extensive ancient remains, at the western end of the Plain of Bathruf, 4 or 5 miles N. of Sephoris. His grounds for the identification are of the slightest: (a) the fre-
quent transposition of letters in Arabic, and (b) a statement of the early Jewish traveller hap-Parchei (Asher's "Hist. of Tudea," 340), that the Arabs identify Kefer Mendi with *Moladan,* or, as Schwarzs would read it, Madan. The reader may judge for himself what worth there is in these suggestions.

In the LXX. version of 2 Sam. xxii. 20 the Hebrew words הַדָּם תִּנְסֵא, "a man of stature," are rendered ἄρπα Μαδαβα, "a man of Madan." This may refer to the town Madon, or may be merely an instance of the habit which these translators had of rendering literally in Greek letters Hebrew words which they did not understand. Other instances will be found in 2 K. vi. 8, ix. 13, xii. 9, xv. 10, &c., &c.

G. MAELUS (Małysz; [Vat. Malys]; Michal), for MIAMIN (1 Esdr. ix. 26; comp. Ezr. x. 25).

* MAG'DALAN. [MAGDALAH].

MAG'DISH (מגּדיש [a gathering, Ges.]; Marybix; [Vat. Marybix]; Magedin). A proper name in Ezr. ii. 30, but whether of a man or of a place is doubted by some; it is probably the latter, as all the names from Ezr. ii. 29 to 34, except Ham and Harim, are names of places. The meaning of the name too, which appears to be "freezing" or "congealing," seems better suited to a place than a man. One hundred and fifty-six of its inhabitants, called the children of Maglish, are included in the genealogical roll of Ezr. ii., but have fallen out from the parallel passage in Neh. vii. Maglish, however, is named (Neh. x. 29), as one of those who sealed the covenant, where Anathoth and Nebol (Nebai) also appear in the midst of proper names of men. Why in these three cases the names of the places are given instead of those of the family, or home, or individual, as in the case of all the other signatures, it is impossible to say for certain, though many reasons might be guessed. From the position of Maglish in the list in Ezr. ii., next to Bethel, Ai, and Nebo, and before Lod, Hoad, Ono, and Jericho, it would seem to be in the tribe of Benjamin. A. C. H.

MAG'DALA (Magdah; in MSS. B, D, and Sinait. — A being defective in this place; but Rec. Text. Marydela; St. Marydah; Vulg. Magdoyle). The name Magdala does not really exist in the Bible. It is found in the received Greek text and the A. V. of Matt. xv. 39 only; but the chief MSS. and versions exhibit the name as Magadan.

Into the limits of Magadan Christ comes by boat, over the lake of Gennesaret, after his miracle of feeding the four thousand on the mountain of the eastern side (Matt. xxv. 39); and from thence, after a short conference with the Pharisees and Sadducees, he returned in the same boat to the opposite shore. In the present text of the parallel narrative of St. Mark (viii. 10) we find the "ports of Dalmanutha," though in the time of Eusebius and Jerome the tw. were in agreement, both reading Megadan, as Mark still does in Codex D. They place it "round Gerasa" (Onomasticon, sub voce) as if the Magedo or Magday of Maceabees; but this is not in accordance with the requirements of the narrative, which indicates a place close to the water, and on its western side. The same, as far as distance is concerned, may be said of Megiddo — in its Greek form, Megedo, or, as Josephus spells it, Magedo — which, as a well-known locality of Lower Galilee, might not unnaturally suggest itself.

Dalmanutha was probably at or near *Aiin el-Ba'reich,* about a mile below *el-Mijbil,* on the western edge of the lake of Gennesaret. *El-Mijbil* is doubtless the representative of an ancient Migdal or Magdala, possibly that from which St. Mary came. Her native place was possibly not far distant from the Magdalan of our Lord's history, and we can only suppose that, owing to the familiar recurrence of the word Magdalen, the less known name was absorbed in the better, and Magdala usurped the name, and possibly also the position of Magadan. At any rate it has prevented any search being made for "the name, which may very possibly still be discovered in the country, though so strangely superseded in the records."

The Magdala which conferred her name on "Mary the Magdalene" (M. ḫ Magdalēn), one of the numerous Migdols, i. e. towers, which stood in Palestine — such as the Miqdal-el, or tower of God, in Naphtali, the Miqdad-gad and Miqdalgad of Judah — probably the place of that name which is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud as near Tiberias (Ohlo, Leg. Buba, 323; Schwartz, 189), and this again is as probably the modern el-Mijbil, "a miserable little Muslim village," rather more than an hour, or about three miles, above Tibr'lech, lying on the water's edge at the southeast corner of the plain of Gennesaret (Rob. ii. 286, 287). Professor Stanley's description seems to embrace every point worth notice. "Of all the numerous towns and villages in what must have been the most thickly peopled district of Palestine one only remains. A collection of a few hovels stands at the southeast corner of the plain of Gennesaret, its name hardly altered from the ancient Magdala or Migdol, so called probably from a watch-tower, of which ruins appear to remain, that guarded the entrance to the plain. Through its connection with her whom in the long tradition of the church identified with the penitent sinner, the name of that ancient tower has now been incorporated into all the languages of Europe. A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation otherwise unmarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the southwest, perforated with caves; recalling, by a curious though the Magdala, or Magday, as the place of the long tradition of the church identified with the penitent sinner, the name of that ancient tower has now been incorporated into all the languages of Europe. A large solitary thorn-tree stands beside it. The situation otherwise unmarked, is dignified by the high limestone rock which overhangs it on the southwest, perforated with caves; recalling, by a curious though

The original form of the name may have been Migron; at least so we may infer from the LXX. version of Migran, which is Magdo or Magdon.

The statement of the Talmud is, that a person proud to be a Magdalan could not bear the presence of the eunuch in Tiberias. At three miles distance this would not be impossible in Palestine, where sound travels a distance far greater than in this country. [See Rob. iii. 17; Stanley, N. & P.; Thomson, Land and Esk.]
I. The position occupied by the Magi in the history of the O. T.

II. The transition stages in the history of the name and of the order between the close of the O. T. and the time of the N. T., so far as they affect the latter.

III. The Magi as they appear in the N. T.

IV. The later traditions which have gathered round the Magi of Matt. ii.

1. In the Hebrew text of the O. T. the word occurs but twice, and then only incidentally. In Jer. xxxix. 3 and 11 we meet, among the Chaldaean officers sent by Nebuchadnezzar to Jerusalem, one with the name or title of Rab-Mag (םלועב). This word is interpreted, after the analogy of Rab-shakeel and Rab-saris, as equivalent to chief of the Magi (Ewald, Freytag, and Hitzig, in loc., taking it as the title of Nergal-Saraezer), and we thus find both the name and the order occupying a conspicuous place under the government of the Chaldeans. Many questions of some difficulty are suggested by this fact.

Historically the Magi are conspicuous chiefly as a Persian religious caste. Herodotus connects them with another people by reckoning them among the six tribes of the Medes (i. 101). They appear in his history as enemies, and as interpreters of dreams (i. 129), the name having apparently lost its ethnological and acquired a caste significance. But in Jeremiah they appear at a still earlier period among the retinue of the Chaldean king. The very word Rab-Mag (if the received etymology of Magi be correct) presents a hybrid formation. The first syllable is unquestionably Semitic, the last is all but unquestionably Aryan. The problem thus presented admits of two solutions: (1.) If we believe the Chaldeans to have been a Humite people, closely connected with the Babylonians (CHALDEANS), we must then suppose that the colossal schemes of greatness which showed themselves in Nebuchadnezzar's conquests led him to gather round him the wise men and religious teachers of the nations which he subdued, and that thus the sacred tribe of the Medes rose under his rule to favor and power. (2.) The remnant of those who bore a like character among the Jews (Dan. i. 4) makes this hypothesis a natural one; and the alliance which existed between the Medes and the Chaldeans at the time of the overthrow of the old Assyrian empire would account for the intermixture of religious systems belonging to two different races. (2.) If, on the other hand, with Renan (Histoire des Langues & Nationes, pp. 68, 67), following Lassen and Ritter, we look on the Chaldeans as themselves belonging to the Aryan family, and possessing strong affinities with the Medes, there is even less difficulty in explaining the presence among the one people of the religious teachers of the other. It is likely enough, in either case, that the simpler Median religion which the Magi brought with them, corresponding more or less closely to

In the Persian dialect of the Zend, Magi = priest (Hylas, Euseb. Vita Pers., c. 21); and this is connected by philologists with the Sanskrit, makat (great, μεγάς), and magus (Gesenius, s. v. מגע ; Aquilius de Persico's Zendavesta, ii. 555). The coinage of a Sanskrit maga, in the sense of a illusion, magic, is remarkable; but it is probable that this, as well as the ambiguous Greek word, is derived rather than the original meaning (comp. Ebeling, Dezeichnung der Sprachen, ed Kaitschnick, p. 321). Hyde (loc. c.) notices another etymology, given by Arabian authors, which makes the word = crypt-exed (parambus unparis), but rejects it. Prideaux, on the other hand (Conнеction, under c. 522), accepts it, and seriously connects it with the story of the Pseudo-Serapis who had lost his ears in Wonder, i. 9. Spahnbek (Deb. Erenyi, xii. 62), speaks favorably, though not decisively of a Hebrew etymology.
the faith of the Zendavesta, lost some measure of its original purity through this contact with the darker superstitions of the old Babylonian population. From this time onward it is noticeable that the names both of the Magi and Chaldæans are identified with the astrologers, divination, interpretation of dreams, which had impressed themselves on the prophets of Israel as the most characteristic features of the old Babylonia religion (Is. xliv. 23, xlvii. 14). The Magi took their places among "the astrologers and star-gazers and monthly prognosticators." It is with such men that we have to think of Daniel and his fellow-exiles as associated. They are described as "ten times wiser than all the magicians (LXX. μαγους) and astrologers" (Dan. i. 29). Daniel himself so far sympathizes with the order into which he is thus, as it were, enrolled, as to intercede for them when Nebuchadnezzar gives the order for their death (Dan. ii. 24), and accepts an office which, as making him "master of the magicians, the astrologers, Chaldæans, soothsayers" (Dan. v. 11), was probably identical with that of the Ral-Mug who first came before us. May we conjecture that he found in the belief which the Magi had brought with them some elements of the truth that had been revealed to his fathers, and that the way was thus prepared for the strong sympathy which showed itself in a hundred ways when the purest Aryan and the purest Semitic faiths were brought face to face with each other (Dan. vi. 3, 16, 26; Eizr. i. 1-4; Is. xlv. 28), agreeing as they did in their hatred of idolatry and in their acknowledgment of the "God of Heaven"? The name of the Magi does not meet us in the Biblical account of the Medo-Persian kings, but, however, we identify the Artaxerxes who stops the building of the Temple (Ezr. iv. 17-22) with the Pseudo-Socrates of Herodotus (Artaxerxes) and the Gomates of the Behistun inscription, we may see here also another point of contact. The Magian attempt to resurrect Median supremacy, and with it probably a corrupted Chaldæan form of Magianism, in place of the purer faith in Ormuzd of which Cyrus had been the propagator, would naturally be accompanied by antagonism to the people whom the Persians had protected and supported. The immediate renewal of the suspended work on the triumph of Darius (Ezr. iv. 24, v. 1, 2, vi. 7, 8) falls in, it need hardly be added, with this hypothesis. The story of the actual massacre of the Magi throughout the dominions of Darius read the commemorative Magophonia (Herod.). They with whatever exaggerations it may be necessary indicates in like manner the triumphs of the Astartian system. If we accept the traditional date of Zoroaster as a contemporary of Darius, we may see in the changes which he effected a revival of the older system. It is at any rate striking that the word Magi does not appear in the Zendavesta, the priests being there described as Atharva (Guardians of the Fire), and that there are multiplied prohibitions in it of all forms of the magic which, in theory, would be possible in the East also, took its name from them, and with which, it would appear, they had already become tainted. All such arts, auguries, necromancy, and the like, are looked on as evil, and emasculated by Abrimmon, and are pursued by the hero-king Fereidoum with the most persistent hostility (Du Perron, Zendavesta, vol. i. part 2, pp. 268, 424). The name, however, kept its ground, and with it probably the order to which it was attached. Under Xerxes, the Magi occupy a position which indicates that they had recovered from their temporary depression. They are consulted by him as soothsayers (Herod. vii. 19), and are as influential as they had in the court of Astyages. The strangely and terrible sacrifices at the Strymon and the Nine Ways (Herod. vii. 114). They were said to have urged the destruction of the temples of Greece (Cic. De Legg. ii. 10). Traces of their influence may perhaps be seen in the regard paid by Mardonius to the oracles of the Greek god that offered the nearest analogue to their own Mithras (Herod. viii. 134), and in the like reverence which had previously been shown by the Median Datis towards the island of Lelles (Herod. vi. 97). They came before the Greeks as the representatives of the religion of the Persians. No sacrifices may be offered unless one of their order is present chanting the prescribed prayers, as in the ritual of the Zendavesta (Herod. i. 332). No great change is traceable in their position during the decline of the Persian monarchy. The position of Judas as a Persian prophet must have kept up some measure of contact between the two religious systems. The histories of Esther and Nehemiah probably in some manner traced back by members of the subject race. It might well be that the religious minds of the two nations would learn to respect each other, and that some measure of the prophetic hopes of Israel might mingle with the

"... (Jowett's translation of the Behistun inscription): "The rite which Gomates the Magian had introduced I prohibited. I restored to the state the clients, and the worship, and to those families which tolerated the Magian had deprived of them.""

"The opinion that Zoroaster otherwise Zenduzuit, or Zardanist, and his work belonged to the 6th century, is derived chiefly on the mention in his life and in the Zendavesta of a king king, who has been identified with Hystaspes, the father of Darius Hyle, c. 24: Du Perron, Zendavesta, c. 29. On the other hand, the name of Zoroaster does not appear in any of the monumental or historical notices of Darius and Bactria, rather than Persia, appears as the scene of his labors. The Magi, at any rate, appear as a distinct order, and with a definite faith, before this time; and his work in reference to them, if contemporary with Darius, must have been that of the restorer rather than the founder of a system. The hypothesis of two Zoroasters is hardly more than an attempt to dissimulate the conflicting traditions that cluster round the same, so as to give some degree of historical credibility to each group. Most of these traditions lie outside the range of our present inquiry, but one or two come within the horizon of Biblical legend, if not of Biblical history. Unable to account for the truth they recognised in his system, except on the hypothesis that it had been derived from the faith of Israel, Christian and Mohammedan writers have seen in him the disciple of one of the prophets of the O. T. The ier Hahnz, the friend and disciple of Jeremias, some unanswerable dis- ciplets of this, i.e., as it may round have, in each his turn, been identified with the Ebranian sage. His name will meet us again in connection with the Magi of the N. T. (Hyde, i. c. Prideaux, Com., a. c. 521-495)"
belief of the Magi. As an order they perpetuated themselves under the Parthenic kings. The name rose to fresh honor under the Sassanides. The classification which was ascribed to Zoroaster was recognized as the basis of a hierarchical system, after other and lower elements had mingled with the earlier Dualism, and might be traced even in the religion and worship of the Persians. According to this arrangement the Magi were divided — by a classification which has been compared to that of bishops, priests, and deacons — into disciples (Harbeds), teachers (M obese), and the more perfect teachers of a higher wisdom (Estur Magi). This division of the sacred class (Bar-jesus) is described (Acts xiii. 8) as having, in his cognomen Elymas, a title which was equivalent to Magnus. 4

Elymas.

In one memorable instance, however, the word remains (probably, at least) its better meaning. In the Gospel of St. Matthew, written (according to the general belief of early Christian writers) for the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, we find it, not as embodying the contempt which the franks of impostors had brought upon it through the whole Roman empire, but in the sense in which it had had, of old, as associated with a religion which they respected, and an order of which one of their own prophets had been the head. In spite of Patriotic authorities on the other side, asserting the Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀποτομῶν of Matt. ii. 1 to have been sorcerers whose mysterious knowledge came from below, not from above, and who were thus translated out of darkness into light (Just. Martyr, Chrysostom, Theophylact, in Spanheim, Dab. Evang. xix.; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Matt. ii.), we are justified, not less by the consensus of later interpreters (including even Maldonatus) than by the general tenor of St. Matthew's narrative, in seeing in them men such as those that were in the minds of the LXX. translators of Daniel, and those described by Philo — at once astronomers and astrologers, but not mingling any conscious fraud with their efforts after a higher knowledge. The vagueness of the description leaves their country undefined, and implies that probably the Evangelist himself had no certain information. The same phrase is used as in passages where the express object is to include a wide range of country within the domain of the Magi, as in Matt. ii. 11, xiv. 27; Luke xii. 20. Probably the region chiefly present to the mind of the Palestine Jew would be the tract of country stretching eastward from the Jordan to the Euphrates, the land of "the children of the East" in the early period of the history of the O. T. (Gen. xxiv. i; Judg. vi. 3, vii. 12, xii. 10). It should be remembered, however, that the language of the O. T., and therefore probably that of St. Matthew, had included under this name countries that lay considerably to the north as well as to the east of Palestine.

Bahram came from "the mountains of the east," i.e. from Pethor on the Euphrates (Num. xxiii. 7, xxxii. 5). Aburham (or Cyrus?) is the righteous man raised up "from the east." (Is. xii. 2). The Persian conqueror is called "from the east, from a far country." (Is. xvi. 11).

We cannot wonder that there should have been very varying interpretations given of words that

MAGI

and men of letters might recognize the better meaning of which the word was capable (Cic. De Divin. i. 23, 41), yet in the language of public documents and of historians, they were treated as a class at once hateful and contemptible (Tacit. Ann. i. 32, xii. 27, xiii. 22, xiii. 59), and as such were the victims of repeated edicts of banishment.

III. We need not wonder, accordingly, to find that this is the predominant meaning of the word as it appears in the N. T. The noun and the verb derived from it (μαγεία and μαγεύειν) are used by St. Luke in describing the impostor, who is therefore known distinctively as Simon Magus (Acts viii. 9). The word of the second class (Bar-jesus) is described (Acts xiii. 8) as having, in his cognomen Elymas, a title which was equivalent to Magnus.4

4 The word "Mobeil," a contraction of the fuller form Magovul, is apparently identical with that which appears in Greek as Μάγος.

5 Instead of "sovereign," Acts xiii. 8, 9 (A. V.).
allowed so wide a field for conjecture. Some of these are, for various reasons, worth noticing. (1.) The feeling of some early writers that the coming of the wise men was the fulfillment of the prophecy which spoke of the gifts of the men of Sheba and Solon (Is. xxi. 10; 15; comp. Is. ix. 6) led them to fix on Arabia as the country of the Magi (lust. Martyr, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Cyprian, in Spanheim, Dub. Evang. l. c.); and they have been followed by Baronius, Mabillon, Grotius, and Lightfoot. (2.) Others have conjectured Mesopotamia to be the great seat of Chaldaean meteorology (Tertullian, Hom. in Matt. vi. and vii.), or Egypt as the country in which magic was most prevalent (Meyer, ad loc.). (3.) The historical associations of the word led others again, with greater probability, to fix on Persia, and to see in these Magi members of the priestly order, to which the name of right belonged (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Osiander, while Hyde (Rel. Pers. l. c.) suggests Parthia, as being at that time the conspicuous eastern monarchy in which the Magi were recognized and honored.

It is perhaps a legitimate inference from the narrative of Matt. ii. that in these Magi we may recognize, as the Church has done from a very early period, the first Gentile worshippers of the Christ. The name, by itself, indeed, applied as it is in Acts xiii. 8, to a Jewish false prophet, would hardly prove this; but the distinctive epithet "from the east," was probably intended to mark them out as different in character and race from the western Magi, Jews, and others, who swarmed over the Roman empire. So, when they come to Jerusalem it is to seek not after "our king" or "the king of Israel," but, as the men of another race might do, after "the king of the Jews." The language of the Old Testament prophets and the traditional interpretation of it are apparently new things to them.

The narrative of Matt. ii. supplies us with an outline which we may legitimately endeavor to fill up, as far as our knowledge enables us, with inference and illustration.

Some time after the birth of Jesus there appeared among the strangers who visited Jerusalem these men from the far East. They were not idolaters. Their form of worship was looked upon by the Jewish people with great toleration and sympathy than that of any other Gentiles (comp. Wisd. xiii. 6, 7). Whatever may have been their country, their name indicates that they would be watchers of the stars, seeking to read in them the destinies of nations. They say that they have seen a star in which they recognize such a prognostic. They are sure that one is born king of the Jews, and they come to pay their homage. It may have been simply that the quarter of the heavens in which the star appeared indicated the direction of Judaea. It may have been that some form of the prophecy of Isaiah that a "star should rise out of Jacob" (Num. xxiv. 17) had reached them, either through the Jews of the Dispersion, or through traditions running parallel with the O.T., and that this led them to recognize its fulfillment (Orig. r. Cels. i. Hom. in Num. xiii.; but the hypothesis is neither necessary nor satisfactory; comp. Elliott, Hulsean Lectures, p. 77). It may have been, lastly, that the traditional predictions ascribed to their own prophet Zoroaster, leading them to expect a succession of three delvers, two working as prophets in the West, and a third as king of the East (Tavernier, Travels, iv. 8), the third (Zosimuth), the greatest of the three, coming to be the head of the kingdom, to conquer Arminian and to raise the dead (Du Perron, Zambaco, i. 2, p. 46; Hyde, e. 31) Elliott, Hulsean Lect. l. c.), and in strange fantastic ways connecting these redeemers with the seed of Abraham (Tavernier, l. c.; and D'Herbelot, Bibliothee Orient, s. v. "Zerdiscus"), had reared their minds to an attitude of expectancy, and that their contact with a people cherishing like hopes on stronger grounds, may have prepared them to see in a king of the Jews, the Oslandersche (Homo Mamli, Hyde, l. c.), or the Zosimuth whom they expected. In any case they shared the "veto et constans opinio" which had spread itself over the whole East, that the Jews, as a people, crushed and broken as they were, were yet destined to arise again to great things.

It is not unlikely that they appeared, occupying the position of Destur-Mobeds in the later Zoroastrian hierarchy, as the representatives of many others who shared the same feeling. They come, at any rate, to pay their homage to the king whose birth was thus indicated, and with the gold and frankincense and myrrh, which were the customary gifts of subject nations (comp. Gen. xi. 11; Is. lx. 16; 1 K. x. 2; 2 Chr. ix. 24; Cant. iii. 6, iv. 14). The arrival of such a company, bound on so strange an errand, in the last years of the tyrannous and distrustful Herod, could hardly fail to attract notice and excite a people, among whom Messianic expectations had already begun to show themselves (Luke ii. 25, 38). "Herod was troubled; and all Jerusalem with him." The Sunehridim was convened, and the question whether the birth was to be born in the usual place, or in Bethlehem. It was in accordance with the subtle, fox-like character of the king that he should pretend to share the expectations of the people in order that he might find in what direction they pointed, and then take whatever steps were necessary to crush them [comp. Herod.]. The answer given, based upon the traditional interpretation of Mic. v. 2, that Bethlehem was to be the birthplace of the Christ, determined the king's plans. He had found out the locality. It remained to determine the time: with what was probably a real belief in astrology, he inquired of them diligently, when they had first seen the star. If he assumed that that was contemporaneous with the birth, he
could not be far wrong. The Magi accordingly are sent on to Bethlehem, as if they were but the forerunners of the king's own hommage. As they journeyed they again saw the star, which for a time, it would seem, they had lost sight of, and it guided them on their way. [Comp. Star in the East for this and all other questions connected with its appearance.] The pressure of the crowds, which a fortnight, or four months, or well-nigh two years before, had driven Mary and Joseph to the rude stable of the innkeeper of Bethlehem, had apparently abated, and the Magi entering "the house" (Matt. ii. 11) fell down and paid their hommage and offered their gifts. Once more they receive guidance through the channel which their work and their studies had made familiar to them. From first to last, in Media, in Babylon, in Persia, the Magi had been famous as the interpreters of dreams. That which they received now need not have involved a disclosure of the plans of Herod to them. It was enough that it directed them to "return to their own country another way." With this their history, so far as the N.T. carries us, comes to an end.

It need hardly be said that this part of the Gospel narrative has had to bear the brunt of the attacks of a hostile criticism. The omission of all mention of the Magi in a gospel which enters so fully into all the circumstances of the infancy of Christ as that of St. Luke, and the difficulty of harmonising this incident with those which he narrates, have been urged as at least throwing suspicion on what St. Matthew alone has recorded. The advocate of a "mythical theory" sees in this almost the strongest confirmation of it (Strauss, Leben Jesu, i. p. 272). "There must be prodigies gathering round the cradle of the infant Christ. Other heroes and kings had had their stars, and so must he. He must receive in his childhood the homage of the representatives of other races and creeds. The facts recorded lie outside the range of history, and are not mentioned by any contemporary historian." The answers to these objections may be briefly stated. (1) Assuming the central fact of the early chapters of St. Matthew, no objection lies represented. The story of the delusions and the absence of a work which was spread against the appearance of their being wonderful and improbable. It would be in harmony with our expectations that there should be signs and wonders indicating its presence. The objection therefore postulates the absolute incredibility of that fact, and beds the point at issue (comp. Trench, Note of the Wise Men, p. 124). (2) The question whether this, or any other given narrative connected with the nativity of Christ, bears upon it the stamp of a myth, is therefore one to be determined by its own merits, on its own evidence; and then the case stands thus: A mythical story is characterized for the most part by a large admixture of what is wild, poetical, fantastic. A comparison of Matt. ii. with the Jewish or Mohammedan legends of a later time, or even with the Christian mythology which afterwards gathered round this very chapter, will show how wide is the distance that separates its simple narrative, without ornament, without explanation, from the exuberant luxuriance of those figures (comp. IV below). (3) The absence of any direct confirmatory evidence in other writers of the time may be accounted for, partly at least, by the want of any full chronicle of the events of the later years of Herod. The momentary excitement of the arrival of such travellers as the Magi, or of the slaughter of some score of children, would easily be effaced by the more agitating events that followed (comp. Herodotus). The silence of Josephus is not more conclusive against this fact than it is (assuming the spuriousness of Ant. xviii. 4, § 3) against the fact of the Crucifixion and the growth of the sect of the Nazarenes within the walls of Jerusalem. (4) The more perplexing absence of all mention of the Magi in St. Luke's Gospel may yet receive some probable explanation. So far as we cannot explain it, our ignorance of all, or nearly all, the circumstances of the composition of the Gospels is a sufficient answer. It is, however, at least possible that St. Luke, knowing that the facts related by St. Matthew were already current among the churches, sought rather to add what was not yet recorded. Something too may have been due to the leading thoughts of the two Gospels. St. Matthew, dwelling chiefly on the kingly office of Christ as the Son of David, sees it naturally on the first recognition of that character by the Magi of the East (comp. on the fitness of this Mill, Pantheistic Principles, p. 375). St. Luke, portraying the Son of Man in his sympathy with common men, in his compassion on the poor and humble, dwells as naturally on the manifestation to the shepherds on the hills of Bethlehem. It was no added, that everything tends to show that the latter Evanglist derived the materials for this part of his history more directly from the mother of the Lord, or her kindred, than did the former; and, if so, it is not difficult to understand how she might come to dwell on that which connected itself at once with the eternal blessedness of peace, good-will, salvation, rather than on the homage and the adoration of the earthly kings, and the peace of an earthly kingdom, and had proved to be the prelude to a life of poverty, and to the death upon the cross.

IV. In this instance, as in others, what is told by the Gospel-writers in plain simple words, has become the nucleus for a whole cycle of legends. A Christian mythology has overshadowed that which itself had nothing in common with it. The love of the strange and marvelous, the eager desire to fill up in detail a narrative which had been left in outline, and to make every detail the representative of an idea these, which tend everywhere to the growth of the mythical element within the region of history, fixed themselves, naturally enough, precisely on those portions of the life of Christ where the written records were the least complete. The stages of the facts of the Gospel history may have been mixed up with (1), but the expression of Augustus does not point to anything beyond. Herod's domestic tragedies. The genuineness of (2) is questionable; and both are too remote in time to be of any worth as evidence (comp. W. H. Mill, Pantheistic Principles, p. 373).

a It is perhaps not right to pass over the supposed testimony of heathen authors. These are found (2), in the saying of Augustus, recorded by Macrobius ("It is better to be Herod's swine than his son"), as connected with the slaughter of a child under two years of age. (2) In the remarkable passage of Chalcidius (Comment. in Thomas, vii. § 125), alluding to the star which had heralded the birth not of a conqueror or warrior, but of a divine and righteous king, the
of this development present themselves in regular succession.

(1) The Magi are no longer thought of as simply "wise men," members of a sacred order. The proprieties of Ps. lxxii: 1, Is. xlix. 28, lx. 16, must be understood. The name once implied "royal," "royal," "rulers," "kings," or "royal.

This tends more and more to the dominant thought. When the arrival of the Magi, rather than the birth or the baptism of Christ, as the first of his mighty works, comes to be looked on as the great Epiphany of his divine power, the older title of the feast receives as a synonym, almost as a substitute, that of "the Feast of the Three Kings." The number of the Wise Men, which St. Matthew leaves altogether undefined, was arbitrarily fixed. They were three (Leo Magn. Serm. ad Epiph., Book De Collect., 3). Symbolic meanings were found for each of the three gifts. The gold they offered as to a king. With the myrrh they figured the bitterness of the Passion, the emolument for the Burial. With the frankincense they adored the divinity of the Son of God (Suerer, Thes. s. v. Mápny; AVR. Rom. in Epiph. passim). (4) Later on, in a tradition which, though appearing in a western writer, is traceable probably to reports brought back by pilgrims from Italy or the East, the names are added, and Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar, take their place among the objects of Christian reverence, and are honored as the patron saints of travellers. The passage from Bode (ibid Collect.) is, in many ways, interesting, and as it is not commonly quoted by commentators, though often referred to, it may be worth while to give it:

1. Primus ductor natus Melchior qui se ad montes, barbare prœxit et capulis, aurum obtint regi Domini. Secundus nomine Gaspar, juvens urbisilli, rubicundus, thure, quasi Poae obdictione digna, Deum honoravit. Tertius fuscus, integre baritus, Balthassar nomine, per myrrhan simiam hominum mortuorum professor."

We recognize at once in this description the received types of the early pictorial art of Western Europe. It is open to believe that Bode's text was the description, and that the art of his time may be traced to early quasi-dramatic representations of the facts of the Nativity. In any such representations names of some kind would become a matter of necessity, and were probably invented at random. Familiar as the names given by Bode now are to us, there was a time when they had no more authority than Bithiasara, Melchior, and Gathasar (Moroni, Hist. s. e. "Magi"); Magalath, Pan-

...pointing, or from the derivations of a miracle-play type, the account of each such a performance in Trench, Son of the Wise Men, p. 70). The account of the offerings, it will be noticed, does not agree with the traditional hexameter of the Latin Church:

"Gaspar ferit myrrham, quod Melchior, Balthasar aurum."  

"Hyde quotes from Bar Bahlul the names of the thirteen who appear in the Eastern traditions. The three which the legends of the West have made famous are not among them.

a Vos autem, o fili mei, ante omnes gentes ortum eis perpétui estis" (Abulpharagius, Dyser. Lib. in Hyde, c. 41).
MAGIC, MAGICIANS

Milan had received the emperor's prefect Eustorgius called for some special mark of favor, and on his consecration as bishop of that city, he obtained for it the privilege of being the resting-place of the precious relics. There the fame of the three kings increased. The prominence given to all the feasts connected with the season of the Nativity—the transfer of the relic of the manger and joy of the old Saturnalia—the setting apart of a distinct day for the commemoration of the Epiphany in the 4th century—a—all this added to the veneration with which they were regarded. When Milan fell into the hands of Frederick Barbarossa (A. D. 1162) the influence of the archbishop of Cologne prevailed on the Emperor to transfer them to that city. The Milaneses, at a later period, consolod themselves by forming a special confraternity for perpetuating their veneration for the Magi by the annual performance of a "Mystery" (Moroni, L. C.); but the glory of possessing the relics of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ remained with Cologne.6 In that proud cathedral which is the glory of Tewtonic art the shrine of the Three Kings has, for six centuries, been shown as the greatest of its many treasures. The taleriiinacle in which the bones of some whose real name and history are lost forever lie enshrinod in honor, bears witness, in its gold and gems, to the faith with which the story of the wanderings of the Three Kings has been received. The reverence has sometimes taken stranger and more grotesque forms. As the patron-saints of travellers they have given a name to the inns of earlier or later date. The names of Melchior, Gaspar, and Baltazar were used as a charm against attacks of epilepsy (Spalding, Dub. Eng. cxxx).

Comp. in addition to authorities already cited. Trench, St or of the Wise Men: J. F. Miller, in Herzog's Real-Encycl., s. v. "Magi"; Triebel, De Magis advenient, and Miegian, De Stellis, etc., in Cris. Sacri, Thea. Nov. ii. 111, 118; Stolberg, Dissert. de Magis: and Rhomen, De primis Soc. reveren., in Cris. Sacri, Theor. Phil. ii. 63. [On the Magi and on Magism among the Babylonians, see especially Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies, iii. 125-139: among the Medes, ibid. iii. 218 ff.; among the Persians, ibid. iv. 391-395.—On the representations of the Magi (the Three Kings) in works of art, and the legends concerning them, see Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Middle Ages, 3d ed., pp. 210-222.—II.] E. H. V.

MAGIC, MAGICIANS. The magical arts spoken of in the Bible are those practiced by the Egyptians, the Canaanites, and their neighbors, the Hebrews, the Chaldeans, and probably the Greeks. We therefore begin this article with an endeavor to state the position of magic in relation to religion and philosophy with the several races of mankind.

The degree of the civilization of a nation is not the measure of the importance of magic in its convictions. The natural features of a country are not the primary causes of what is termed superstition in its inhabitants. With nations as with men, and the analogy of Plato in the "Republic," is not always false,—the feelings on which magic fixes its hold are essential to the mental constitution. Contrary as are these assertions to the common opinions of our time, inductive reasoning forbids our doubting them.

With the lowest race magic is the chief part of religion. The Nigrinians, or blacks of this race, show this in their extreme use of amulets and their worship of objects which have no other value in their eyes but as a supposed magical character through the influence of supernatural agents. With the Turanians, or corresponding whites of the same great family,—we use the word whites for a group of nations mainly yellow, in contradistinction to black,—incantations and witchcraft occupy the same place, shamanism characterizing their tribes in both hemispheres. In the days of Herodotus the distinction in this matter between the Nigrinians and the Caucasian population of North Africa was what it now is. In his remarkable account of the journey of the Nasnonian young men,—the Nasons, he it remembered, were "a Libyan race" and dwellers on the northern coast, as the historian here says,—we are told that the adventurers passed through the inhabited maritime region, and the tract occupied by wild beasts, and the desert, and at last came upon a plain with trees, where they were seized by men of small stature who carried them across marches to a town of such men black in complexion. A great river, running from west to east and containing crocodiles, flowed by that town, and all that nation were sorcerers (δείνους ὑποστήνυμοι αὐθρόσυς, γονάτος εἶναί πάντας. ii. 32, 33). It little matters whether the conjecture that the great river was the Niger be true, which the idea adopted by Herodotus that it was the Upper Nile seems to favor; it is quite evident that the Nasonians came upon a nation of Nigrinians beyond the Great Desert and were struck with their fetishism. So, in our own days, the traveller is astonished at the height to which this superstition is carried among the Nigrinians, who have no religious practices that are not of the nature of sorcery, nor any priests who are not magicians, and magicians alone. The strength of this belief in magic in these two great divisions of the human race is shown in the case of each by its having maintained its hold in an instance in which its tenacity must have been severely tried. The ancient Egyptians show their partly-Nigrinian origin not alone in their physical characteristics and language but in their religion. They retained the strange low nature-worship of the Nigrinians, forbiddingly combining it with more intellectual kinds of belief, as they represented their gods with the heads of animals and the bodies of men, and even connecting it with truths which point to a primordial revelation. The Ritual, which was the great treasure of Egyptian belief and explained the means of gaining future happiness, is full of charms to be said, and contains directions for making and for using amulets. As the Nigrinian goes on a journey hung about with amulets, so amulets were placed on the Egyptian's embalmed body, and his soul went on its mysterious way fortified with incantations learnt while on earth. In China, although

1. The institution of the Feast of the Three Wise Men is ascribed to Pope Julius, a. d. 336 (Moroni, Dict. c.).

2. For the later medieval developments of the traditions, consult John von Hildebrand in Quarterly Review, p. 538.
Buddhism has established itself, and the system of Conflagrism has gained the power its positivism would insure it with a highly-educated people of low type, another belief still maintains itself which there is strong reason to hold to be older than the other two, although it is usually supposed to have been of the same age as Conflagrism; in this theosophic magic is of the highest importance, the distinguishing characteristic by which it is known.

With the Shemites magic takes a lower place. Nowhere is it even part of religion; yet it is looked upon as a powerful engine, and generally unlawful or hateful according to the aid invoked. Among many of the Shemite peoples there linger the remnants of a primitive fetishism. Sacred trees and stones are reverenced from an old superstition, of which they do not always know the meaning, derived from the nations whose place they have taken. Thus fetishism remains, although in a kind of fossil state. The importance of astrology with the Shemites has tended to raise the character of their magic, which deals rather with the discovery of supposed existing influences than with the production of new influences. The only direct association of religion is where priests, as the educated class, have taken the functions of magicians; but this is far different from the case of the Nigerians, where the magicians are the only priests. The Shemites, however, when depending on human reason alone, seem never to have doubted the efficacy of magical arts, yet recourse to their aid was not usually with them the first idea of a man in doubt. Though the case of Saul cannot be taken as applying to the whole race, yet, even with the heathen Shemites, prayers must have been held to be of more value than incantations.

The Iranians assign to magic a still less important position. It can scarcely be traced in the relics of old nature-worship, which they with greater skill than the Egyptians interwove with their more intellectual beliefs, as the Greeks gave the objects of reverence in Arcadia and Crete a place in poetical myths and the Scythianarians united the hard remains of primitive superstition. The character of the ancient belief is utterly gone with the assigning of new reasons for the reverence of its sacred objects. Magic always maintained some hold on men's minds; but the stronger intellects despaired it, like the Roman commander who threw the sacred chickens overboard, and the Greek who defied an adverse omen at the beginning of a great battle. When any, oppressed by the sight of the calamities of mankind, sought to resolve the mysterious problem, they fixed, like Eschylus, not upon the childish notion of a chance government by many conflicting agencies, but upon the older idea of a dominating fate. Men of highly sensitive temperament have always inclined to a belief in magic, and there has therefore been a section of Iranian philosophers in all ages who have paid attention to its practice; but, expelled from religion, it has held but a low and precarious place in philosophy.

The Hebrews had no magic of their own. It was so strictly forbidden by the Law that it could never afterwards have had any recognized existence, save in times of general heresy or apostasy, and the same was doubtless the case in the patriarchal ages. The magical practices which obtained among the Hebrews were therefore borrowed from the nations around. The hold they gained was such as we should have expected with a Shemitic race, making allowance for the discredit thrown upon them by the prohibitions of the Law. From the first entrance into the Land of Promise until the destruction of Jerusalem we have constant glimpses of magic practiced in secret, or resorted to, not above a few places by numbers also by the great. The Talmud abounds in notices of contemporary magic among the Jews, showing that it survived idolatry notwithstanding its original connection, and was supposed to produce real effects. The Kur-an in like manner treats charms and incantations as capable of producing evil consequences when used against a man. It is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible that from first to last it warrants no sanctity or dread. In the Psalms, the most personal of all the books of Scripture, there is no prayer to be protected against magical influences. The believer prays to be delivered from every kind of evil that could hurt the body or the soul, but he says nothing of the machinations of sorcerers. Here and everywhere magic is passed by, or if mentioned, mentioned only to be condemned (comp. Ps. cxvi. 29). Let those who affirm that they see in the Psalms merely human piety, and in the Greek Eclesiastes merely human philosophy, explain the absence in them, and throughout the Scriptures, of the expression of superstitions feelings that are inherent in the Shemitic mind. Let them explain the luxuriant growth in the after-literature of the Hebrews and Arabs, and notably in the Talmud and the Kur-an, of these feelings with no root in those older writings from which that after-literature was derived. If the Bible, the Talmod, and the Kur-an, be but several expressions of the Shemitic mind, differing only through the effect of time, how can this contrast be accounted for? — the very opposite of what obtains elsewhere; for superstitions are generally strongest in the earlier literature of a race, and gradually fade, excepting a condition of barbarism to restore their vigor. Those who see in the Bible a Divine work can understand how a God-taught preacher could throw aside the miserable fears of his race, and boldly tell man to trust in his Maker alone. Here, as in all matters, the history of the Bible confirms its doctrine. In the doctrinal Scriptures magic is passed by with contempt, in the historical Scriptures the reasonableness of this contempt is shown. Whenever the practitioners of magic attempt to conduct the servants of God, they conspicuously fail. Pharœus's magicians how to the Divine power shown in the wonders wrought by Moses and Aaron. Balaam, the great enchantor, comes from afar to curse Israel and is forced to bless them.

In examining the mentions of magic in the Bible, we must keep in view the curious inquiry whether there be any reality in the art. We would at the outset protest against the idea that the use of magic was very prevalent, that the conviction that the seen and unseen worlds were often more manifestly in contact in the Biblical ages than now necessitates a belief in the reality of the magic spoken of in the Scriptures. We do indeed see a connection of a supernatural agency with magic in such a case as that of the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination mentioned in the Acts; yet the agency of certain persons had affected him with a kind of rheumatism.

4 The 13th chapter of the Kur-an was written when Muhammad believed that the magical practices
appears to have been involuntary in the dansel, and shrewdly made profitable by her employers. This does not establish the possibility of man being able at his will to use supernatural powers to gain his own ends, which is magic, as such, an absolute triumph. Thus much we premise, lest we should be thought to hold intuitional opinions because we treat the reality of magic as an open question.

Without losing sight of the distinctions we have drawn between the magic of different races, we shall consider the notices of the subject in the Bible in the order in which they occur. It is possible in every case to assign the magical practice spoken of to a particular nation, or, when this can be done, to determine whether it be native or borrowed, and the general absence of details renders any other system of classification liable to error.

The theft and carrying away of Laban's teraphim (גֶּבֶר) by Rachel seems to indicate the practice of magic in Padan-aram at this early time. It appears that Laban attached great value to these objects, from which he was as to the theft, and his determined search for them (Gen. xxxi. 19, 30, 32-35). It may be supposed from the manner in which they were hidden that these teraphim were not very small. The most important point is that Laban calls them his "gods" (ibid. 30, 32), although he was not without belief in the true God (24, 49-53); for this makes it almost certain that we have here not an indication of the worship of strange gods, but the first notice of a superstition that afterwards obtained among those Israelites who added corrupt practices to the true religion. a The derivation of the name teraphim is extremely obscure. Gesenius takes it from an "unusual" root, תְרַפָּה, which he supposes, from the Arabic, probably signified "to live pleasantly" (Thee. s. v.). It may, however, be reasonably conjectured that such a root would have had, if not in Hebrew, in the language whence the Hebræans took it or its derivative, the proper meaning "to dance," corresponding to this, which would then be its true meaning. b We should prefer, if no other derivation be found, to suppose that the name teraphim might mean "givers," or "causers of dancing," with reference either to primitive nature-worship c or its magical rites of the character of shamanism rather than that it signifies, as Gesenius suggests "givers of pleasant life." There seems, however, to be a cognate word, unconnected with the "unusual" root just mentioned, in ancient Egyptian, whence we may obtain a conjectural derivation. We do not of course trace the worship of teraphim to the sojourn in Egypt. They were probably those objects of the pre-Abrahamic idolatry, put away by order of Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 2-4), yet retained even in Joshua's time (Josh. xiv. 14); and, if so notwithstanding his exhortation, abandoned only for a season (Judg. xiii., xvii.); and they were also known to the Babyloniæ, being used by them for divination (Ez. xxi. 21). There is but great reason for supposing a close connection between the oldest language and religion of Chaldaea, and the ancient Egyptian language and religion. The Egyptian word TER signifies "a shape, type, transformation," c and has for its determinative a mummy: it is used in the Ritual, where the various transformations of the deceased in Hades are described (Todtenbuch, ed. Lepsins, ch. 76 ff.). The small mummy-shaped figure, SIEBTETE, usually made of baked clay covered with a fine vitreous varnish, representing the Egyptian as deceased, is of a nature connecting it with magic, since it was made with the idea that it secured benefits in Hades; and it is connected with the word TER, for it represents a mummy, the determinative of that word, and was considered to be of use in the state in which the deceased passed through transformations, TERU. The difficulty which forbids our doing more than conjecture a relation between TER and teraphim is the want in the former of the third radical of the latter; and in our present state of ignorance respecting the ancient Egyptian and the primitive language of Chaldaea in their verbal relations to the Semitic family it is impossible to say whether it is likely to be explained. The possible connection with the Egyptian religious magic is, however, not to be slighted, especially as it is not improbable that the household idolatri of the Hebrews was mono-theistic worship, and the SIEBTETE was the image of a deceased man or woman, as a mummy, and therefore as an Ostis, bearing the insignia of that divinity, and so in a manner as a deified dead person, although we do not know that it was used in the ancestral worship.

in the fragments ascribed to Sanchoniathon, which, whatever their age and author, cannot be doubted to be genuine, the Baalûtu are characterized in a manner that illustrates this supposition. The Baalûtu, it must be remembered, were sacred stones, the reverence of which in Syria in the historical times was a relic of the early low nature-worship with which fetishism or shamanism is now everywhere associated. The words used, "Everègnê thec Oôárôn Bââlûtu. Baalu ôôcôc kôcôc noôcôc têcôcôc (Cory. Asiat. Disc. p. 12), cannot be held to mean more than that the deity contrived living stones, but the idea of contriving and the term "living" imply motion in these stones.

Egyptologists have generally read this word TER. Mr. Birch, however, reads it CHEUPAR (SIEPER according to the writer's system of transliteration). The basis is decided by the discovery of the Coptic equivalent TOP, "transmutant," in which the absence of the final R is explained by a peculiar but regular modification which the writer was the first to point out (Hieroglyphics Encyclopaedia Brit.-am. 8th ed. p. 421).
of the Egyptians. It is important to notice that no singular is found of the word teraphim, and that the plural form is once used where only one statue seems to be meant (1 Sam. xix. 13, 16); in this instance, it may be a plural without the latter inference be true, this word must have become thoroughly Semiticized. There is no description of these images; but from the account of Michael's stratagem to deceive Saul's messengers, it is evident, if only one image be there meant, as is very probable, that they were at least sometimes of the size of a man, and perhaps in the head and shoulders, if not lower, of human shape, or of a similar form (I. L. 13-16).

The worship or use of teraphim after the occupation of the Promised Land cannot be doubted to have been one of the corrupt practices of those Hebrews who went to idolatry, but did not abandon their belief in the God of Israel. Although the Scriptures draw no marked distinction between those who forsook their religion and those who added to it such corruptions, it is evident that the latter always professed to be orthodox. Teraphim therefore cannot be regarded as among the Hebrews necessarily connected with strange gods, whatever may have been the case with other nations. The account of Michael's images in the Book of Judges, compared with a passage in Hosea, shows our conclusion to be correct. In the earliest days of the occupation of the Promised Land, in the time of anarchy that followed Joshua's rule, Michael, "a man of Mount Ephraim," made certain images and other objects of heretical worship, which were stolen from him by those Danites who took Laish and called it Dan, there setting up idolatry, where it continued the whole time that the ark was at Shiloh, the priests retaining their post "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Judg. xvii. xviii., esp. 30, 31). Probably this worship was somewhat changed, although not in its essential character, when Jeroboam set up the golden calf at Dan. Michael's idolatrous objects were a graven image, a molten image, an ephod, and teraphim (xvii. 3, 4, 5, xviii. 17, 18, 20). In Hosea there is a retrospect of this period where the prophet takes a harlot, and commands her to be faithful to him "many days." It is added: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image [or "pillar,"  דודל], and without an ephod, and teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king; and shall fear Jehovah and His goodness in the latter days" (iii. esp. 4, 5). The apostate people are long to be without their spurious king and false worship, and in the end are to return to their loyalty to the house of David and their faith in the true God. That Dan should be connected with Jeroboam "who made Israel to sin," and with the kingdom whose case it may be used natural; and it is therefore worthy of note that the images, ephod, and teraphim made by Michael and stolen and set up by the Danites at Dan should so nearly correspond with the objects spoken of by the prophet. It has been imagined that the use of teraphim and the similar abominations of the heretical Israelites are not so strongly condemned in the Scriptures as the worship of strange gods. This mistake arises from the mention of these kings who did not suppress the high places, which proves only their timidity, and not any lesser sinfulness in the spurious religion than in tube systems borrowed from the peoples of Canaan and neighboring countries. The cruel rites of the heathen are indeed especially reproved, but the heresy of the Israelites is too emphatically denounced, by Samuel in a passage to be soon examined, and in the repeated condemnation of Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin," for it to be possible that we should take a view of it consistent only with modern sophistry.a

We pass to the magical use of teraphim. By the Israelites they were consulted for oracular answers. This was apparently done by the Danites who asked Michael's Levite to inquire as to the success of their spring expedition (Judg. xviii. 5, 6). In later times this is distinctly stated of the Israelites where Zechaariah says, "to death the workers in spoken vanity, and the diviners have seen a lie, and have told false dreams" (x. 2). It cannot be supposed that, as this first positive mention of the use of teraphim for divination by the Israelites is after the return from Babylon, and as that use obtained with the Babylonians in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, therefore the Israelites borrowed it from their conquerors; for these objects are mentioned in earlier places in such a manner that their connection with divination must be intended, if we hear in mind that this connection is undoubted in a subsequent period. Samuel's reproof of Saul for his disobedience in the matter of Amalek, associates "divination" with "vanity," or "idols" (1 Sam. xxxi), and "teraphim," however we render the difficult passage where these words occur (1 Sam. xx. 22, 23). (The word rendered "vanity," כַּלְכָּל, is especially used with reference to idols, and even in some places stands alone for an idol or idols.) When Jeroboam, in black arts, finding himself rejected of God in his extremity, sought the witch of Ebion, and asked to see Samuel, the prophet's apparition denounced his doom as the punishment of this very disobedience as to Amalek. The reproof would seem, therefore, to have been a prophecy that the self-confident king would at the last alienate himself from God, and take refuge in the very abominations he despised. This apparent reference tends to confirm the inference we have indicated. As to a later time, when Josiah's reform is related, he is said to have put away "the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols" (2 K. xxii. 24); where the mention of the teraphim immediately after the wizards, and as distinct from the idols, seems to favor the inference that they are spoken of as objects used in divination.

The only account of the art of divining by teraphim is in a remarkable passage of Ezekiel relating to Nebuchadnezzar's advance against Jerusalem. "Also, thou son of man, appoint thee two ways, that the sword of the king of Babylon may come: both twain [two swords] shall come forth out of

---

a Kalisch, in his Commentary on Genesis (pp 533, 534), considers the use of teraphim as a comparatively harmless form of idolatry, and explains the passage in Hosea quoted above as meaning that the Israelites should be deprived not alone of true religion, but even of the resources of their mind household superstitions. He thus entirely misses the sense of the passage and makes the Bible contradictory.
MAGIC

one hand: and choose thou a place, choose [it] at
the head of the way to the city. Appoint a way,
that the sword may come to Babylonia of the
Ammonites, and to Judah in Jerusalem the defended.
For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of
the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divina-
tion: he shuffled arrows, he consulted with teraphim,
he looked in the liver. At his right hand was the
divination for Jerusalem;" (xxi. 19-22). The men-
tion together of consulting with teraphim and looking
into the liver, may not indicate that the victim was
offered to teraphim and its liver then looked into,
but may mean two separate acts of divining.
That the former is the right explanation seems, however;
probable from a comparison with the LXX.
rendering of the account of Michael's stratagem. Perhaps Michal had been divining, and on the
coming of the messengers seized the image and
liver and hastily put them in the bed. — The ac-
counts which the Rabbinus give of divining by ter-
aphim are worthless.

Before speaking of the notices of the Egyptian
magicians in Genesis and Exodus, there is one
passage that may be examined out of the regular
order. Joseph, when his brethren left after their
second visit to buy corn, ordered his steward to
hide his silver cup in Benjamin's sack, and after-
wards sent him after them, ordering him to claim
it, thus: "Is not this [it] in which my lord drinketh,
and whereby Ile divineth?" (Gen. xlv. 5). The meaning of the latter clause has
been contested, Gesenius translating, "he could
surely foresee it" (ap. Barrett, Synopsis, in loc.),
but the other rendering seems far more probable,
especially as we read that Joseph afterwards said to his brethren, "Wot ye not that such a man as I
can certainly divinity?" (xiv. 15), — the same
word being used. If so, the reference would prob-
able be to the use of the cup in divining, and we
should have to infer that here Joseph was acting on
his own judgment, divination being not alone doubtful a forbidden act, but one of which he
called before Pharaoh had distinctly

Magicians, among the Arabs in the present
day, and cups bearing Chaldean inscriptions in ink have
been discovered by Mr. Layard, and probably show
that this practice existed among the Jews in Baby-
lonia in about the 7th century of the Christian era. In
the other use the cup or bowl was of very sec-
ondary importance. It was merely the receptacle
for water, in which, after the performance of magical rites, a boy looked to see what the magician
desired. This is precisely the same as the practice
of the modern Egyptian magicians, where the dif-
fERENCE that ink is employed and is poured into the
cup of the boy's hand is merely accidental.
A Gnostic papyrus in Greek, written in Egypt in
the earlier centuries of the Christian era, now preserved
in the British Museum, describes the practice of
the boy with a bowl, and alleges results strikingly
similar to the alleged results of the well-known
modern Egyptian magician, whose divination would
seem, therefore, to be a relic of the famous magic of
ancient Egypt. As this latter use only is of
the nature of divination, it is probable that to it
Joseph referred. The practice may have been
prevailing in his time, and hieroglyphic inscriptions
upon the bowl may have given color to the idea
that it had magical properties, and perhaps even
that it had thus led to the discovery of its place of
concentration, a discovery which must have struck
Joseph's brethren with the utmost astonishment.

The Aegyptians of Egypt are spoken of as a class
in the histories of Joseph and Moses. When
Pharaoh's officers were troubled by their dreams,
being in prison they were at a loss for an in-
terpreter. Before Joseph explained the dreams he
dismissed the power of interpreting save by the
Divine aid, saying, "Do not interpretations [be-
long] to God? tell me [them], I pray you" (Gen. xi. 8). In like manner when Pharaoh had
his two dreams we find that he had recourse to
those who professed to interpret dreams. We read:

"He sent and called for all the scribes of Egypt,
and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told
them his dream; but there was none that could
interpret them unto Pharaoh" (xli. 8; comp. ver.
24). Joseph, being sent for on the report of the
chief of the cup-bearers, was told by Pharaoh that
he had heard that he could interpret dreams.
Pharaoh said to Joseph, "If thou art able to
interpret God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace" (ver. 16). Thus,
from the expectations of the Egyptians and Joseph's
disavowals, we see that the interpretation of dreams
was a branch of the knowledge to which the ancient
Egyptian magicians pretended. The failure of the
Egyptians in the case of Pharaoh's dreams must
probably be regarded as the result of their inability
to give a satisfactory explanation, for it is unlikely
that they refused to attempt to interpret. The two

a The Masoretic text reads, "And Michal took the teraphim, and laid [it] upon the bed, and the mattress
(גניא) of she-goats [or goats' hair] she put at its head, and she covered [it] with a cloth " (or garment)
(1 Sam. xix. 13). The LXX. has "the liver of goats," having apparently found לֹא instead of לֹא.
(Kal ְוַּיֶּשׁ מַלְּכָה תַּאָסְפָּה, וַיּוֹסֵא עָלָיו כָּלֵב וַיְבָשֵׁא כָּלֵב אֵשׁ, וַיְבָשֵׁא כָּלֵב אֵשׁ). It is now,
however, considered to be a corruption.

b יֶּה יָּּכְלֵּה יְּצֻּר בְּנֶּה.

The modern Persians apply the word Ján, signi-
fying a cup, mirror, or even globe, to magical ves-
sels of this kind, and relate marvels of two which they say
belonged to their ancient king Jemshid and to Alex-

under the Great. The former of these, called Jám-i-
Jemmin or Jám-i-Jemshid, is famous in Persian poetry.
D'Herbelot quotes a Turkish poet who thus alludes to
this belief in magical cups: "When I shall have been
illuminated by the light of heaven my soul will be-
come the mirror of the world, in which I shall dis-
cover the most hidden secrets" (Biographique Orientale, a. v. "Glam")

c Modern Egyptians, 5th edit. chap. xi.
d Nimmer and Bobbitt, p. 3/9, &c. There is an
excellent paper on these bowls by Dr. Levy of Breslau,
in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenland. Gesellschaft,
x. p. 495, &c.

f See the Modern Egyptians, 5th edit. chap. xii. for
an account of the performances of this magician, and
Mr. Lane's opinion as to the causes of their occasional
apparent success.
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words used to designate the interlocutors sent for by Pharaoh are אָשִּׁיָּהוּ, "scribes" (?), and אָשִּׁיָּהוּ, "wise men," a
We again hear of the magicians of Egypt in the narrative of the events before the Exodus. They were summoned by Pharaoh to oppose Moses. The account of what they effected requires to be carefully examined, from its bearing on the question whether magic be an imposture. We read: 9 And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, Show a miracle for you: then shall you say unto Aaron, Take thy rod, and cast [it] before Pharaoh, [and] it shall become a serpent. 10 It is then related that Aaron did thus, and afterwards: 11 Then Pharaoh also called as wise men c and the enchanters: d now they, the scribes c of Egypt, did so by their secret arts: f for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents, but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods e (Ex. vii. 8-12). The rods were probably long staves like those represented on the Egyptian monuments, not much less than the height of a man. If the word used mean here a serpent, the Egyptian magicians may have feigned a change: if it signify a crocodile they could scarcely have done so. The names by which the magicians are designated are to be noted. That which we render "scribes" seems here to have a general signification, including wise men and enchanters. The last term is more definite in its meaning, denoting users of incantations. 9 On the occasion of the first plague, the turning the rivers and waters of Egypt into blood, the opposition of the magicians again occurs. 10 And the scribes of Egypt did so by their secret arts (vii. 22). When the second plague, that of frogs, was sent, the magicians again made the same opposition (viii. 7). Once more they appear in the history. The plague of lice came, and we read that when Aaron had worked the wonder the magicians opposed him: 11 And the scribes did so by their secret arts to bring forth the lice, but they could not: so there were lice upon man and upon beast. And the scribes said unto Pharaoh, This [is] the finger of God: but Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had said (viii. 18, 19, Heb. 14, 15). After this we hear no more of the magicians. All we can gather from the narrative is that the appearances produced by them were sufficient to deceive Pharaoh on three occasions. It is nowhere declared that they actually produced wonders, since the expression "the scribes did so by their secret arts:" is used on the occasion of their complete failure. Nor is their statement that in the wonders wrought by Aaron they saw the finger of God any proof that they recognized a power superior to the native objects of worship they invoked, for we find that the Egyptians frequently spoke of a supreme being as God. It seems rather as though they had said, "our juggles are of no avail against the work of a divinity." There is one later mention of these transactions, which adds to our information, but does not decide the main question. St. Paul mentions James and Jamies as having "withstood Moses," and says that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii. 8, 9). The Egyptian character of these names, the first of which is, in our opinion, found in hieroglyphics, does not favor the opinion, which seems inconsistent with the character of an inspired record, that the Apostle cited a prevalent tradition of the Jews. [JANES AND JAMES.]

We turn to the Egyptian illustrations of this part of the subject. Magic is a system of incantations and directions for making amulets, with the object of securing the future happiness of the disembodied soul. However obscure the belief of the Egyptians as to the actual character of the state of the soul after death may be to us, it cannot be doubted that the knowledge and use of the magical amulets and incantations treated of in the Ritual was held to be necessary for future happiness, although it was not believed that they alone could ensure it, since to have done good works, or, more strictly, not to have committed certain sins, was an essential condition to the idea that a similar Egyptian word was imitated: instances Abrech, Moses, and behemoth (יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם); but no one of these can be proved to be Egyptian in origin, and there is no strong ground for seeking any but a Hebrew etymology for the second and third (1 Tim. i. 13). The most similar word is Biminum, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם (Ps. lxxxi. 31, Heb. 22), which we suppose to be Egyptian, meaning Hermopolites, with perhaps, in the one place where it occurs, a reference to the wisdom of the citizens of Hermopolis Magna, the city of Thoth, the Egyptian Hermes, [HARMONIM.] We prefer to keep in the Hebrew derivation simply from יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, and to read "scribes," the idea of magicians being probably understood. The other word, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, does not seem to mean any special class, but merely the wise men of Egypt generally.

b יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם. c יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם. d יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם.

e יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם. f יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם.

9 The word יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, elsewhere יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם (ver. 22 viii. 7, 18, Heb. 3, 11), signifies "secret" or "hidden arts," from יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, יִבְּהַמֹּת שַׁם, "he or it was vered ever hid, or wrapped up."
at the auspittal of the soul in the great trial in Hades. The thoroughly magical character of the Ritual is most strikingly evident in the minute directions given for making amulets (Tochenbach, sh. 100, 129, 134), and the secrecy enjoined in one case to those thus occupied (133). The later chapters of the Ritual (163-165), held to have been added after the composition or compilation of the rest, which theory, as M. Chalas has well remarked, does not prove their much more modern date (Le Papyrus Magique Harris, p. 162), contain mystical names not bearing an Egyptian etymology. These names have been thought to be Ethiopian: they either have no signification, and are mere magical gibberish, or else they are, mainly at least, of foreign origin. Besides the Ritual, the ancient Egyptians had books of a purely magical character, such as that which M. Chalas has just edited in his work referred to above. The main source of their belief in the efficacy of magic appears to have been the idea that the souls of the dead, whether justified or condemned, had the power of revisiting the earth and taking various forms. This belief is abundantly used in the moral tale of "The Two Brothers," of which the text has been recently published by the Trustees of the British Museum (Select Papyri, Part II.), and we learn from this ancient papyrus the age and source of much of the machinery of medicinal fictions, both eastern and western. A likeness that strikes us at once in the ease of a fiction is not less true of the Ritual; and the perils encountered by the soul in Hades are the first rude indications of the adventures of the heroes of Arab and German romance. The regions of terror traversed, the mystic portals that open alone to magical words, and the monsters whom magic alone can deprive of their power to injure, are here already in the book that in part was found in the reign of king Menæches four thousand years ago. Bearing in mind the Nigritarian nature of Egyptian magic, we may look for the source of these ideas in primitive Africa. There we find the realities of which the ideal form is not greatly distorted, though greatly intensified. The forests that clothe the southern slopes of snowy Atlas, full of fierce beasts; the vast desert, untemanted save by harmful reptiles, swept by sand-storms, and ever burning under an unchanging sun; the marshes of the south, teeming with countless brutes of vast size and strength, are the several zones of the Egyptian Hades. The creatures of the desert and the plains and slopes, the crocodile, the pachyderms, the lion, panther, the gorilla, are the genii that hold this land of fear. If what dread must the first scanty population have held dangers and enemies still feared by their swarming posterity. No wonder then that the imaginative Nigritians were struck with a superstitious fear that certain conditions of external nature always produce with races of a low type, where a higher feeling would only be touched by the analogies of life and death, of time and eternity. No wonder that, so struck, the primitive race imagined the evils of the unseen world to be the recurrence of those against which they struggled while on earth. That there is some ground for our theory, besides the reminiscence which leads us to it, is shown by a usual Egyptian name of Hades, "the West," and that the wild regions west of Egypt might directly give birth to such fancies as form the common ground of the machinery, not the general belief, of the Ritual, as well as of the machinery of medieval fiction, is shown by the fables that the rude Arabs of our own day tell of the wonders they have seen.

Like all nations who have practised magic generally, the Egyptians separated it into a lawful kind and an unlawful. M. Chalas has proved this from a papyrus which he finds to contain an account of the prosecution, in the reign of Rameses III. (B.C. cir. 1220), of an official for unlawfully acquiring and using magical books, the king's property. The culprit was convicted and punished with death (p. 169 ff.).

A belief in unlucky and lucky days, in actions to be avoided or done on certain days, and in the fortune attending birth on certain days, was extremely strong, as we learn from a remarkable ancient calendar (Select Papyri, Part I.) and the evidence of writers of antiquity. A religious prejudice, or the occurrence of some great calamity, probably has the root of this observance of days. Of the former, the birthday of Typhon, the fifth of the Egyptian month, is an instance. Astrology was also held in high honor, as the calendars of certain of the tombs of the kings, stating the positions of the stars and their influence on different parts of the body, show us; but it seems doubtful whether this branch of magical arts is older than the XVIIIth dynasty, although certain stars were held in reverence in the time of the XVth dynasty. The belief in omens probably did not take an important place in Egyptian magic, if we may judge from the absence of direct mention of them. The superstition as to "the evil eye" appears to have been known, but there is nothing else that we can class with phenomena of the nature of animal magnetism. Two classes of learned men had the charge of the magical books: one of these, the name of which has not been read phonetically, would seem to correspond to the "scribes," as we render the word, spoken of in the history of Joseph; whereas the other has the general sense of "wise men," like the other class there mentioned.

There are no representations on the monuments that can be held to relate directly to the practice of this art, but the secret passages in the thickness of the wall, lately opened in the great temple of Denderah, seem to have been intended for some purpose of imposture.

The Law contains very distinct prohibitions of all magical arts. Besides several passages condemning them, in one place there is a specification which is so full that it seems evident that its object is to include every kind of magical art. The reference is to the practices of Canaan, not to those of Egypt, which indeed do not seem to have been brought away by the Israelites, who, it may be remarked, apparently did not adopt Egyptian idolatry, but only that of foreigners settled in Egypt.

Rempman.

The Israelites are commanded, in the place referred to, not to learn the abominations of the peoples of the Promised Land. Then follows this prohibition: "There shall not be found with thee one who offereth his son or his daughter by fire, a

his deductions; and the theory we have put forth of the origin of Egyptian magic is purely our own.
practitioner of divinations (מַרְעִי הַבָּדַע), a worker of hidden arts (מַרְעִי הָיוֹת), an augur (מַרְעִי הַנָּבֹע), an enchanter (מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה), or a fabricator of charms (מַרְעִי הַנָּצָר), or an inquirer by a familiar spirit (מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה), or a wizard (מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה), or a consultant of the dead (מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה). It is added that these are abominations, and that on account of their practice the nations of Canaan were to be driven out (Deut. xviii. 9-14, comp. 10, 11). It is remarkable that the offering of children should be mentioned in connection with magical arts. The passage in Mica, which has been supposed to preserve a question of Balak and an answer of Balaam, when the soothsayer was sent for to curse Israel, should be here noticed, for the questioner asks, after speaking of sacrifices of usual kinds, "Shall I give my first-born [for] my transgression, the fruit of my body [for] the sin of my soul?" (vi. 5-8). Perhaps, however, child-sacrifice is specified on account of its atrocity, which would connect it with secret arts, which we know were frequently in later times the causes of cruelty. The terms which follow appear to refer properly to eight different kinds of magic, but some of them are elsewhere used in a general sense. 1. מַרְעִי הַנָּצָר is literally "a diviner of divinations." The verb מִרְעָה is used of false prophets, but also in a general sense for divining, as in the narrative of Saul's consultation of the witch of Endor, where the king says "divine unto me" (משי הינע תאני), I pray thee, by the familiar spirit" (1 Sam. xxviii. 8). 2. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה conveys the idea of "one who acts covertly," and so "a worker of hidden arts." The meaning of the root הָיָה is covering, and the supposed connection with fascination by the eyes, like the notion of "the evil eye," as though the original root were "the eye" (הָיָה), seems untenable. 3. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה, which we render "an augur," is from יָנָה, which is literally the "he who hisses or whispers," and in Lev. is applied to the practice of enchantments, but also to divining generally, as in the case of Joseph's cup, and where, evidently referring to it, he tells his brethren that he could divine, although in both places it has been read more vaguely with the sense to foresee or make trial (Gen. xlv. 5, 15). We therefore render it by a term which seems appropriate but not too definite. The supposed connection of יָנָה with יָנָה as "a serpent," as though meaning serpent-divination, must be rejected, the latter word rather coming from the former, with the signification "a hisser." 4. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה signifies "an enchanter:" the original meaning of the verb was probably "he prayed," and the strict sense of this word "one who uses incantations." 5. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה seems to mean "a fabricator of material charms or amulets," if מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה, when used of practicing sorcery, means to bind magical knots, and not to bind a person by spells. 6. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה is "an inquirer by a familiar spirit." The second term signifies a "bottle," a familiar spirit consulted by a soothsayer, and a soothsayer having a familiar spirit. The LXX. usually render the plural מַרְעִי הַנָּצָר by ἡγαρτόν, which has been rashly translated "diviner," for it may not signify what we understand by the latter, but refer to the mode in which soothsayers of this kind gave out their responses: to this subject we shall recur later. The consulting of familiar spirits may mean no more than invoking them; but in the Acts we read of a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination (xxi. 16-18) in very distinct terms. This kind of sorcery — divination by a familiar spirit — was practised by the witch of Endor. 7. מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה, which we render "a wizard," is properly "a wise man," but is always applied to wizards and false prophets. Gesenius (Thes. s. v.) supposes that in Lev. xx. 27 it is used of a familiar spirit, but surely the reading "a wizard" is there more probable. 8. The last term, מַרְעִי הַנַּעֲרָה, is very explicit, meaning "a consultant of the dead:" necromancer is an exact translation if the original signification of the latter is retained, instead of the more general one it now usually bears. In the Law it was commanded that a man or woman who had a familiar spirit, or a wizard, should be stoned (Lev. xx. 27). An "enchantress" (משי הינע) was not to live (Ex. xxii. 18; Heb. xvi.). Using augury and hidden arts was also forbidden (Lev. xix. 26). The history of Balaam shows the belief of some ancient nations in the powers of soothsayers. When the Israelites had begun to conquer the land of Promise, Balak the king of Moab and the elders of Midian, resorting to Pharaon's expediency, sent by messengers with "the rewards of divination" (משי הינע) in their hands" (Num. xxii. 7) for Balaam the diviner (משי הינע), Josh. xiii. 22), whose fame was known to them though he dwelt in Aram. Balak's message shows what he believed Balaam's powers to be: "Behold, there is a people come out from Egypt: behold, they cover the face of the earth, and they abide over against me: come now therefore, I pray thee, curse me this people: for they [are] too mighty for me: peradventure I shall prevail, [that] we may smite them, and [that] I may drive them out of the land: for I wot that he whom thou blesses [is] blessed: and he whom thou cursest is curse" (Num. xxii. 5, 6). We are told, however, that Balaam, warned of God, first Ex. vi. 21: Ruth iv. 29, &c.), means "enchanter:" it was probably used as a proper name in a vague sense. This meaning suggests the probability that the Arab idea of the evil Jinn having been inclosed in bottles by Solomon was derived from some Jewish tradition.
said that he could not speak of himself, and then by inspiration blessed those whom he had been sent for to curse. He appears to have received the inspiration in a vision or a trance. In one place it is said, "And Balaam saw that it was good in the eyes of the Lord to bless Israel; and he went not, now as before, to the meeting enchanterments (בְּנֵי נֶדֶל), but he set his face to the wilderness" (xxiv. 1). From this it would seem that it was his wont to use enchantments, and that when on other occasions he went away after the sacrifices had been offered, he hoped that he could prevail to obtain the wish of those who had sent for him, but was constantly defeated. The building new altars of the mystic number of seven, and the offering of seven oxen and seven rams, seem to show that Balaam had some such idea; and the marked manner in which he declared "there is no enchantment (שֵׁלֶג) against Jacob, and no divination (כָּבָד) against Israel" (xxiii. 20), that he had come in the hope that they would have availed, the diviner here being made to declare his own powerlessness while he blessed those whom he was sent for to curse. The case is a very difficult one, since it shows a man who was used as an instrument of declaring God's will trusting in purposes of his own, and having availed himself of his divination for his own pleasure. The simplest explanation seems to be that Balaam was never a true prophet but on this occasion, when the enemies of Israel were to be singularly confounded. This history affords a notable instance of the failure of magicians in attempting to resist the Divine will.

The account of Saul's consulting the witch of En-dor is the foremost place in Scripture of those who appear to have received the spirit of divination, with which it is full cannot however be proved to be due to this art, for it has always been held by sober critics that the appearing of Samuel was permitted for the purpose of declaring the doom of Saul, and not that it was caused by the incantations of a sorceress. As, however, the narrative is allowed to be very difficult, we may look for a moment at the evidence of its authenticity. The details are strictly accordant with the account of the last time; there is a simplicity in the manners described that is foreign to a later time. The circumstances are agreeable with the rest of the history, and especially with all we know of Saul's character. Here, as ever, he is seen resolved to gain his ends without caring what wrong he does; he wishes to consult a prophet, and asks a witch to call up his shade. Most of all, the vigor of the narrative, showing us the scene in a few words, proves its antiquity and genuineness. We can see no reason whatever for supposing that it is an interpolation. "Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city. And Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land. And the Philistines gathered themselves together, and came and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel together, and they pitched in Gilboa." That the Philistines had advanced so far, spreading in the plain of Esdraelon, the garden of the Holy Land, shows the straits to which Saul had come. Here in times of faith Sisera was defeated by Barak, and the Midianites were smitten by Gideon; some of the army of the former perishing at En- dor itself (Ps. lxxix. 9, 10).

And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and enquire of her. And his servants said to him, Behold, [there is] a woman that hath a familiar spirit at En-dor. And Saul disguised himself, and put on other raiment, and he went, and two men with him, and they came to the woman by night." En-dor lay in the territory of Issachar, about 7 or 8 miles to the northward of Mount Gilboa. Its name, the "fountain of Dor," may connote it with the Phenician city Dor, which was on the coast to the westward. If so, it may have retained its stranger-population, and been therefore chosen by the witch as a place where she might with less danger than elsewhere practice her arts. It has been noticed that the mountain on whose slope the modern village stands is hollowed into rock-hewn caverns, in one of which the witch may probably have dwelt. [EN-DOR.] Saul's disguise, and his journeying by night, seem to have been taken that he might not alarm the woman, rather than because he may have passed through a part of the Philistine force. The Philistines held the plain, having their camp at Shunem, whither they had retired from their encampments. They were at first encamped a fountain at Jezreel, but when their enemies had advanced to Jezreel they appear to have retired to the slopes of Gilboa, whence there was a way of retreat either into the mountains to the south, or across Jordan. The latter seems to have been the line of flight, as, though Saul was slain on Mount Gilboa, his body was fastened to the wall of Beth-shan. Thus Saul could have scarcely reached En-dor without passing at least very near the army of the Philistines.

"And he said, Divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me [him] up, whom I shall name unto thee." It is noticeable that here witchcraft, the inquiring by a familiar spirit, and necromancy, are all connected as though but a single art, which favors the idea that the prohibited in Deuteronomy specifies every name by which magical arts were known. Rather than a single art, different kinds of arts, in order that no one should attempt to evade the condemnation of such practices by any subterfuge. It is evident that Saul thought he might be able to call up Samuel by the aid of the witch; but this does not prove what was his own general conviction, or the prevalent conviction of the Israelites on the subject. He was in a great extremity: his kingdom in danger: himself forsaken of God: he was weary with a night-journey, perhaps of risk, perhaps of great length to avoid the enemy, and faint with a day's fasting: he was conscious of wrong as, probably for the first time, he commanded unholy rites and heard in the gloom unholy incantations. In such a strait no man's judgment is steady, and Saul may have asked to see Samuel in a moment of sudden desperation when he had only meant to demand an oracular answer. It may even be thought that, yearning for the counsel of Samuel, and longing to learn if the net that he felt closing about him were one from which he should never escape, Saul had that keener sense that some say comes in the last

a Dor is said to have taken its name from Dorus, a son of Neptune, whose name reminds one of Tara, the founder of Tarentum.
hours of life, and so, conscious that the prophet's shade was near, or was about to come, at once sought to see and speak with it, though this had not been before purposed. Strange things we know occur at the moment when man feels he is about to die, and if there be any time when the unseen world is felt while yet unmentioned, it is when the soul comes first within the chink of its long-projected shadow. And the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land: wherefore thou hast cast thy soul out for my life, to cause me to die? And Saul spake to thy Lor'd, saying, [As] the Loard liveth, [there] shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing.

Nothing more shows Saul's desperate resolution than his thus swearing when engaged in a most holy act—a terrible profanity that makes the horror of the scene complete. Everything being prepared, the final act takes place.

Then said the woman, Whom shall I bring up unto thee? And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice unto Samuel, saying, What hast thou done to me? for thou hast not called me this night. And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou? And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth. And he said unto her, What is [is] his form? And she said, An old man cometh up: and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with [his] face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted [or "disturbed"] me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed: for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mightest make known unto me what I shall do. Then said Saul, Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath hitherto from the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, [even] to David: because thou obeyest not the voice of the Lord, nor executest his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day. Moreover, the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines, and thou shalt be no more a servant unto thine eyes and thy sons [be] with me: the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of Samuel; and there was no strength in him: for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night. (1 Sam xxviii. 3-20.) The woman clearly was terrified by an unexpected apparition when she saw Samuel. She must therefore either have been a very jingler, or one who had no power of working magical wonders at will. The sight of Samuel at once showed her who had come to consult her. The prophet's shade seems to have been preceded by some majestic shapes which the witch called gods. Saul, as it seems, interrupting her, asked his form, and she described the prophet as he was in his last days on earth. He had no more shape than the most hideous specter, such as the prophets used to wear, or wrapped in his winding-sheet. Then Saul knew it was Samuel, and bowed to the ground, from respect or fear. It seems that the woman saw the appearances, and that Saul only knew of them through her, perhaps not daring to look, else why should he have asked what form Samuel had? The prophet's complaint we cannot understand, in our ignorance as to the separate states: thus much we know, that state is always described as one of perfect rest or sleep. That the woman should have been able to call him up cannot be hence inferred: her astonishment shows the contrary; and it would be explanation enough to suppose that he was sent to give Saul the last warning, or that the earnestness of the king's wish had been permitted to disquiet him in his thoughts. Although the word disquieted need not be pushed to an extreme sense, and seems merely to mean the interruption of a state of rest, our translators wisely, we think, preferring this rendering to "disturbed," it cannot be denied that, if we hold that Samuel appeared, this is a great difficulty. However, we suppose that the prophet's coming was ordered, it is not unanswerable.

The declaration of Saul's doom agrees with what Samuel had said before, and was fulfilled the next day, when the king and his sons fell on Mount Gilboa. It may, however, be asked—Was the apparition Samuel himself, or a supernatural messenger in his stead? Some may even object to our holding it to have been an aught but a phantom of a sick brain; but if so, what can we make of the woman's conviction that it was Samuel, and the king's horror at the words he heard, or, as these would say, that he thought he heard? It was not only the hearing his doom, but the hearing it in a voice from the other world that stretched the faithless strongly man on the ground. He must have felt the presence of the dead, and heard the sound of a sepulchral voice. How else could the doom have come true, and not the king alone, but his sons, have gone to the place of disembodied souls on the morrow? for to be with the dead concerned the soul, not the body: it is no difficulty that the king's corpse was buried to the generous men of Jableshzilde, mindful of his old kindness, rescued it from the wall of Bethshan. If then the apparition was real, should we suppose it Samuel's? A reasonable criticism would say it seems to have been so; (for the supposition that a messenger came in his stead must be rejected, as it would make the speech a mixture of truth and untruth) and if asked what sufficient cause there was for such a sending forth of the prophet from his rest, would reply that we

9 We may instance the well-known circumstance that men who have been near death by drowning have asserted that in the last moments of consciousness all the events of their lives have passed before their minds. A friend of the writer assured him that he experienced this sensation, whenever he had a very bad fall in mountaineering, while he was actually falling. This is alluded to in the epistle.

10 "Between the saddle and the ground, I mercy sought, and mercy found."
know not the reason for such warnings as abound in the Bible, and that perhaps even at the eleventh hour, the door of repentance was not closed against the king, and his impuity might have been pardoned had he repented. Instead, he went forth in despair, and, when his sons had fallen and his army was put to the rout, sore wounded fell on his own sword.

From the beginning to the end of this strange history we have no warrant for attributing super-natural power to magicians. Viewed reasonably, it refers to the question of apparitions of the dead, as to which other places in the Bible leave no doubt. The connection with magic seems purely accidental. The witch is no more than a bystander after the first: she was Samuel, and that is all. The apparition may have been a terrible fulfillment of Saul's desire, but this does not prove that the measures he used were of any power. We have examined the narrative very carefully, from its detail and its remarkable character: the result leaves the main question unanswered.

In the later days of the two kingdoms magical practices of many kinds prevailed among the Hebrews, as we especially learn from the condemnation of them by the prophets. Every form of idola-trvry which the people had adopted in succession doubtless brought with it its magic, which seems to have remained with a strange tenacity that probably made it outweigh the false worship with which it was connected. Thus the use of teraphim, dating from the patriarchal age, was not abandoned even when the worship of the Canaanite, Phoenietian, and Syrian idols had been successively adopted.

In the historical books of Scripture there is little notice of magic, excepting that wherever the false prophets are mentioned we have no doubt an indication of the prevalence of magical practices. We are especially told of Josiah that he put away the workers with familiar spirits, the wizards, and the teraphim, as well as the idols and the other abominations of Judah and Jerusalem, in performance of the commands of the book of the Law which had been found (2 K. xxi. 24). But in the prophets we find several notices of the magic of the Hebrews in their times, and some of the magic of foreign nations. Isaiah says that the people had become "workers of hidden arts (דָּגַי בְּלָיָל) like the Philistines," and apparently alludes in the same place to the practice of magic by the Bene-Kedem (ii. 6). The nation had not only abandoned true religion, but had become generally addicted to magic in the manner of the Philistines, whose Egyptian origin (CAMPBELL) is consistent with such a condition. The origin of the Bene-Kedem is doubtful, but it seems certain that as late as the time of the Egyptian wars in Syria, under the XIXth dynasty, n. c. cir. 1800, a race, partly at least Mongoloid, inhabited the valley of the Orontes, among whom therefore we should again expect a national practice of magic, and its prevalence with their neighbors. Balbaam, too, dwell with the Bene-Kedem, though he may not have been of their race.

In another place the prophet reproves the people for seeking unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter" (viii. 19). The practices of one class of magicians are still more distinctly described, where it is thus said of Jerusalem: "And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, [and] shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be the voice of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust" (xxix. 3, 4).

Isaiah alludes to the magic of the Egyptians when he says that in their calamity "they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers (יוֹרֵדֵי נִפְלָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל), and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards" (xix. 3). And in the same manner he thus taunts Babylon: "Stand now with thy charmers, and with the multitude of thine enchantments, wherein thou hast labored from thy youth; if so be thou shalt be able to profit, if so be thou mayest prevail. Thou art weary in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the viewers of the heavens [astrologers], the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee" (xvii. 12, 13). The magic of Babylon is here characterized by the prominence given to astrology, no magicians being mentioned excepting practitioners of this art: unlike the case of the Egyptians, with whom astrology seems always to have held a lower place than with the Chaldean nation. In both instances the folly of those who seek the aid of magic is shown.

Micaiah, declaring the judgments coming for the crimes of his time, speaks of the prevalence of divination among prophets who most probably were such pretended prophets as the opponents of Jeremiah, not avowed prophets of idols, as Ahab's seem to have been. Concerning these prophets it is said, "Night [shall be] unto you, that ye shall not have a vision: and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divide; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them. Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded: yea, they shall all cover their lip: for [there is] no answer of God." (iii. 6, 7). Later it is said as to Jerusalem, "The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, [Is] not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us?" (ver. 11). These prophets seem to have practiced unlawful arts, and yet to have expected revelations.

Jeremiah was constantly opposed by false prophets, who pretended to speak in the name of the Lord, saying that they had dreamt, when they told false visions, and who practiced various magical arts (xiv. 14, xviii. 25, etc.), that these are "words of the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us," which is the several designations applied to those who counselled the people not to serve the king of Babylon may be used in contempt of the false prophets — xxix. 8, 9).

Ezekiel, as we should have expected, affords some remarkable details of the magic of his time, in the clear and forcible descriptions of his visions. From him we learn that fetishism was among the idolatries which the Hebrews, in the latest days of the

---

4 Let those who doubt this examine the representation in Rosellini's Monumenti Storici, i. p. ixxxviii.

5 word this may mean whisper ers, if it be the plural of נְפָלָיָה "a murmuring."
kingdom of Judah, had adopted from their neighbors, like the Romans in the age of general corruption that caused the decline of their empire. In a vision, in which the prophet saw the abominations of Jerusalem, he entered the chambers of imagery in the Temple itself: "I went in and saw: and there was all of every kind of abominable imagery, and abominable heads, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about." Here seventy elders were offering incense in the dark (viii. 7-12).

This imagery was probably borrowed from Egypt, for the description perfectly answers to that of the dark sanctuaries of Egyptian temples, with the sacred animals portrayed upon their walls, and does not accord with the character of the Assyrian sculptures, where creeping things are not represented as objects of worship. With this low form of idolatry an equally low kind of magic obtained, practiced by &ppleses who for small rewards made amulets by which the people were deceived, (xiii. 17, ad fin.). The passage must be allowed to be very difficult, but it can scarcely be doubted that amulets are referred to which were made and sold by these women, and perhaps also worn by &ppleses. Thus it is possible, and was probably the ease, that the women to whom Joseph, (ii. 18), refers, in the Hebrew text, "to the women that sew pillows upon all joints of the hands [elbows or armpits?], and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature to hunt souls!" (xiii. 18). If so, we have a practice analogous to that of the modern Egyptians, who hang amulets of the kind called "hemhāb" upon the right side, and of the Nubians, who hang them on the upper part of the arm. We cannot, in any ease, see how the passage can be explained as simply referring to the luxurious dress of the women of that time, since the prophet distinctly alludes to pretended visions and to divinations (ver. 21), using almost the same expressions that he applies in another place to the practices of the false prophets (xxii. 28). The notice of Nebuchadnezzar's divination by arrows, where it is said "he shuffled arrows" (xiv. 21), must refer to a practice the same or similar to the kind of divination by arrows called El-Meyzar, in use among the pagan Arabs, and forbidden in the Korān. [See HOSPITALITY.]

The references to magic in the book of Daniel relate wholly to that of Babylon, and not so much to the art as to those who used it. Daniel, when taken captive, was instructed in the learning of the Chaldeans and placed among the wise men of Babylon (ii. 18), by whom we are to understand the Magi (תרגום התפיס), for the term is used as including magicians (תפיס ה', תפיס ח), sorcerers (תפיס נ), enchanters (תפיס נ), astrologers (תפיס נ), and Chaldeans, the last being apparently the most important class (ii. 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 18, 24, 27; comp. i. 29). As in other cases the true prophet was put to the test with the magicians, and he succeeded where they utterly failed. The case resembles Pharaoh's, excepting that Nebuchadnezzar asked a harder thing of the wise men. Having forgotten his dream, he not only required of them an interpretation, but that they should make known the dream itself. They were perfectly ready to tell the interpretation if only they heard the dream. The king at once saw that they were impostors, and that if they truly had supernatural powers they could as well tell him his dream as its meaning. Therefore he decreed the death of all the wise men of Babylon; but Daniel, praying that he and his fellows might escape this destruction, had a vision in which the matter was revealed to him. He was accordingly brought before the king. When the prophet, he answered with knowledge of his own. "The secret which the king hath demanded, the wise men, the sorcerers, the magicians, the astrologers, cannot show unto the king; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets" (vv. 27, 28). "But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for [any] wisdom that I have more than any living" (30). He then related the dream and its interpretation, and was set over the province as well as over all the wise men of Babylon. Again the king dreamt: and though he told them the dream the wise men could not interpret it, and Daniel again showed the meaning (iv. 4, 5). In the relation of this event we read that the king called him "chief of the scribes," the second part of the title being the same as that applied to the Egyptian magicians (iv. 9; Chald. 6). A third time, when Belshazzar saw the writing on the wall, were sent to the wise men, and on the second day Daniel was brought before the king and the interpretation given (v.). These events are perfectly consistent with what always occurred in all other cases recorded in Scripture when the practitioners of magic were placed in opposition to true prophets. It may be asked by some how Daniel could take the post of chief of the wise men when he had himself proved their imposture. If, however, as we cannot doubt, the class was one of the learned generally, among whom some practiced magical arts, the case is very different from what it would have been had these wise men been magicians only. Besides, it seems almost certain that Daniel was providentially thus placed that, like another Joseph, he might further the welfare and ultimate return of his people. [MAGI.]

After the Captivity it is probable that the Jews gradually abandoned the practice of magic. Zechaariah speaks indeed of the deceit of teraphim and diviners (x. 2), and foretells a time when the very names of idols should be forgotten and false prophets have virtually ceased (xiv. 1-4), yet in neither case does it seem certain that he is alluding to the usages of his own day.

In the Apocrypha we find indications that in the later centuries preceding the Christian era magic was no longer practiced by the educated Jews. In the Wisdom of Solomon the writer, speaking of the Egyptian magicians, treats their art as an imposture (xiv. 7). The book of Tobit is an exceptional case. If we hold that it was written in Persia or a neighboring country, and, with Ewald, date its composition not long after the fall of the Persian empire, we may then assign this reference to a different state of society to [from] that of the Jews of Egypt and Palestine. If, however, it was written in Palestine about the time of the Maccabees, as others suppose, we must still recollect that it refers rather to the superstitions of the common people than to those of the learned. In either case its pretensions make it useless to follow as indicating the opinions of the time at whose writing it was done. It professes to relate to a period of which its writer could have known little, and borrows its idea of supernatural agency from Scripture, adding as much as was judged safe of current superstition.

In the N. T. we read very little of magic. The coming of Magi to worship Christ is indeed related
Matt ii. 1-12, but we have no warrant for supposing that they were magicians from their name, which the A. V. not unreasonably renders "wise men" [MAGI]. Our Lord is not said to have been opposed by magicians, and the Apostles and other early teachers of the Gospel seem to have rarely encountered them. Philip the deacon, when he preached at Samaria, found there Simon a famous magician, commonly known as Simon Magus, who had had great power over the people; he is not said to have been able to work wonders, nor, had it been so, is it likely that he would have soon been admitted into the Church (Acts viii. 9-24). When St. Barnabas and St. Paul were at Paphos, as they preached to the proconsul Sergius Paulus, Euphis, a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet (τιμων άθομος άγαθος), withstood them, and was struck blind for a time at the word of St. Paul (xiii. 6-12). At Ephesus, certain Jewish exorcists naturally falling, both Jews and Greeks were afraid, and abandoned their practice of magical arts. * And many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand [pieces] of silver (xix. 19). In the both Greek and Greeks seem to have been greatly addicted to magic, even after they had nominally joined the Church. In all these cases it appears that though the practitioners were generally or always Jews, the field of their success was with Gentiles, showing that among the Jews in general, or the educated class, the art had fallen into disrepute. Here, as before, there is no evidence of any real effect produced by the magicians. We have already noticed the remarkable case of the "damned having a spirit of divination" (σωτευμενοι, ἡμῶν ἀνώμονος πείρα τοῦ διανομοντωστι, which brought her master's much gain by foretelling) (Acts xix. 18), from whom St. Paul cast out the spirit of divination (xvi. 16-18). This is a matter belonging to another subject than that of magic.

Our examination of the various notices of magic in the Bible gives us this general result: They did not, as far as we know, exercise a real power positively that any but illusory results were produced by magical rites. They therefore afford no evidence that man can gain supernatural powers to use at his will. This consequence goes some way towards showing that we may conclude that there is no such thing as real magic: for although it is dangerous to reason on negative evidence, yet in a case of this kind it is especially strong. Had any but illusions been worked by magicians, surely the Scriptures would not have passed over a fact of so much importance, and one which would have rendered the prohibition of these arts far more necessary. The general belief of mankind in magic, or things akin to it, is of no worth, since the holding such current superstition in some of its branches, if we push it to its legitimate consequences, would lead to the rejection of faith in God's government of the world, and the adoption of a creed far below that of Plato.

From the conclusion at which we have arrived, that there is no evidence in the Bible of real results having been worked by supernatural agency used by magicians, we may draw this important inference, that the absence of any proof of the same in profane literature, ancient or modern, in no way militates against the credibility of the miracles recorded in Scripture.

R. S. P.

**MAGIDDO** ([Rom.] Μαγιδδώ; but Mai [i. e. Vat.], μετὰ Αδώνιος: and Alex. Ἀτατίοιος: Magidado), the Greek form of the name McGuinn). It occurs only in I Esd. i. 29. [MAGIDDOX.]

* MAGISTRATES has its generic sense of rulers, civil officers, in Ezx. vii. 25; Luke xii. 11; Tit. iii. 1; but in Acts xvi. 20 ff. is a specific term (στρατηγοι) referring to the darmavoi or protors at Philippi [see COLONY, Amer. ed.].

* MAGNIFICAL = magnificent, according to the present usage, applied to Solomon's Temple, only in 1 Chr. xxii. 5. It is the rendering of the

Hiph. inf. of בָּשָׁם. II.

**MA'GOG [תֶּבְמַגָּג] [see below]: Ma'agô; in Ezx. xxxiii. 6 [אֵו, Alex. אכ; in 1 Chr., Alex. מָגָגו: Magog]). The name Magog is applied in Scripture both to a person and to a land or people. In Gen. x. 2 (and 1 Chr. i. 5) Magog appears as the second son of Japheth in connection with Go- mer (the Cimmerians) and Madai (the Medes): in Ezx. xxxviii. 2, xxxix. 1, 6, it appears as a country or people of which Gog was the prince, in conjunction with Meshech (the Moschici), Tubal (the Tibarren), and Rosh (the Roxonians). In the latter of these senses there is evidently implied an etymological connection between Gog and Ma='ag, on the Magog being regarded by Ezekiel as a prefix significative of a country. In this case Gog contains the original element of the name, which may possibly have its origin in some Persian root. * The notices of Magog would lead us to fix a northern locality: not only did all the tribes mentioned in connection with it belong to that quarter, but it is expressly stated by Ezekiel that he was to come up from "the sides of the north" (xxxix. 2), from a country adjacent to that of Toghrah or Armenia (xxxvii. 6), and not far from "the isles" or mari-

Vulg. in consequence of the name Rosh not occurring elsewhere in Scripture. [Rosh.]

* Various etymologies of the name have been suggested, none of which can be absolutely accepted. Knobel (Volkert, p. 63) proposes the Sanskrit mah or maha, "great," and a Persian word signifying "mountain," which case the reference would be the Caucasian range. The terms "gaghi and magh" are still applied to some of the heights of that range. This etymology is supported by Von Bohlen (Introcl, to Gen. ii. 211). On the other hand, Bihatz (Comm. in Ezx.) connects the first syllable with the Coptic ma, "place," or the Sanskrit maha, "land," and the second with a Persian root, koka, "the moon," as though the term had reference to moon-worshippers.
time regions of Europe (xxxix. 6). The people of Magog further appear as having a force of cavalry (xxxviii. 5), and as armed with the bow (xxxix. 3). From the above data, combined with the consideration of the time at which Ezekiel lived, the conclusion has been drawn that Magog represents the important race of the Scythians. Josephus (Ant. i. 6, § 1) and Jerome (Quest. in Gen. xii. 2) among early writers adopted this view, and they have been followed in the main by modern writers. In identifying Magog with the Scythians, however, we must not be understood as using the latter term in a strictly ethnographical sense, but as a general expression for the tribes living north of the Caucasus. We regard Magog as essentially a geographical term, just as it was applied by the Syrians of the Middle Ages to Asiatic Tartary, and by the Arabs to the district between the Caspian and Euxine seas (Whitgift, Redb., v. s. v.). The inhabitants of this district in the time of Ezekiel were undoubtedly the people generally known by the classical name of Scythians. In the latter part of the 7th century B.C. they had become well known as a formidable power through the whole of western Asia. Forced from their original quarters north of the Caucasian range by the inroad of the Massagetae, they descended into Asia Minor, where they took Bithynia (v. c. 629), and maintained a long war with the Lydian monarchs; since they spread into Media (5th. c. 624), where they defeated Cyzicenes. They then directed their course to Egypt, and were bribed off by Permecedon: on their return they attacked the temple of Venus Frain at Ascalon. They were finally ejected in 519 B.C., after having made their name a terror to the whole eastern world (Herod. i. 192 ff.). The Scythians are described by classical writers as skilful in the use of the bow (Herod. i. 73, iv. 132; Xen. Anth. iii. 4, § 15), and even as the inventors of the bow and arrow (Plin. vii. 57): they were specially famous as mounted bowmen (psevzogarén: Herod. iv. 46; Thucyd. ii. 98); they also enjoyed vengeance executed upon them (xxxviii. 14-23) — a massacre so tremendous that seven months would hardly suffice for the burial of the corpses in the valley which should thenceforth be named Hamongog (xxxix. 11-16). The imagery of Ezekiel has been transferred in the Apocalypse to describe the final struggle between Christ and Antichrist (Rev. xx. 8). As a question of ethnology, the origin of the Scythians presents great difficulties: many eminent writers, with Niebuhr and Neumann at their head, regard them as a Mongolian, and therefore a non-Japhetic race. It is unnecessary for us to enter into the general question, which is complicated by the undefined and varying applications of the name Scythia and Scythians among ancient writers. As far as the Biblical notices are concerned, it is sufficient to state that the Scythians of Ezekiel's age — the Scythians of Herodotus — were in all probability a Japhetic race. They were distinguished on the one hand from the Arzigiata, a clearly Mongolian race (Herod. iv. 23), and they are connected on the other hand with the Agathyrsi, a clearly Indo-European race (iv. 10). The mere silence of so observant a writer as Herodotus, as to any striking features in the physical conformation of the Scythians, must further be regarded as a strong argument in favor of their Japhetic origin.

MAJOT-MISSARIE (Μαγωτος, Μισσαριος: Μέτωκος, Μισσαριος, literally, "terror on every side": the name given by Jeremiah to Ishur, the priest, when he smote him and put him in the stocks for prophesying against the holiness of Jerusalem (Jer. xx. 3)). The significance of the appellation is explained in the denunciation with which it was accompanied (ver. 4): "Thus saith Jehovah, Behold I will make thee a terror to thyself and to all thy friends." The LXX. must have connected the word with the original meaning of the root — to wander," for they keep up the play on the name in ver. 4. It is remarkable that the same phrase occurs in several other passages of Jeremiah (vi. 25, xx. 16, xlix. 3, xlix. 23; Lam. ii. 22), and is only found besides in Ps. xxxi. 13.

MAGUS/ASH (Μαγος, Ασηος, pers. moth-killer): Μαγος (Μαγος, Ασηος, [Vat.] Α. B. A. B., one of the heads of the people who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 20). The name is probably not that of an individual, but of a family. It is supposed by Calmet and Junius to be the same as Magus in Ezr. ii. 30.

MAHALAH (Μαχαλα: sickness): Μαχαλα (Μαχαλα, [sickness]): Μαχαλα, one of the three children of Hamankoth, the sister of Gilead (1 Chr. vii. 18). The name is probably that of a woman, as it is the same with that of Mahalath, the daughter of Zelophehad, also a descendant of Gilead the Manasseh.

MAHALALEL (Μαχαλαλα, [part. f. of the former]: Μαχαλαλα, [praise of God]): Μαχαλαλα, [praise of God]): Μαχαλαλα, [praise of God]). 1. The fourth in descent from Adam, according to the Sethite genealogy, and son of Cainan (Gen. v. 12, 13, 15-17; 1 Chr. i. 2). In the LXX. the names of Mahalalel and Mehujael, the fourth from Adam in the
genealogy of the descendants of Cain, are identical. Ewald recognizes in Mahalath the sung-god, or Apollo of the anteluvian mythology, and in his son Jared the god of water, the Indian Varuna (Gesch. i. 357), but his assertions are perfectly arbitrary.

2. [(Vat.] F.A. MA'ALEPH. A descendant of Perez, or the Perez, of the son of Judah, and ancestor of Athaliah, whose family resided in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. xii. 4).

MA'HALATH (םהלת [verb, harp, lyre]): Ma'acheloth, the daughter of Ishmael, and one of the wives of Esau (Gen. xxviii. 9). In the Elomite genealogy (Gen. xxxvi. 3, 4, 10, 13, 17) she is called Basemath, sister of Nebajoth, and mother of Ielem; but the Hebrew-Samaritan text has Mahalath throughout. On the other hand Basemath, the wife of Esau, is described as the daughter of Elon the Hittite (Gen. xxvi. 34). [Bashemath.]

MA'HALATH (םהלת [verb, harp, lyre]): [Rom. Mark.] Mahalath (Alex Malath: Mahalath), one of the eighteen wives of King Rehoboam, apparently his first (2 Chr. xi. 18 only). She was her husband's cousin, being the daughter of King David's son Jerimoth, who was probably the child of a concubine, and not one of his regular family. Josephus, without naming Mahalath, speaks of her as "a kinswoman" (Συγγενής τοῦ τιμ. Ant. viii. 10, § 1). No children are attributed to the marriage, nor is she again named. The ancient Hebrew text (Crepid) in this passage has "son" instead of "daughter." The latter, however, is the correction of the K'ri, and is adopted by the LXX., Vulgate and Targums, as well as by the A. V. G.

MA'HALATH (םהלת [see below]: Ma'achel.) The title of Ps. lxi. in which this rare name occurs was rendered in the Geneva version, "To him that excelleth on Mahalath:" which was explained in the margin to be "an instrument or kind of note." This expresses in short the opinions of most commentators. Connecting the word with מָחֵל, machol (Ex. xv. 20; Ps. cl. 4), rendered "dance" in the A. V., but supposed by many from its connection with instruments of music to be one itself (Dance, vol. i. p. 538 b), Jerome renders the phrase "on Mahalath" by "per chordum," and in this he is supported by the translations of Theodotion (ἐπάνω τῆς κιθαρᾶς), Symmachus (בַּד אֵחֹד), and Aquila (אֶחֹד אֵחֹד), quoted by Theodoret (Comm. in Ps. lii.). Augustine (Enarr. in Ps. liii.) gives the title of the Psalm, "in finem pro Amulek intellectus ipsi David: "explaining "pro Amulech," as he says from the Hebrew, "for one in labor or sorrow" (pro parturiente sive dolore), by whom he understands Christ, as the subject of the psalm. But in another passage (Enarr. in Ps. lxxviii.) he gives the word in the form meloch, and interprets it by the Latin choras: having in the first instance made some confusion with מַחְלָל, "sorrow," which forms part of the proper name "Amulek." The title of Ps. liii. in the Chaldee and Syriac versions contains no trace of the word, which is also omitted in the almost identical Ps. xiv. From his fact alone it might be inferred that it was not attended to point etymologically to the contents of the psalm, as Hengstenberg and others are inclined to believe. Alas Ezra understands it by the name of a melody to which the psalm was sung, and R. Solomon Jarchi explains it as "the name of a musical instrument," adding however immediately, with a play upon the word, "another discourse of the sickness (macholah) of Israel when the Temple was hild waste." Calvin and J. H. Michaelis, among others, regarded it as an instrument of music or the commencement of a melody. Junius derived it from the root מַחֲלָל, child, "to bore, perforate," and understood it by a wind instrument of some kind, like Nebiloth in Ps. xii.: but his etymology is certainly wrong. Its connection with machol is equally uncertain. Joel B. in the second preface to his notes on the Psalms in Mendelssohn's Bible, mentions three opinions as current with regard to the meaning of Mahalath; some regarding it as a feminine form of machol, others as one of the stringed instruments (the flute, according to De Wette's translation of Ps. lii.), and others again as a stringed instrument. Between these conflicting conjectures, says he, it is impossible to decide. That it was a stringed instrument, played either with the fingers or a quill, is maintained by Simonis (Lex. Heb.), who derives it from an unused Arabic root ملأح, to sweep. But the most probable of all conjectures, and one which genealogists approves, is that of Lord, who quotes the Ethopic name, by which the subject of the LXX. is rendered in Gen. iv. 21 (Simonis, Apocryphon Enochum, p. 475). Fürst (Hebr. s. v.) explains Mahalath as the name of a musical corps dwelling at Axel-Mekhol, just as by gittith he understands the band of Levite minstrels at Gith Kinnmon.

On the other hand, the opinion that Mahalath contains an enigmatical indication of the subject of the psalm, which we have seen hinted at in the quotations from Jarchi given above, is adopted by Hengstenberg to the exclusion of every other. He translates "on Mahalath" by "on sickness," referring to the spiritual malady of the sons of men (Comm. über die Psalmen.). Lengerke (die Psalmen) adopts the same view, which had been previously advanced by Arias Montano. A third theory is that of Dlitzsch (Comm. ad. d. Psalter), who considers Mahalath as indicating to the choir the manner in which the psalm was to be sung, and compares the modern Italian method, in which the conductor leaves it untranslated and unexplained, regarding it as probably an abbreviation of a longer sentence (Dichter d. Alt. Tanzes, i. 174). The latest speculation upon the subject is that of Mr. Thrupp, who, after dismissing as mere conjecture the interpretation of Mahalath as a musical instrument, or as sickness, propounded, as more probable than either, that it is "a proper name borrowed from the, xxviii. 17, and used by Delitzsch, as an enigmatical designation of Abigail, in the same manner as, in Psalms vii., xxiv., the names Cush and Ahimelech are employed to denote Shimee and Achish. The real Mahalath, Esau's wife, was the sister of Nebajoth, from whom were descended an Arabian tribe famous for their wealth in sheep; the name might be therefore not unfitly applied to one who, though now married to David, had till recently been the wife of the rich sheep-owner of the village of Carmel" (Introit, to the Psalms, i. 314). It can scarcely be said that Mr. Thrupp has replaced conjecture by certainty.

W. A. W.
MAHALATH LEANNOTH (מַחַלְת לֶאֲנָנֹת׃ Mæchlih thw ānānihā: Mahalath ad respondendum). The Geneva version of Ps. lxxxvii., in the title of which these words occur, has "upon Mahalath Leannoth," and in the margin, "that is, to humble. It was the beginning of a song, by the time whereof this Psalm was sung." It is a remarkable proof of the obscurity which envelops the former of the two words that the same commentator explains it differently in each of the passages in which it occurs. In De Wette's translation it is a "flute" in Ps. liii., a "guitar" in Ps. lxxviii.; and while Jarchi in the former passage explains it as a musical instrument, he describes the latter as referring to "one sick of love and affliction who was afflicted with the punishments of the Captivity," Symmachus, again, as quoted by Theodoret (Comm. in Ps. 87), has δίκαιος, unless this be a mistake of the copyst for Δίκαιός as in Ps. liii. Augustine and Theodoret both understand incubioth of responsive singing. Theophylact says "they danced while responding to the music of the organ," Jerome, in his version of the Hebrew, has περι χορομ α δρα πρε κενον δο μ ην. The Hebrew הַשָּׁם in the Ps. Conj., certainly signifies πρὸς σιγᾶ, as in Ex. xxxii. 18; Is. xxvii. 2; and in this sense it is taken by Ewald in the title of Ps. lxxviii. In like manner Junius and Tremellius render πρὸς Mahalath Leannoth πρὸς to be sung to the wind instruments. There is nothing, however, in the construction of the psalm to show that it was adapted for responsive singing; and if leannoth be simply πρὸς to sing, it would seem, as Olshausen observes, almost unnecessary. It has reference, more probably, to the character of the psalm, and might be rendered πρὸς to humble, or affliction, in which sense the root occurs in verse 7. In support of this may be compared, πρὸς to bring to remembrance, in the titles of Ps. xxxviii. and lix.; and πρὸς to thank, 1 Th. xvi. 7. Mr. Trapp remarks that this psalm (lxxviii.) "should be regarded as a solemn exercise of humiliation: it is more deeply melancholy than any other in the Psalter" (intr. to the Psalms, ii. 99). Hengstenberg, in accordance with the view he takes of Mahalath, regards Ps. lxxviii., as the prayer of one recovered from severe bodily sickness, rendering leannoth concerning affliction, and the whole πρὸς on the sickness of distress," Luscher has a similar explanation, which is the same with that of Tischendorf, but is too forced.

W. A. W.

MAHAL (מַחַל; sich, infrm.: Mo'ala; [Vat.] Alex. Mo'ala; Melob, Mahali, the son of Merari. His name occurs in the A. V. but once in this form (Ex. vi. 19).

MAHANAIM (מַחָנָּאִム) = two camps or hosts: [Παραμιδία] Παραμιδίας. [Tom. Kamil. Vat.] Kamik: Ma'amī. Mau'mims. [Kama'mi, rtz:] Joseph. Θεού στρατηγόν: [Mahanaim], Μαναήμ, [Castra], a town on the east of the Jordan, intimately connected with the early and middle history of the nation of Israel. It purports to have received its name at the most important

This paragraph is added in the LXX.

For this observation the writer is indebted to a sermon by Prof. Stanley Marlorough, 1853."

a To the latter Josephus testifies: Παραμιδία — so he renders the Hebrew Mahanaim — καλλίτερα κα"

b Ανάγκης χώρας (Int. vii. 9, § 8).

c Jabbok, παραβιον, wrestled, παραβιον.
occupy any of the towns of Benjamin or Ephraim, which were then in the hands of the Philistines, he fixed on Mahanaim as his head-quarters. There the new king was crowned over all Israel, east as well as west of the Jordan (2 Sam. ii. 9). From thence Abner made his disastrous expedition to Gideon (ver. 12), and there apparently the unfortunate Ishboseth was murdered (iv. 5), the murderers making off to Hebron by the way of the valley of the Jordan.

The same causes which led Abner to fix Ishboseth's residence at Mahanaim probably induced David to take refuge there when driven out of the western part of his kingdom by Absalom. He proceeds thither without hesitation or inquiry, but as if when Jerusalem was lost it was the one alternative (2 Sam. xvii. 24; 1 K. ii. 8). It was then a walled town, capacious enough to contain the "hundreds" and the "thousands" of David's followers (viii. 1, 4; and compare "ten thousand," ver. 3); with gates, and the usual provision for the watchman of a fortified town (see the remark of Josephus quoted in the note). But its associations with royal persons were not fortunate. One king had already been murdered within its walls, and it was here that David received the news of the death of Absalom, and made the walls of the "chamber over the gate" resound with his cries.

Mahanaim was the seat of one of Solomon's commission officers (1 K. iv. 14); and it is alluded to in the Song which bears his name (vi. 13), in terms which, though very obscure, seem at any rate to show that at the date of the composition of that poem it was still in repute for sanctity, possibly famous for some ceremonial commemorating the original vision of the patriarch: "What will ye see in the Shishanite? We see as it were the dance (mehelbâh, a word usually applied to dances of a religious nature; see vol. i. p. 539) of the two hosts of Mahanaim.

On the monument of Sheshouk (Shishak) at Karmak, in the 22d cartouch — one of those which are believed to contain the names of Israelite cities conquered by that king — a name appears which is read as Mâ-hor-â-nâ, that is, Mahanaim. The adjoining cartouches contain names which are read as Mied-er-shem, Shumen, Megiddo, Beth-horon, Gideon, and other Israelite names, mucchuc, Geras, der Nuchwinder, Egypets, etc., p. 61). If this interpretation may be relied on, it shows that the "oasis of Shishak was more extensive than we should gather from the records of the Bible ([2 Chr. xii.]), which are occupied mainly with occurrences at the metropolises. Possibly the army entered by the plains of Philistia and Sharon, ravaged Edromick and some towns like Mahanaim just beyond Jordan, and then retraced, either by the same route or by the Jordan Valley, to Jerusalem, attacking it last. This would account for Rehobom's non-resistance, and also for the fact, of which special mention is made, that many of the chief men of the country had taken refuge in the city. It should, however, be remarked that the names occur in most promiscuous order, and that none has been found resembling them.

As to the identification of Mahanaim with any modern site or remains, little can be said. To Eusebius and Jerome it appears to have been unknown. A place called Mâhëkh does certainly exist among the villages of the east of Jordan, though its exact position is not so certain. The earliest mention of it appears to be that of the Jewish traveller hap-Parchi, according to whom "Mâhanim is Mâhëkh, and stands about half a day's journey not confined to Jebel from Beth- saman." (Zimm. in Ascher's Bej. of Tabitha, p. 482) Mahëkh is named in the lists of Dr. Eil Smith among the places of Jebel Ajlôn (Kob. Bibl. Res. 1st ed., iii. App. 168). It is marked on Kiepert's map (1566) as exactly east of Beth-shan, but about 30 miles distant therefrom — i. e. not half a long whole day's journey. It is also mentioned, and its identity with Mahanaim upheld, by Porter (Hunbok, ii. 643). The name Mähneh stands from the Jordan and from both the Wady Zârâk and the Yarnâk — each of which has claims to represent the torrent Jabokk — seems to forbid this conclusion. At any rate the point may be recommended to the investigation of future travellers east of the Jordan.

* Mr. Porter's remark (Hunbok, ii. 322) is merely that "perhaps" Mähneh may be the ancient Mahanaim; but he cannot be said to "uphold" that identity (see above). In his more recent article on this name in Kitto's Cyclo. of Biblical Literature (1856) he suggests that "the ruins of Gerasa, the most extensive and splendid east of the Jordan, may occupy the site of Mahanaim." On the other hand, Mr. Tristram, who visited Mahanaim, regards the other as altogether the better opinion. He describes the place as near "a fine natural pond, with traces of many buildings, grass-grown and beneath the soil," and "sufficiently extensive to have belonged to a considerable place," though "there is no trace of a wall, such as must have been there when David sat in the gate and wept for his son Absalom." He admits that the situation of Mähneh so far north of the Jabok presents some difficulty, but argues that this and other objections are not insuperable. "Mähneh is on the borders of Bashan (see Josh. xiii. 3), and though to the north, it is also to the east of the Jabok, and therefore outside of the line where the river was the boundary of Gilead and Bashan. It is probable, also, that in Genesis the "Mount of Gilead" may be used in a general significance for the "Jebel Gilead," including also Ajlôn, which was certainly a portion of Gilead. Considering the geography of the region, it would have been more natural for Jacob to take this course in his flight from Laban, than to have gone south to Jebel Osha, and then turned northwards again to cross the deep ravine of the Jabok. There is therefore, I conceive, every probability that the name of Mahanaim has been preserved in Mähneh, and that these grass-grown mounds represent all that is left of the capital of Ishboseth (2 Sam. ii. 8) and the refuge of David ("Land of Israel," 2d ed., p. 487 f.).

Mr. Grose also, who writes the above article, represents Mähneh as probably Mahanaim in his Index to Clark's Bible Atlas, p. 102. It must be that he would abate something at present from the force of his own objections as urged above. The region is still remarkable for its forests of oaks. It was in the boughs of such a tree that Absalom was caught by his hair, and, thus entangled, was killed. (2 Sam. xvi. 22). The defeat, too, of Absalom and his army was the more complete because "the battle was scattered over the face of all the country, and the wool..."
decoured more people that day than the sword decoured" (2 Sam. viii. 21). The ruins of Mahaneh-Dan are on one of the branches of Wady el-Mahaneh, which is known as Wady Melech on that account (Rob. Phys. Geogr. p. 86).

MAHANEH-DAN (מַחָנֵה-דָּן): [Rom. Trapf^-. H.]. 

A name which commemorates the last encampment of the band of six hundred Danite warriors before setting out on their expedition to Laish. The position of the spot is specified with great precision, as "behind Kirjath-jearim" (Judg. xvii. 12), and as "between Zorah and Eshtaol" (xii. 23); here the name is translated in the A.V., Kirjath-jearim is identified with tolerable certainty in Kavret el-Emeth, and Zorah in Socor, about 7 miles S.W. of it. But no site has yet been suggested for Eshtaol which would be compatible with the above conditions, requiring as they do that Kirjath-jearim should lie between it and Zorah. In Kastel, a "remarkable conical hill about an hour from Kavret el-Emeth, towards Jerusalem," south of the road, we have a site which is not dissimilar in name to Eshtaol, while its position sufficiently answers the requirements. Mr. Williams (Holy City, 1. 12 note) was shown a site on the north side of the Wady Isma'il, N. E. from Dir el-Horre, which bore the name of Kirjath Melemeneh, and which he suggests may be identical with Mahaneh-Dan. The position is certainly very suitable; but the name does not occur in the lists or maps of other travellers—not even of Tolkler (Duitsche Wunderwelt, 1839); and the question must be left with that started above, of the identity of Kastel and Eshtaol, for the investigation of future explorers and Arabic scholars.

The statement in xviii. 12 of the origin of the name is so precise, and has so historical an air, that it supplies a strong reason for believing that the event there recorded took place earlier than those in xii. 25, though in the present arrangement of the book they come after them.

G.

MAHARAI [3 syll.] (מַהֲרָאִים): [hairy, aery?].

Nephi; Alex. Mara'ei, in 2 Sam. xxiii. 28; Mara'i; [Vat. F. Nephe], Alex. Mara'ei, 1 Chr. vii. 30; Meqa'ei, Alex. Mara'ei, 1 Chr. xxvii. 13: Mahulites, Merarites, 1 Chr. xxvii. 14), an inhabitant of Nezophah in the tribe of Judah, and one of David's captains. He was of the family of Zerah, and commanded the tenth monthly division of the army.

MAHATHIT (מַחַתית [perh. fere pin cencer]):

Ma'dit; [Vat. Me'ot; Meathoit]. 1. The son of Amosai, a Kohathite of the house of Korah, and ancestor of Heman the singer (1 Chr. vi. 33). In ver. 23 he is called AHIMAOTH (Hervey, General, p. 215).

2. [Alex. Me'ot, 2 Chr. xxvii. 12; [Vat., by inclusion of the following word, Chavwhranan, 2 Chr. xxvii. 13.]) Also a Kohathite, who, in the reign of Hezekiah, was appointed, as one of the representatives of his house, to assist in the purification of the Levites, by which they prepared themselves to cleanse the Temple from the traces of idolatrous worship. He was apparently the same who, with other Levites, had the charge of the tithes and dedicated offerings, under the superintendence of Zosoniah and Shimeon.

MAHITES, THE

MAHAVITE, THE (מַהֲוֹאִית, i. e. "the Mahavites"): [Rom. Ἄφατ; Vat. F.A.]. [Mias. o Mavater: Mahamathites], the designation of Edel, one of the warriors of king David's guard, whose name is preserved in the catalogue of 1 Chronicles only (xi. 46). It will be observed that the word is plural in the Hebrew text, but the whole of the list is evidently in the singular state, so that it is impossible to draw any inference from that circumstance. The Targum has מַהֲוֹאִית, "from Mahavana." Komitoff (Dissert. 213) conjectures that originally the Hebrew may have stood מַחֲוָא, "from the Halvites." Others have proposed to insert an N and read "the Mahamantine" (First, Helb. p. 721 a; Bertheau, Chronicl, p. 136).

MAHAKIOTH (מַהֲקֵי-וֹת, [vivious]):

Mea'-Coh; [Vat. in ver. 1, Me'a-Coh; Alex. Maa-Coath: Mahahoch], one of the 14 sons of Hemam the Kohathite, who formed part of the Temple choir, under the leadership of their father with Asaph and Jeduthun. He was chief of the 2nd course of twelve musicians (1 Chr. xxv. 4, 30), whose office to it was to blow the horns. [HOTHAU, Amer. ed.]

MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ (מַהֲרֵה-שָׁלָל-הַשַּׁלָּח בָּזָ:):

Tαχύως σκέπασθαι ζηως παρωμήνως: Accedent spoliis detrahente festina, son of Issah, and younger brother of Sheer-jashub, of whom nothing more is known than that his name was given by Divine direction, to indicate that Danascus and Zanaria were soon to be plundered by the kings of Assyria (2 Kings v. 26; comp. 153). In reference to the grammatical construction of the several parts of the name, whether the verbal parts are imperative, indicative, infinitives, or verbal adjectives, leading versions, as well as the opinions of critics, differ; though all agree as to its general import (comp. Borelchiser in loc.).

E. — II. e.

MAHAL (מַהֲלוֹא, [vivaceous]):

Maad; Num. xxxi. 33; Maada. [Alex. Maala]. Num. xxvii. i7; Josh. xxvii. 3: Maada, Num. xxxvi. 11; Maad; Alex. Moala; 1 Chr. vii. 18: Maada in all cases, except Moladi, 1 Chr. vii. 18), the eldest of the five daughters of Zelophehad, the grandson of Manasseh, in whose favor the law of succession to an inheritance was altered (Num. xxxvii. 1-14). She married her cousin, and received as her share a portion of the territory of Manasseh, east of the Jordan.

MAHL (מַהֲלָה, [sickly, pain]):

Mo'la; [Vat. Mo'la, and once Mo'la: Moladi]. 1. The son of Merari, the son of Levi, and ancestor of the family of the Mahites (Num. iii. 20; 1 Chr. vi. 19, 29; xxiv. 20). In the last quoted verse there is apparently a gap in the text, Lihani and Shimei belonging to the family of Gershom (comp. ver. 20, 42), and Eleazar and Kish being afterwards described as the sons of Mahal (1 Chr. xxiii. 21, xxiv. 28), one of his descendants. Sheborah, by the lineage of one of the ministers to the Temple in the days of Ezra (Ezr. viii. 18). He is called MAHALI in the A. V. of Ex. vi. 19, Moli in 1 Esdr. viii. 47, and MAHUL in the margin.

2. The son of Mushi, and grandson of Merari (1 Chr. vi. 47, xxiv. 23, xxiv. 39).

MAHLITES, THE (מַהֲלוֹאִים [see above])
MAHLON (םהלון) [pining]: Mahlah, the first husband of Ruth. He and his brother Chilion were sons of Eli'nechac and Naomi, and are described, exactly in the same terms with a subsequent member of their house — Jesse, as — "Ephratites of Bethlehem-judah" (Ruth i. 2, 5). Like his brother, Mahlon died in the land of Moab without issue, which in the Targum on Ruth (i. 5) is explained to have been a judgment for their transgression of the law in marrying a Moabitess. In the Targum on 1 Chr. iv. 22, Mahlon is identified with Joash, possibly on account of the double meaning of the Hebrew word which follows, and which signifies both "had dominion" and "married." (See that passage.) [CHILION, Amer. ed.]

MAHOL (םMahon) [a dance]: Mel: Alex. Mayhok: Mahol. The father of Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, Chalcol, and Darda, the four men mentioned for wisdom next to Solomon himself (1 K. iv. 31), who in 1 Chr. ii. 6 are the sons and immediate descendants of Zerah. Mahol is evidently a proper name, but some consider it an appellative, and translate the "sons of Mahol" by "the sons of song," or "sons of the choir," in reference to their skill in music. In this case it would be more correct to render it "sons of the dance;" nakhol corresponding to the Greek χορός in its original sense of "a dance in a ring," though it has not followed the meanings which have been attached to its derivatives "chorus" and "choir." Jarchi says that "they were skilled in composing hymns which were recited in the dances of song;" an explanation still is that Ethan and his brethren the minstrels were called "the sons of Mahol," because nakhol is the name of an instrument of music in Ps. cl. 4. Josephus (Ant. vii. 2, § 5) calls him Iadov. W. A. W.

MAIA'NEAS [Maias]: Mi'nahas; [Ahd. Ma'ناس]; om. in Vulg.: = MAISEMATH, 7 (1 Esdr. iv. 48); probably a corruption of MAASAS.

*MAIL. [A'Mis, li. i.]

*MAINSAIL, Acts xxvii. 40. [Simp. (6.)]

MA'KAZ (מַּקָּז) [enl., perh. border-town]: [Rom. M'కe; Vat. M'కe; Alex. M'कe; M'कe], a place, apparently a town, named once only (1 K. iv. 9), in the specification of the jurisdiction of Solomon's commissarial officer, Den-Dekar. The places which accompany it — Shocal, Beth-shemen, and Eloa-beth-hanan — seem to have been on the western slopes of the mountains of Judah and Benjamin, i. e. the district occupied by the tribe of Dan. But Makaz has not been discovered. Michmash — the reading of the LXX. (but of no other version) — is hardly possible both for distance and direction, though the position and subsequent importance of Michmash, and its great fertility of its neighborhood, render it not an unlikely seat for a commissarial officer.

MAKKEDAH (מַּקְּדָה) [place of shepherds]: Mekh'dah, once [Jos. xv. 41] Makkedah [Vat. An. Jos. x. 28]: Alex. M'ke; Syr. Mokor, and Naboth: M'ke'doth, a place memorable in the annals of the conquest of Canaan as the scene of the execution by Joshua of the five confederate kings: an act by which the victory of Beth-horon was sealed and consummated, and the subjection of the entire southern portion of the country insured. Makkedah is first mentioned (Jos. x. 10) with Azekah, in the narrative of the battle of Beth-horon, as the point to which the rout extended; but it is difficult to decide whether this refers to one of the operations in the earlier portion of the fight, or is not rather an anticipation of its close — of the circumstances related in detail in vv. 11 and 16, &c. But with regard to the event which has conferred immortality on Makkedah — the "crowning mercy" — (if we may be allowed to borrow an expression from a not dissimilar transaction in our own history) — there is fortunately no obscurity or uncertainty. It unconsciously occurred in the afternoon of that tremendous day, which was like no day before or after it." The order of the events of the twenty-four hours which elapsed after the departure from the ark and tabernacle on the camp seems to have been as follows. The march from the depths of the Jordan valley at Gilgal, through the rocky defiles of the ravines which lead up to the central hills, was made during the night. By or before dawn they had reached Gilzean: then — at the favorite hour for such surprises — came the sudden onset and the first carnage; then the chase and the appeal of Joshua to the rising sun, just darting his level rays over the ridge of the hill of

* MAKE has the sense of "do," "be occupied with," — "What makest thou in this place" (Judg. xvi. 3). The use also of "make" as signifying "pretend," "sigh" (Josh. viii. 15, 16; 2 Sam. xii. 6; Luke xxiv. 23) deserves notice.

MAKRED (M'ךד; Alex. M'ךד; Syr. Mokor, and Naboth: M'ךד), one of the "strong and great" cities of Gilead — Josephus says Galilee, but this must be an error — into which the Jews were driven by the Amorites under Moabus, and from which they were delivered by Judas Macacobaus (1 Macc. v. 26, 36; in the latter passage the name is given in the A. V. Makkedah). By Josephus (Ant. xii. 8, § 3) it is not mentioned. Some of the other cities named in this narrative have been identified; but no name corresponding to Makked has yet been discovered; and the conjecture of Schwarz (p. 230) that it is a corruption of MINNITH forミニ with, though ingenious, can hardly be accepted without further proof.

MACKELETH (מַּכּלֶת) [M'ךל': Mekeloth], a place only mentioned in Num. xxiii. 25 as that of a desert encampment of the Israelites. The name is plural in form, and may signify "places of meeting." H. H.

MAKKE'DAH (מַּקְּדַה) [place of shepherds]: Mekedah, once [Jos. xv. 41] Makkedah [Vat. An. Jos. x. 28]: Alex. M'ke; Syr. Mokor, and Naboth: M'ke'doth, a place memorable in the annals of the conquest of Canaan as the scene of the execution by Joshua of the five confederate kings: an act by which the victory of Beth-horon was sealed and consummated, and the subjection of the entire southern portion of the country insured. Makkedah is first mentioned (Jos. x. 10) with Azekah, in the narrative of the battle of Beth-horon, as the point to which the rout extended; but it is difficult to decide whether this refers to one of the operations in the earlier portion of the fight, or is not rather an anticipation of its close — of the circumstances related in detail in vv. 11 and 16, &c. But with regard to the event which has conferred immortality on Makkedah — the "crowning mercy" — (if we may be allowed to borrow an expression from a not dissimilar transaction in our own history) — there is fortunately no obscurity or uncertainty. It unconsciously occurred in the afternoon of that tremendous day, which was like no day before or after it." The order of the events of the twenty-four hours which elapsed after the departure from the ark and tabernacle on the camp seems to have been as follows. The march from the depths of the Jordan valley at Gilgal, through the rocky defiles of the ravines which lead up to the central hills, was made during the night. By or before dawn they had reached Gilzean: then — at the favorite hour for such surprises — came the sudden onset and the first carnage; then the chase and the appeal of Joshua to the rising sun, just darting his level rays over the ridge of the hill of

a E. g. Gibson's, Saul's, and David's attacks. [See SCRAPMENTS, i. 385.]

b The Moslem tradition is that the attack took place on a Friday, and that the day was prolonged by one half, to prevent the Sabbath being encroached upon. (See Jahladdin, Temple of Jerusalem, p. 257.)
MAKKEDAH

Gideon in the rear; then the furious storm assisting and completing the rout. In the mean time the detection of the five chiefs in their hiding-place was as communicated to Joshua, and, as soon as he matter in hand will allow, he rushes on with the whole of his force to Makkedah (ver. 21). The first thing to be done is to form a regular camp (ןַנְמָרֵב). The next to dispose of the five chiefs, and that by no hurried massacre, but in so deliberate and judicial a manner as at once to inflame terror into the Canaanites and confidence into his own followers, to show to both that "thus shall Jehovah do to all that enemies" of Israel. The cave in the recesses of which the wretched kings were hidden was a well-known one. It was close to the town; we may safely conclude that the whole preceding was in full view of the walls. At last the ceremony is over, the strange and significant parable has been acted, and the bodies of Adoni-zedek and his companions are swinging from the trees — possibly the trees of some grove sacred to the abominable rites of the Canaanite Ashtoth — in the afternoon sun. Then Joshua turns to the town itself. To force the walls, to put the king and all the inhabitants to the sword (ver. 28) is to that indomitable energy, still fresh after the gigantic labors and excitement of the last twenty-four hours — the work of an hour or two. And now the evening has arrived, the sun is at last sinking — the first sun that has set since the departure from Gilgal — and the tragedy is terminated by cutting down the five bodies from the trees, and restoring them to the cave, which is then so blocked up with stones as henceforth never again to become refuge for friend or foe of Israel.

The taking of Makkedah was the first in that series of sieges and destructions by which the Great Captain possessed himself of the main points of defense throughout this portion of the country. Its situation has hitherto eluded discovery. The catalogue of the cities of Judah in Joshua (xxv. 41) places it in the Shefelah or maritime plain, but unfortunately it forms one of a group of towns of which few or none are identified. The report of Eueschus and Jerome (Onomasticon, ounced Macedonia) is that it lay 8 miles to the east of Eleutheropolis, Beit-IIericho, a position irreconcilable with every report contained in the narrative. Porter (Handbook 224, 251) suggests a ruin on the northern slope of the Plain of Soreq, bearing the somewhat similar name of el-Khulah; but it is difficult to understand how this can have been the position of Makkedah, which we should imagine would be found, if it ever is found, considerably nearer Ramleh or Jimzn.

Vatke de Vlch (Moscow, p. 332) would place it at Nitzana, a village standing on a low hill 6 or 7 miles N.W. of Beit-Iheron; but the only claim of this site appears to be the reported existence in the neighborhood of a large cavern, while its position at least 8 miles further from Beth-horon than even el-Khulah — would make the view of the narrative taken above impossible.

MALACHI (מָלָכָי): Malikia in the title only: *Malaki*, the last, and therefore called "the seal" of the prophets, as his prophecies constitute the closing book of the canon. His name is probably contracted from Malachijah, "messenger of Jehovah," as Ahi (2 K. xviii. 2) from Abijah (2 Chr. xxxix. 1). Of his personal history nothing is known. A tradition preserved in Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Prophet) relates that Malachi was of the tribe of Zebulun, and born after the captivity at Sophah (Synag) in the territory of that tribe. According to the same apocryphal story he died young, and was buried with his fathers in his own country. Jerome, in the preface to his Commentary on Malachi, mentions a belief which was current among the Jews, that Malachi was identical with Ezra the priest, because the circumstances recorded in the narrative of the latter are also mentioned by the prophet. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel, on the words "by the hand of Malachi" (i. 1), gives the gloss "whose name is called Ezra the scribe." With equal probability Malachi has been identified with Mordecai, Nehemiah, and Zechariah. The LXX. renders "by Malachi" (Mal. i. 1), "by the hand of his angel;" and this translation appears to have given rise to the idea that Malachi, as well as Haggai and John the Baptist, this meaning. It is an entirely distinct term from מַלָּךְ, which, though also translated "hand," in the A.V., really means "authority." See Mesopotaem. 1 One of the few cases in which our translators have represented the Hebrew letter Caph by K, which they commonly reserve for Kop. [See also Mekonah.] 2 The literal Aramaic renders the words by תַּרְפָּא ; Teshubim, or תַּרְפָּא. The Hebrew term is the same as that employed in Judg. xix. 19 for the hollow basin or combe in Leth from which the spring burst forth for the relief of Samson.
was an angel in human shape (comp. Mal. iii. 1; 2 Esd. i. 40; Jerom., Comm. in Hag. i. 13). Cyril alludes to this belief only to express his disappointment, and characterizes those who held it as romancers (οὶ νάτην ἐφηβανεκαίνων κ. τ. λ.). Another Hebrew tradition associated Malachi with Haggai and Zechariah as the companions of Daniel when he saw the vision recorded in Dan. x. 7 (Smith's Select Discourses, p. 214; ed. 1669), and as among the first members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 cliers.

The time at which his prophecies were delivered it is not difficult to ascertain. Cyril makes him contemporaneous with Haggai and Zechariah, or a little later. Synedrus (p. 240 B) places these three prophets under Joshua the son of Josedec. That Malachi was contemporary with Nehemiah, is rendered probable by a comparison of ii. 8 with Neh. xii. 15; ii. 10-16 with Neh. xi. 23, &c.; and iii. 7-12 with Neh. xii. 10, &c. That he prophesied after the times of Haggai and Zechariah is inferred from his omitting to mention the restoration of the Temple, and from no allusion being made to him by Ezra. The Captivity was already a thing of the long past, and is not referred to. The existence of the Temple-service is presupposed in i. 10, iii. 1, 10. The Jewish nation had still a political chief (v. 8); distinct from, and not represented by, the high-priest. This is the case in Nehemiah (Neh. xii. 26), to which Gesenius assigns a Persian origin. Hence Vitringa concludes that Malachi delivered his prophecies after the second return of Nehemiah from Persia (Neh. xiii. 6), and subsequently to the 352d year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (cir. n. c. 420), which is the date adopted by Kennicott and Haile, and approved by Davidson (Introduct. p. 835). It may be mentioned that in the Seder Olam Rabba (p. 53, ed. Meyer), the date of Malachi's prophecy is assigned, with that of Haggai and Zechariah, to the second year of Darus; and his death in the Seder Olam Zuta (p. 105) is placed, with that of the same two prophets, in the 552d year of the Meles and Persians. The principal reasons adduced by Vitringa, and which appear conclusively to fix the time of Malachi's prophecy as contemporaneous with Nehemiah, are the following: The offenses denounced by Malachi as prevailing among the people, and especially the corruption of the priests by marrying foreign wives, correspond with the actual abuses with which Nehemiah had to contend in his efforts to bring about a reformation (comp. Mal. ii. 8 with Neh. xii. 29). The alliance of the high-priest's family with Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh. xiii. 4, 28) and Sanballat the Horavite had introduced neglect of the customary Temple-service, and the offerings and tithes due to the Levites and priests, in consequence of which the Temple was forsaken (Neh. xiii. 4-13), and the Sabbath openly profaned (iv. 15-21).

The short interval of Nehemiah's absence from Jerusalem had been sufficient for the growth of these corruptions, and on his return he found it necessary to put them down with a strong hand, and to do over again the work that Ezra had done a few years before. From the striking parallelism between the state of things indicated in Malachi's prophecies and that actually existing on Nehemiah's return from the court of Artaxerxes, it is on all accounts highly probable that the efforts of the secular governor were on this occasion seconded by the preaching of "Jehovah's messenger," and that Malachi occupied the same position with regard to the reformation under Nehemiah, which Isaiah held in the time of Hezekiah, and Jeremiah in that of Josiah. The last chapter of canonical Jewish history is the key to the last chapter of its prophecies.

The book of Malachi is contained in four chapters in our version, as in the LXX., Vulgate, and Peshito-Syriac. In the Hebrew the 3d and 4th form but one chapter. The whole prophecy naturally divides itself into three sections, in the first of which Jehovah is represented as the loving father and ruler of his people (i. 2-ii. 9); in the second, as the supreme God and father of all (ii. 10-16); and in the third, as their righteous and final judge (ii. 17-end). These may be again subdivided into smaller sections, each of which follows a certain order: first, a short sentence; then the skeptical questions which might be raised by the people; and, finally, their full and triumphant refutation. The formal and almost scholastic manner of the prophecy seems to Eschyl to indicate that it was rather delivered in writing than spoken publicly. But though this may be true of the prophecy in its present shape, which probably presents the substance of oral discourses, there is no reason for supposing that it was not also pronounced orally in public, like the warnings and denunciations of the older prophets, however it may differ from them in vigor of conception and high poetic diction. The style of the prophet's language is unfitting to the manner of his prophecy. Smooth and easy to a remarkable degree, it is the style of the reasoner rather than of the poet. We miss the fiery prophetic eloquence of Isaiah, and have in its stead the calm and almost artificial discourse of the practiced orator, carefully modeled upon those of the ancient prophets; thus blending in one the characteristics of the old prophetic and the more modern dialectical structures.

I. The first section of the prophet's message consists of two parts: the first (i. 1-6) addressed to the people generally, in which Jehovah, by his messenger, asserts his love for them, and proves it, in answer to their reply, "Wherein hast thou loved us?" by referring to the punishment of Edom as an example. The second part (i. 6-ii. 9) is addressed to the priests (i. 6-ii. 5), who, had despised the name of Jehovah, and had been the chief movers of the detection from his worship and covenant. They are rebuked for the worthlessness of their sacrifices and offerings, and their profanation of the Temple there (i. 7-14). The denunciation of their offense is followed by the threat of punishment for future neglect (ii. 1-3), and the character of the true priest is drawn as the companion picture to their own (i. 5-9).

II. In the second section (ii. 10-16) the prophet reproves the people for their intermarriages with the idolatrous heathen, and the divorces by which they separated themselves from their legitimate wives, who wept at the altar of Jehovah; in violation of the great law of marriage which God, the father of all, established at the beginning. III. The judgment, which the people lightly regard, is announced with all solemnity, ushered in by the advent of the Messiah. The Lord, preceded by his messenger, shall come to his Temple suddenly, to purify the land from its iniquity, and to execute swift judgment upon those who violate their duty to God and their neighbor. The first part (ii. 17-iii. 5) of the section terminates with the threatened punishment; in the second (iii. 6-12) the faithfulness of God to his promises is vindicated, and the people exhorted to repentance.
its attendant blessings; in the third (iii. 13-iv. 6) they are reproved for their want of confidence in God, and for confusing good and evil. The final severance between the righteous and the wicked is then set forth, and the great day of judgment is depicted, to be announced by the coming of Elijah, or John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ (Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 10-13).

The prophecy of Malachi is alluded to in the N. T., and its canonical authority thereby established (comp. Mark i. 2, ix. 11, 12; Luke i. 17; Rom. ix. 13).

W. A. W.

It has been made a question (not distinctly adverted to here) whether the Hebrew term for Malachi in i. 1 denotes the actual name of the prophet or his mission and office. According to this form of the question the writing may be anonymous, and yet that not affect at all its canonical character or authority. This idea of the appellative import of the name probably appears in εν χειρι ἄγγελου αὐτοῦ of the LXX. Jerome also entertained this view.

Writings, among other later writers, support the statement (see Note on verse, ii. 31-32) that Hengstenberg (denying the reference to the prophet either as a personal or a symbolic name) maintains that it is identical with "my messenger" in iii. i. (Christologie, iii. 582 ff., 2. Ausg. or Keith's trans., iii. 272 ff.) The correspondence between the name and Malachi's errand as "Jehovah's messenger" or "my messenger," i. e. of Jehovah, does not show the name to be fictitious: for this correspondence between names and history of occurrence is a well-known characteristic of Hebrew names (for example, Elijah, Isaiah), and may be accounted for sometimes as accidental and sometimes as a change of the original name (subsequently lost) for the sake of the conformity. [NAMES, Amer. ed.] Hengstenberg urges that the title (i. i.) says nothing of the parentage or birth-place of the prophet. But this omission is not peculiar to Malachi; for of the sixteen prophets whose writings are preserved in the Canon, the fathers of only eight are named. The birth-place of only three (Amos, Micah, and Nahum) is mentioned, and in the case of Haggai and Haggai, nothing is added to the names except "the prophet".

Another of his arguments is that Nehemiah, the contemporary of Malachi, makes no mention of him. But history shows innumerable instances in which writers of the same period who are known in other ways to have been personally connected with each other, have left in their works no evidence of this knowledge and intimacy. Besides, in this case Nehemiah may possibly have been absent from Jerusalem at the time of Malachi's greatest activity (see Neh. xii. 6), and hence would have had so much less occasion for speaking of him. Further, the use of the same expression as a proper name in one place is not inconsistent with its literal sense in another place: and still more questionable is the identification if the Hebrew expression in i. 1 differs from that in iii. i. as "a messenger of Jehovah" differs from "my messenger." Hengstenberg denies, in opposition to the best authorities (First, Ges. s. r., that מָלָךְ is abridged from מְלָכָה). In support of that etymology see Havernick's Einl. in den A. Test., ii. 431, and especially Nisselovitch's article on "Malachi" in Her- sogg's R. d. Evangelii, vii. 755. Block remarks that the form itself of the name leads us much sooner to think of an actual name, as also by far most of the interpreters understand it." (Einl. in den A. Test. p. 566).

The unity which characterizes the contents of Malachi is unusual. Instead of being composed of detached messages or themes, as in the case of the other prophets, the parts here arise out of each other by a natural gradation. The ground-thought which pervades the book is that of the relations of God and his chosen people to each other under the ancient and the new economy.

Literature.—For the older writers on Malachi either separately or as one of the minor prophets (among whom may be mentioned Calvin, Barheb, Seb. Schmid, Faber, Pococke), see Winer's Handb. der theolog. Literatur, i. 222 ff. The later commentators (most of them in connection with the Minor Prophets) are Rosenmüller, Ewald, Umbreit, Hitzig, Maurer, Keil (ib. iv., Bibl. Comm. 1886), Loud. Reinke, Henderson (Amer. ed., 1860); and in this country Neyes, T. V. Moore (Prophecies of the Restoration, New York, 1856), and Cowles. (See the lists under AMOS and HABAKKUK.) Reinke's work (Der Prophet Malachi, Giessen, 1850) contains an introduction, the Hebrew text, and a translation, together with philological and historical notes, and is the most complete modern work on this prophet. On the Christology of the book, one may consult Haake's dass Christologie des O.T. (i. 273-364 (Keith's transl.)); Stuhlmacher Die Messianischen Wissensungen, p. 135 f.; Havernek, Vorlesungen üb. die Theologie des O. T. p. 173 f.; and J. Pce Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, 5th ed., p. 269 f.

H.

MAL'ACHTA (Molochina), the prophet Malachi (2 Esdr. i. 40).

MAL'ACHAM (םָלָךְ their king): Mal- i. 1. One of the heads of the fathers of Benjamin, and son of Shallumah by his wife Hodesh (1 Chr. viii. 9), whom the Targum of R. Joseph identifies with Baara.

2. (ב בֶּן מָלָךְ their king): Malach. The idol Moloch, as some suppose (Zeph. i. 5). The word literally signifies "their king," as the margin of our version gives it, and is referred by Gesenius to an idol generally, as invested with regal honors by its worshippers. He quotes Is. viii. 21 and Am. 5. 26 as support of this view, though he refers Jer. xix. 1, 3, to Moloch (as the LXX., the present reading being evidently corrupt), and regards Malach as equivalent to Milcom (1 K. xi. 5, &c.). Hitzig (Kurzg. Hdb. Jeremia), while he considers the idol Moloch as unquestionably intended in Jer. xiv. 1, renders Malachim literally "their king" in ver. 3. The same ambiguity occurs in 2 Sam. xii. 30, where David, after his conquest of the Ammonites, is said to have taken the crown of "their king," or " Malachim" (see LXX. and Vulg., on 1 Chr. xx. 2). A legend is told in Jerome's Questions de loc. (1 Chr. xx. 2), how that, as it was unlawful for a Hebrew to touch anything of gold or silver belonging to an idol, Hittai the Gittite, who was a Philistine, snatched the crown from the head of Milcom, and gave it to David, who thus avoided the pollution. [Hittai; Moloch.]

Again, in 2 Sam. xii. 31, the Gittite has מָלָךְ where the Keri is מָלָךְ מָלָקָה (A. V. "through the
Malchiah

[Joshua's king: [Malchias; [Vat. Melchias]: Melchias].] A descendant of Gershom the son of Levi, and ancestor of Asaph the minstrel (1 Chr. vi. 40).

* The A. V. ed. 1011 here reads Melchiah; the Bishops' Bible Melchisia.

1. [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] A priest, the father of Pashur (1 Chr. ix. 26; Neh. iii. 14).

2. [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] One of the sons of Parosh, who was married a foreign wife, and put her away at the command of Ezra (Ezr. x. 25; Neh. vii. 4).

3. [Vat. Alex. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] Enumerated among the sons of Harim, who lived in the time of Ezra, and had intermarried with the people of the land (Ezr. x. 31). In 1 Esdr. x. 32 he appears as Melchias, and in Neh. iii. 11 as Malchis [Melchias; [Vat. FA. Melchias]: Melchias].

4. Vat. Alex. Melchias.] Son of Rechab, and ruler of the circuit or environs of Bethcerehem. He took part in the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah, and repaired the Dung Gate (Neh. iii. 14).

5. [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] "The goldsmith's son," who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 31). The word rendered "the goldsmith" is taken as a proper name by the LXX. (Zechariah), and in the Peshito-Syriac Malchiah is called "the son of Zephaniah." The A. V. has followed the Vulgate and Jarchi.

6. [Melchias: [Vat. FA. Alex. Melchias: Melchias.] One of the priests who stood at the left hand of Ezra when he read the Law to the people in the street before the Water Gate (Neh. viii. 4). In 1 Esdr. ix. 4 he is called Melchitas.

7. [Vat. Neh. Vat. M. Melchias: FA. Melchias.] A priest, the father of Paschur = Malchisiah 1 (Neh. xi. 12; Jer. xxxviii. 1), and Melchisiah (Jer. xxi. 1).

8. [Malchis [see above: Alex. Melchias: Melchias.] The son of Ham-melech (or "the king's son"), as it is translated in 1 K. xxii. 26; 2 Chr. xxvii. 7), into whose dungeon or cistern Jeremiah was cast (Jer. xxxvii. 6). The title "king's son" is applied to Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvi. 26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners Jeremiah and Baruch; to Joash, who appears to have held an office inferior to that of the governor of the city; and to whose custody Micaiah was committed by Ahah (1 K. xxi. 22); and to Zadokiah who was slain by Zichri the Ephraimite in the vasion of Judah by Pekah, in the reign of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxvii. 7). It would seem from these passages that the title "king's son" was applied to Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvi. 26), who was among those commissioned by the king to take prisoners Jeremiah and Baruch; to Joash, who appears to have held an office inferior to that of the governor of the city; and to whose custody Micaiah was committed by Ahah (1 K. xxi. 22); and to Zadokiah who was slain by Zichri the Ephraimite in the invasion of Judah by Pekah, in the reign of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxvii. 7). It would seem from these passages that the title "king's son" was applied to that of "king's mother," and applied to one of the royal family, who exercised functions somewhat similar to those of Potiphar in the court of Pharaoh.

W. A. W.

Malchiel

[God's king, i. e. appointed by him: Melchias, Gen. xvi. 17; Melchis, in Num. and Chr., as Alex. in all cases; Vat. in Num. Melchis, in Chr. Melchiel; Melchiel, the son of Bethiah, the son of Asher, and ancestor of the family of the Malchielites (Num. xxvi. 45). In 1 Chr. vii. 31 he is called the father, that is founder, of Bizzizra or Berath; as is the reading of the Targum of J. Josephus (Ant. ii. 7, § 4) reckons him with Heber among the six sons of Asher, thus making up the number of Jacob's children and grandchildren to seventy, without reckoning great-grandchildren.

Malchielites, The (Malchiel: Melchias; [Vat. Melchiaseki: Melchielites], the descendants of Malchiel, the grandson of Asher (Num. xxvi. 45).

Malchiah 2

1. [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] A priest, the father of Pashur (1 Chr. ix. 12); the same as Malchisiah 7.

2. [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchias.] A priest, chief of the fifth of the twenty-four courses appointed by David (1 Chr. xxiv. 9).

3. [Vat. Melchias: [Vat. Melchias: Melchias; [Vat. FA. Melchias: Melchis]: Josephas (2) An Israelite servant of the sons of Parosh, who at Ezra's command put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 25). In 1 Esdr. ix. 26 he is called Asirias, which agrees with the reading of the LXX.

4. [Melchias: [Vat. FA. Alex. Melchias: Melchias.] Son, that is, descendant of Harim, who with Hashub repaired the Tower of the Furnaces when the wall of Jerusalem was rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 11). He is probably the same as Malchisiah 3.

5. [Melchias: [Vat. Alex. Melchias: Melchias.] One of the priests who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 3). It seems probable that the names in the list referred to are rather those of families than of individuals (comp. 1 Chr. xxiv. 7-18, and Neh. xii. 1-7), and in this case Malchijah in Neh. x. 3 would be the same with the head of the fifth course of priests = Malchisiah 2.

6. [Melchias: [Vat. Alex. Melchias: Melchias.] One of the priests who assisted in the solemn dedication of the wall of Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. xii. 42).

Malchiram (Malchiram: [king of cedars]: Melchira; [Vat. Melchias: Melchiram], one of the sons of Jechoniah, or Jehoachin, the last but one of the kings of Judah (1 Chr. iii. 18).

Malchi-shua (Malchi-shua: [king of help]: [Rom. Alex. Melchi-shua: Vat. Alex. Melchi-shua: Melchis]: Melchisid, one of the sons of king Saul. His position in the family cannot be exactly determined. In the two genealogies of Saul's house preserved in Chronicles he is given as the second son next below Jonathan (1 Chr. viii. 53; ix. 39). But in the account of Saul's offspring in 1 Samuel he is named third—Isbi being between Jonathan (1 Sam. xiv. 49), and on the remaining occasion the same order is preserved, but Abinadab is substituted for Ishbi (1 Sam. xxi. 2). In both these latter passages the name is erroneously given in the A. V. as Melchi-shua. Nothing is known of Malchi-shua beyond the fact that he fell, with his two brothers, and before his father, in the early part of the battle of Gilboa. G
MALCHUS (Mαλχος; Molluck, in 1 Chr. vi. 44, Neh. x. 4, &c., ruler or councillor; LXX. Μαλχος or Μαλθος; and Joseph. Μαλχος, Ant. xiii. 5, § 1, xiv. 14, § 1) is the name of the servant of the high-priest, whose right ear Peter cut off at the time of the Saviour's apprehension in the garden. See the narrative in Matt. xxvi. 51; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxi. 49-51; John xviii. 10. He was the personal servant (διάλογος) of the high-priest, and not one of the hallifs or apparitors (ἀναπληρώτες) of the Sanhedrim. The high-priest intended is Caiaphas no doubt (though Anna is called ἀρχιερεύς in the same connection): for John, who was personally known to the former (John xviii. 15), is the only one of the Evangelists who gives the name of Malchus. This servant was probably stepping forward at the moment with others to handfast or pinion Jesus, when the zealous Peter struck at him with his sword. The blow was meant undoubtedly to be more effective, but reached only the ear. It may be as Stere remarks (Reisen Jean, vi. 268), that the man seeing the danger, threw his head or body to the let, so as to expose the right ear more than the other.

The allegation that the writers are inconsistent with each other, because Matthew, Mark, and John say either άτίνος, or άτραπωρ (as if that meant the lippet or tip of the ear), while Luke says άύς, is groundless. The Greek of the New Testament age, like the modern Romaine, made no distinction often between the primitive and diminutive. This is especially true of terms relating to parts of the human body. (See Lobeck ad Phara, p. 211.) In fact, Luke himself exchanges the one term for the other in this very narrative (vv. 50 and 51). The Saviour, as his pursuers were about to seize Him, asked to be left tree for a moment longer (τετέρα εις ταύτην [Luke xxi. 51]), and that moment He used in restoring the wounded man to soundness. The άφθανος τού άτίνος may indicate (which is not forbidden by άφθανετοι, απεκοφέτοι) that the ear still adhered slightly to its place. It is noticeable that Luke the physician is the only one of the writers who mentions the act of healing. It is a touching remembrance that this was our Lord's last miracle for the relief of human suffering. The hands which had been stretched forth so often to heal and bless mankind, were then bound, and his beneficent ministry in that form of his exercise was finished for ever. H. B. H.

MALE LEEL (Μαλλαλέεια; Molhlel). The same as MAHALALEL, the son of Caiman (Luke iii. 37; Gen. v. 12, marg.).

MALLOWS, THEY OF (Μαλλάδειαι; Molhlae), who, with the people of Tarsus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes because he had bestowed them on one of his concubines (2 Macc. iv. 30). The absence of the king from Antioch to put down the insurrection, gave the infamous Menelaus the high-

priest an opportunity of plundering some of the sacred vessels from the Temple of Jerusalem (vv. 32, 39), an act which finally led to the murder of the good Onias (vv. 34, 35). Mallos was an important city of Cilicia, lying at the mouth of the Pyramus (Zeilaun), on the shore of the Mediterranean, N. E. of Cyprus, and about 20 miles from Tarsus (Tarsea). (See Dict. of Geography.)

MALLOTHI (Μαλλοθiggs [perh. Jecohiak is spurious]. First): Mollotti; (Vat. Masora, Mollotti.) Alex. Molloti, and Mollarv Mollotti, a Kohathite, one of the fourteen sons of Heman the singer, and chief of the nineteenth course of twelve Levites into which the Temple choir was divided (1 Chr. xxv. 4, 26). (Hovius, Amer. ed.)

MALLOWS (Μαλώς, malluoch [sc. Αλμα: herba et arborem cortices]. By the Hebrew word we are no doubt to understand some species of Orchis, and in all probability the Aristolochia mollissima of botanists. It occurs only in Job xxx. 4, where the patriarch launts that he is exposed to the derision of the lowest of the people, "whose fathers he would have disbained to have set with the dogs of his flock," and who from poverty were obliged to seek their sustenance in desert places amongst wild herbs—"who pluck off the sea orchis near the hedges and eat the bitter roots of the Spanish bower." Some writers, as R. Levi (Job xxx.) and Luther, with the Swedish and the old Danish versions, have understood "nelttes" to be denoted by malluoch, this troublesome weed having been from time immemorial an article of occasional diet.

Jew's Mallow (Corchorus olitorius).
MALLOWS

amongst the poor, even as it is amongst ourselves at this day (1 Tim. II. V. xxi. 15; Athen. iv. c. 15). Others have conjectured that some species of “mallow” (malow) is intended, as Boedas and the A. V. Sprengel (Hist. Rei herb. 14) identifies the “Jew’s mallow” (Corchorus olitorius) with the mallow, and Lady Calcutt (Script. Herb. p. 255) is of a similar opinion. In Purchas’s Pilgrims,” observes this writer, “there is a letter from Master William Biddulph, who was travelling from Aleppo to Jerusalem in 1600, in which he says, “we saw many poor people gathering mallows and three-leaved grasse, and asked them what they did with it, and they answered that it was all their food and they did eat it.” See also Harmer’s Observations, iii. 169. There is no doubt that this same mallow is still eaten in Arabia and Palestine, the leaves and pods being used as a pot-herb. Dr. Shaw (Treat. i. 298, 8vo. 1808) mentions Mallow-Keachs, which he says is the same with the Corchorus, as being cultivated in the gardens of Barbary, and draws attention to the resemblance of this word with the mallowach of Job, but he thinks “some other plant of a more saltish taste.”

* * *

Atriplex halimus.

is rather intended. The Atriplex halimus has undoubtedly the best claim to represent the mallowach, as Bochart (Hieroz. ii. 233), and before him Drusius (Quodst. Hebr. i. qu. 17) have proved. Cædus (Hieroz. ii. 97), Hillel (Hierozol. i. 457), Rosenmüller (Schol. in Job xxx. 4, and Botany of the Bible, p. 115), and Dr. Kitto (Pictor. Bible on 16) adopt this opinion. The Greek word used by the LXX. is applied by Dioscorides (i. c. 120) to the Atriplex halimus, as Sprengel (Comment. in . c.) has shown. Dioscorides says of this plant, that it is a shrub which is used for hedges, and resembles the Rhamnus, being white and without horns; its leaves are like those of the olive, but broader and smoother, they are cooked as vegetables; the plant grows near the sea, and in hedges.” See also the quotation from the Arabian botanist, Alen-

MAMMON

Beitar (in Bochart, l.c. above), who says that the plant which Dioscorides calls “halimus” is the same with that which the Syrians call mallow, Galen (vi. 22), Scrapius in Bochart, and Prosper Alpinus (De Plant. Aegypt. cxxvii. 45).

The Hebrew name, like the Greek, has reference either to the bonyness where the plant grows — often grassy or leafy mat — or to its saline taste. The Atriplex halimus is a shrub from four to five feet high, with many thick branches; the leaves are rather sour to the taste; the flowers are purple and very small; it grows on the sea-coast in Greece, Arabia, Syria, etc., and belongs to the natural Order Chenopodiaceae. Atriplex hortensis, or garden Orach, is often cooked and eaten as spinach, to which it is by some persons preferred. W. H.

* * *

“The best authorities,” says Tristram (Not. Hist. of the Bible, p. 464), “are in favor of a species of Sea Purslane (Atriplex halimus), which grows abundantly on the shores of the Mediterranean, in salt marshes, and also on the shores of the Dead Sea still more luxuriantly. We found thickets of it of considerable extent on the west side of the sea, and it exclusively supplied us with fuel for many days. It grows there to the height of ten feet — more than double its size on the Mediterranean. It forms a dense mass of thin twigs without thorns, has very minute purple flowers close to the stem, and small, thick, sour-tasting leaves, which could be eaten, as is the Atriplex hortensis, or garden Orache, but it would be very miserable food.” Prof. Coman renders ממלעך “salt-plant” (Book of Job, in loc.).

II.

MAL'LUCH [מַלְלֻךְ; ruler or counselor]:

Malḵû: Maloch.

1. A Levite of the family of Merari, and ancestor of Ethan the singer (1 Chr. vi. 44).

2. (Malḵû:) [Vat. with preceding word, Malḵû-malḵû:] Mallickh. One of the sons of Beni, who put away his foreign wife at Ezra’s command (Ezr. x. 3). He was probably of the tribe of Judah and line of Pharez (see 1 Chr. ix. 4). In the parallel list of 1 Esdr. ix. 30, he is called Mal-lechuch.

3. (Baḵû:) [Vat.] Alex. Malḵû: Malockey.

One of the descendants of Harim in the time of Ezra, who had married a foreign wife (Ezr. x. 32).

4. (Malḵû:) Mellukh. A priest or family of priests who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x. 4).

5. One of the “heads” of the people who signed the covenant on the same occasion (Neh. x. 27).

6. (Vat. Akuk.) One of the families of priests who returned with Zerubabel (Neh. xii. 23; probably the same as No. 4). It was represented in the time of Joashim by Jonathan (ver. 14). The same as Melicu.

MAM'ATAS [3 vbl.] (Saznayis: Sameon), apparently the same with Shemaleh in Ezr. viii. 16. In the Geneva version of 1 Esdr. viii. 44, it is written Samain. [See also Masmak.]

MAM'MON (מָעָם; Matt. vi. 24, and Luke xvi. 9), a word which often occurs in the Chaldee Targums of Onkelos, and later writers, and in the Syriac version, and which signifies “riches.” This meaning of the word is given by Tertullian, Adv. Marc. iv. 33, and by Augustine and Jerome commenting on St. Matthew: Augus-
F. 7.

The Cirus, G. and lightly interval with sirens/th, 474. thew the "torrens — XXV. ments Heer-shelia if word
the Mambre — of Abraham the book of Mambre, in the east in whose brother's shade of brown, and in the other a kind of dingy gray. When they apply the term "red" to man, they always mean by it "fair." The name Adam has been supposed by some to be de-

MAMNITANAIMUS (Mau-stamentalos: [Vat. 

MAMNITANAIMUS (Mau-stamentalos: [Vat. 

MAMRE (S7{^7^2) [perh. fatness, and then strength, manliness, Gez.:] Maiouj: Joseph. Maiouj: Mose), an ancient Amorite, who with his brothers Eshek and Aner was in alliance with Abim (Gen. xiv. 23), and under the shade of whose oak-grave the patriarch dwelt in the interval between his residence at Bethel and at Beer-sheba (xiii. 18, xvii. 1). The personality at this ancient chieftain, unmistakably though slightly brought out b in the narrative just cited — a narrative regarded by Ewald and others as one of the most ancient, if not the most ancient, docu-

MAMUCHUS (Maulousios: Moluchus), the same as Mauuchus 2 (1 Esdr. ix. 30). The LXX.

MAMUCHUS (Mauousios: Moluchus), the same as Mauuchus 2 (1 Esdr. ix. 30). The LXX. was probably Mauousios at first, which would easily be corrupted into the present reading.

MAN. Four Hebrew terms are rendered "man" in the A. V. 1. Adam, 7^7^. (A.) The name of

MAN. Four Hebrew terms are rendered "man" in the A. V. 1. Adam, 7^7^. (A.) The name of

a The LXX., except in xiv. 24, give the name with the feminine article. They do the same in other cases: e. g. Buhl.

b In the Jewish traditions he appears as encouraging Abraham to unburgo the pain of circumcision, from which his brothers would have divorced him — by a re-

currence to the deliverance he had already experienced from far greater trials — the furnace of Chedron and the sound of Cherubim. (Beer, Livon Abrahams, 3d.)

A. It has been derived from 'man,' "he was sick," so as to mean weak, mortal; to which Gesenius objects that this verb comes from the theme 8 (Lxx. s v. 8). 

q The opposite signification, strength and robust.

r. It has been suggested with a reference to the theme 8 (First. Concord. s v. 8). It seems more reasonable to suppose, with Gesenius, that this is a primitive word — Lxx. s v. 8. Perhaps the der of being may lie at its foundation.
of a son of Seth and grandson of Adam (Gen. iv. 26; 1 Chr. 1. 1). In the A. V. it is written Enos. It might be supposed that this was a case like that of Adam's name; but this cannot be admitted, since the variant Jsh and the fem. form Ishshah are used before the birth of Enos, as in the cases of the naming of Eve (Gen. ii. 23) and Cain (iv. 1). If it be objected that we must not lay too much stress upon verbal criticism, we reply that, if so, no stress can be laid upon the name of Enos, which might even be a translation, and that such forms as Methusel and Methuselah, which have the characteristics of a primitive state of Hebrew, oblige us to lay the greatest stress upon verbal criticism.a

3. Geber, γεβήρ, "a man," from γεβάω, b "to be strong," generally with reference to his strength, corresponding to sir and āvēp.

4. Méthim, מְתִימָ, c "men," always masculine. The singular is to be traced in the antediluvian proper names Methusel and Methuselah.b Perhaps it may be derived from the root מִיח, "he died,"c in which case its use would be very appropriate in Is. xii. 14, "Fear not, thou womb Jacob, ye men of Israel."d If this conjecture be admitted, this word would correspond to βρότος and might be read "mortals."

MANAEN: Manaen is mentioned in Acts xiii. 1 as one of the teachers and prophets in the church at Antioch at the time of the appointment of Saul and Barnabas as missionaries to the heathen. He is not known out of this passage. The name signifies consider (נכול, κοιτάζων), 2 K. xv. 17, &c.; and both that and his relation to Herod render it quite certain that he was a Jew. The Herod with whom he is said to have been brought up (συνήφη) could not have been Herod Agrippa I. (Acts xxv. 13), for as he was only seventeen old at the time of the death of his father, Herod Agrippa I. in A. D. 44 (Joseph. Ant. xix. 9, § 1), a comrade of that age would have been too young to be so prominent as a teacher at Antioch as Manaen was at the date of Paul's first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 3). The Herod in question must have been Herod Antipas, under whose jurisdiction the Saviour as a Galilean lived, and who beheaded John the Baptist. Since this Antipas was older than Archelaus, who succeeded Herod the Great soon after the birth of Christ, Manaen (his συνήφη) must have been somewhat advanced in years in A. D. 44, when he appears before us in Luke's history—older certainly than forty-five or fifty, as stated in Lange's Biblicalk (v. 192). The point of chief interest relating to him concerns the sense of συνήφη, which the historian regarded as sufficiently remarkable to connect with his name. We have a learned discussion of this question in Walch's Dissertationes in Acta Apostolorum (de Menachen, ii. 195-292). For the value of this treatise see Tholuck's Greek Syntax, p. 107.

The following are the principal views that have been advanced, and have still their advocates. One is that συνήφη means comrade, associate, or, more strictly, one brought up, educated with another. This is the more frequent sense of the word, and Calvin, Grotius, Schott, Baumgarten, and others, adopt it here. It was very common in ancient times for persons of rank to associate other children with their own, for the purpose of sharing their amusements (hence συνηστασία in Xenoph. Cyr. v. iii. 3, § 14) and their studies, and thus exciting them to greater activity and emulation. Josephus, Plutarch, Polybius, and others speak of this custom. Walch shows it to have existed among the Medes, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. Herod might have adopted it from the Romans, whom he was so much inclined to imitate (see Raphel's Annotationes, ii. 80, and Wetstein, Nov. Testament. ii. 532).

The other view is that συνήφη denotes foster-brother, brought up at the same breast (αυγογαλακτος, colostanches), and, as so taken, Manaen's mother, or the woman who reared him, would have been also Herod's nurse. So Kinoed, Olshausen, De Wette, Alford, and others. Walch's conclusion (not correctly represented by some recent writers) combines in a measure these two explanations. He thinks that Manaen was educated in Herod's family along with Antipas and some of his other children, and at the same time that he stood in the stricter relation to Antipas which συνήφη denotes as colostanches. He calls attention to the statement of Josephus (Ant. xvii. 1, § 3) that the brothers Antipas and Archelaus were educated in a private way at Rome (Ἀρχέλαος δὲ καὶ Ἀντίπας καὶ Ράφας παῖδα τὴν ἱδίατη τροφαζόν εὔγνων), and though not so supposing that Manaen accompanied them thither he thinks we may infer that Manaen enjoyed at home the same course of discipline and instruction (συνήφη) in that sense as the two brothers, who are not likely to have been separated in their earlier, any more than in their later education. Yet as Manaen is called the συνήφη of Herod, and whilst he suggests that there may have been the additional tie in their case which resulted from their having had a common nurse.

It is a singular circumstance, to say the least, that Josephus (Ant. xv. 10, § 5) mentions a certain Manaen (Μαναηᾶς), who was in high repute among the Essenes for wisdom and sanctity, and who foretold to Herod the Great, in early life, that he was destined to attain royal honors. After the fulfillment of the prediction he lived the prophet, with special favor, and honored the entire sect on his account (παται αὐτ' ἐκείνου τοῖς Ἑσσαῖοι is not, as Gessenius would make it, changed by the construct state, but has a case-ending 3, to be compared to the Arabic case-ending of the nominative, un. 3, 51, 1.

c The conjecture of Gessenius (L. T. s. v.), that the middle Radical of מָנָה is softened from r is not borne out by the Egyptian form, which is MEI "a dead one."

f מָנָה לָא; יבשונת יִשְׂרָאֵל. For the word "worm" compare Job xiv. 6; Ps. xiii. 6.
MANAHATH

There was a class of the Essenes who had families (Walsh, 257 i., though others had not; and it has been conjectured with some plausibility that, as one of the results of Herod's friendship for the lucky soothsayer, he may have adopted one of his sons (who took the father's name), so far as to receive him into his family, and make him the companion of his children (see Walsh, p. 234, &c.). Lichtfurst surmises, as one of the possibilities, that the Manaei of Josephus may be the one mentioned in the Acts (superscription, etc.); he has sought, however, in vain to make the name of the soothsayer may have been the prophet at Antioch. (See I뉴스. ii. 726 f.) The inevitable disparity in age which must have existed between the Essene of Josephus and Antipas, the son of Herod the Great, to say nothing of other difficulties, puts the former of their suppositions out of the question.

The precise interest which led Luke to recall the Herodian connection is not certain. Meyer's suggestion, that it may have been the contrast between the early relationship and Manaeus's later Christian position (though he makes it of the first only), applies to one sense of συντροφία as well as the other. A far-fetched motive need not be sought. Even such a close relation to the great Jewish family of the age (whether it was that of a foster-brother or a companion of princes) was peculiar and interesting, and would be mentioned without any special object merely as a part of the individual's history. Walch's citations show that συντροφία, as used of such intimacies (συντροφικά), was a title very esteemed among the ancients; that it was often borne through life as a sort of proper name, and was prefixed among the honorifics of the epitaph after death. It is found repeatedly on ancient monuments.

It may be added that Manaeus, as a resident in Palestine (he may have been one of Herod's courtiers till his banishment to Gaul), could hardly fail to have had some personal knowledge of the Saviour's ministry. He must have spent his youth at Jerusalem or in that neighborhood; and among his recollections of that period, connected as he was with Herod's family, may have been the tragic scene of the massacre at Bethlehem. H. B. H.

MANASSEH

[Vat.] Manasses: [Rom. 6-12; Alex. Mushaeth.] Manasseh, a place named in 1 Chr. viii. 6 only, in connection with the genealogies of the tribe of Benjamin. The passage is very obscure, and is not made less so by the translation of the A. V.; but the meaning probably is that the family of Ephraim had the heads of the town of Gela, migrated thence, under the guidance of Manasseh, Ahiah, and Gera, and settled at Manasseh. Of the situation of Manasseh we know little or nothing. It is tempting to believe it identical with the Menammeh mentioned, according to many interpreters, in Judges xx. 44 b (in the A. V. translated "with ease"). This has in its favor the close proximity in which the place, if a place, evidently stood to Gibeah, which was one of the chief towns of Benjamin, even if not identical with Gela. [Meyers; Amer. ed.]. Manassath is usually identified with a place of similar name in Judah, but, considering how hostile the relations of Judah and Benjamin were at the earlier period of the history, this identification is difficult to receive. The Chaldee Targum adds, "in the land of the house of Esam," i. e. in Edom. The Syriac and Arabic versions connect the name with that immediately following, and read "to the plein or pasture of Naaman." But these explanations are no less obscure than that which they seek to explain. [Manashitehs.]

[Manasstehs.]

{i. e. the Menuchoth, and, 

= Gen. xxvi. 23; Mosasaeth: Manassath. 1 Chr. i. 40, Manasseh: [Vat. Mayarugh.] Alex. Manasseh: Manassath, one of the sons of Shishak, and descendant of Ser the Horite.

MANASSETHES, THE [Manassthes, i. e. the Menuchoth, and,

= Gen. xxvi. 23; Mosasaeth: Manassath. 1 Chr. i. 40, Manasseh: [Vat. Mayarugh.] Alex. Manasseh: Manassath, one of the sons of Shishak, and descendant of Ser the Horite.

Of the situation or nature of the place or places we have as yet no knowledge. The town Manassteath naturally suggests itself, but it seems impossible to identify a Benjaminite town with a place occurring in the genealogies of Judah, and apparently in close connection with Bethlehem and with the horse of Job, the great opponent and murderer of Absol the Benjaminite. It is more probably identical with Manocho (Manassthes = מְנַשְׂחָת), one of the eleven cities which in the LXX. text are inserted between verses 59 and 60 of Josh. xiv., Bethlehem being another of the eleven. The writer of the Targum, playing on the word as if it were Menochah, "an offering," renders the passage in 1 Chr. ii. 52, "the priests and priests who looked to the division of the offerings." His interpretation of vers. of ver. 54 is too long to quote here. See the editions of Wilkins and Beek, with the learned notes of the latter.

MANASSEH'S (Maasaseh: [Vat. Abd.] Alex. Marasaseth: w. Manasses = Manasseh 3, of the sons of Patheb Meab (1 Esdr. ix. 31; comp. Ezr. x. 30).

MANASSEH (? [Manasseh: [Vat. Abd.] Alex. Marasaseth: w. Manasses = Manasseh 3, of the sons of Patheb Meab (1 Esdr. ix. 31; comp. Ezr. x. 30).
The position of the tribe of Manasseh during the march to Canaan was with Ephraim and Benjamin on the west side of the sacred Tent. The standard of the three sons of Rachel was the figure of a boy with the inscription, "The cloud of Jehovah rested on them until they went forth out of the camp" (Targ. PsuedoJoh. On Num. ii. 18). The Chief of the tribe at the time of the census at Sinai was Gannani ben-Pedalzur, and its numbers were then 32,200 (Num. i. 10, 35, ii. 20, 21, vii. 54-59). The numbers of Ephraim were at the same date 40,500. Forty years later, on the banks of Jordan, these proportions were reversed. Manasseh had then increased to 52,700, while Ephraim had diminished to 32,500 (Num. xxvi. 34, 37). On this occasion it is remarkable that Manasseh resumes his position in the catalogue as the eldest son of Joseph. Possibly this is due to the prowess which the tribe had shown in the conquest of Gilgal, for Manasseh was certainly at this time the most distinguished of all the tribes. Of the three who had elected to remain on that side of the Jordan, Reuben and Gad had chosen the lot because the country was suitable to their pastoral possessions and tendencies. But Machir, Jair, and Noboth, the sons of Manasseh, were no shepherds. They were pure warriors, who had taken the most prominent part in the conquest of those provinces which up to that time had been conquered, and whose deeds are constantly referred to (Num. xxxii. 20; Deut. iii. 13, 14, 15) with credit and renown. "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the tract of Argob, . . . sixty great cities" (Deut. iii. 14). "Noboth took Kenath and the daughter-towns thereof, and called it after his own name" (Num. xxxii. 43). "Because Machir was a man of war, therefore he had Gilead and Bashan" (Jesh. xvii. 1). The district which these ancient warriors conquered was among the most difficult, if not the most difficult, in the whole country. It embraced the hills of Gilead with their numerous heights and impassable ravines, and the almost impregnable tract of Argob, which derives its modern name of Lejoph from the secure "asylum" it affords to those who take refuge within its natural fortifications. Had they not remained

a This seems to follow from the expressions of xviii. 5 and 9: "The two sons who were born unto thee in the land of Egypt" — "My sons whom thou hast given me in this place," and from the solemn invocation over them of Jacob's "name," and the "names" of Abraham and Isaac (ver. 16), combined with the fact of Joseph having married an Egyptian, a person of different race from his own. The Jewish commentators overcome the difficulty of Joseph's marrying an entire foreigner, by a tradition that Asenath was the daughter of Bithus and Shechem. See Targum PseudoJoh. on Gen. xlii. 45.

b "And like fish become a multitude." Such is the literal rendering of the words צ'ג"י צ'ג"י (Gen. xlviii. 16), which in the text of the A. V. are "grow into a multitude." The sense is preserved in the margin. The expression is no doubt derived from that which is to this day one of the most characteristic things in Egypt. Certainly, next to the vast stream itself, nothing could strike a native of Southern Palestine more, on his first visit to the banks of the Nile, than the abundance of its fish.

in these wild and inaccessible districts, but had gone forward and taken their lot with the rest, who shall say what changes might not have occurred in the history of the nation, through the presence of such energetic and warlike spirits? The few personalities of eminence whom we can with certainty identify as Manassites, such as Gideon and Jephthah—for Elijah and others may with equal probability have belonged to the neighboring tribe of Gad—were among the most remarkable characters that Israel produced. Gideon was in fact the greatest of the judges, and his children all but established hereditary monarchy in their own line (Stanley, S. of P., p. 230). But with the one exception of Gideon the warlike tendencies of Manasseh seem to have been confined to the east of the Jordan. There they drove exceedingly, pushing their way northward over the rich plains of Judaea and Jazer—the Golanites and Ituraeans of the Roman period—to the foot of Mount Hermon. At the time of the coronation of David at Hebron, while the western Manasseh sent 18,000, and Ephraim itself 20,800, the eastern Manasseh, with Gad and Reuben, mustered to the number of 120,000, thoroughly armed—a remarkable demonstration of strength, still more remarkable when we remember the fact that Saul's house, with David and Jonathan, was then residing at Mahanaim on the border of Manasseh and Gad. But, though thus outwardly prosperous, a similar fate awaited them in the end to that which befall Gad and Reuben; they gradually assimilated themselves to the old inhabitants of the country—they transgressed against the God of their fathers, and went a-wandering after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them (ib. v. 25). They relinquished too the settled mode of life and the defined limits which beffited the members of a federal nation, and gradually became Bedouins of the wilderness, spreading themselves over the vast deserts which lay between the allotted possessions of their tribe and the Ephraimites, and which had from time immemorial been the hunting-grounds and pastures of the wild Hafragites of Jazer, Nophili and Nobash (1 Chr. v. 19, 22). Up to that time the punishment which was ordained to be the inevitable consequence of such misdoing. They, first of all Israel, were carried away by Palt and Tuthith-Pischar, and settled in the Assyrian territories (ib. vii. 26). The connection, however, between east and west had been kept up to a certain degree. In Beth-shan, the most easterly city of the cis-Jordanic Manasseh, the two portions all but joined. David had judges or officers there for the western sacred and secular (1 Chr. xxvii. 32); and Solomon's commissariat officer, Ben-Giberel, ruled over the towns of Jair and the whole district of Argob (1 K. iv. 13), and transmitted their productions, doubtless not without their people, to the court of Jerusalem. The genealogies of the tribe are preserved in

Num. xxvi. 28-41; Josh. xvii. 1, &c.; and 1 Chr. viii. 14-19. But it seems impossible to unravel these so as to ascertain for instance which of the families remained east of Jordan, and which advanced to the west. From the fact that Abi-ezer (the family of Gideon), Hophir (possibly Ophrah, the native place of the same hero), and Shechem (the well-known city of the Bene-Joseph) all occur among the names of the sons of Gilead the son of Machir, it seems probable that Gilead, whose name is so intimately connected with the eastern, was also the immediate progenitor of the western half of the tribe. Nor is it less difficult to fix the exact position of the territory allotted to the western half. In Josh. xvii. 14-18, a passage usually regarded by critics as an exceedingly ancient document, we find the two tribes of Joseph complaining that only one portion had been allotted to them, namely, Mount Ephraim (ver. 15), and that they could not extend into the plains of Jordan or Edaron, because these districts were still in the possession of the Canaanites, and secured by their chariots. In reply Joshua advises them to go up into the forest (ver. 15. A. V. "wood")—into the mountain which is a forest (ver. 18). This mountain clothed with forest can surely be nothing but Carmel, the mountain closely adjoining the portion of Ephraim, whose richness of wood was so proverbial. And it is in accordance with this view that the majority of the towns of Manasseh—which as the weaker portion of the tribe would naturally be pushed to seek its fortunes outside the limits originally bestowed—were actually on the slopes either of Carmel itself or of the contiguous ranges. Thus Tannach and Megiddon were on the northern spur of Carmel; Hileam appears to have been on the eastern continuation of the range, somewhere near the present Junin. Ex. XIX was on the slopes of the so-called "Little Hermon." The two remaining towns mentioned as belonging to Manasseh formed the extreme eastern and western limits of the tribe; the one, Beth-shan (Josh xvii. 11), was in the hollow of the Ghir, or Jordan-valley; the other, Dora (Dor), was on the coast of Tyre, and proclaims Carmel, and immediately opposite the bluff or shoulder which forms its highest point. The whole of these cities are specially mentioned as standing in the allotments of other tribes, though inhabited by Manassites and this, with the absence of any attempt to define a limit to the possessions of the tribe on the north, looks as if no boundary-line had existed on that side, but as if the territory failed gradually into those of the two contiguous tribes from whom it had borrowed its finest cities. On the south side the boundary between Manasseh and Ephraim is more definitely described, and may be generally traced with tolerable certainty. It began on the east in the territory of Issachar (xviii. 10) at a place called Aser, (ver. 7) now Jafir, a boundary line separating Ephraim and Manasseh. It cannot have been at any great distance from Shechem, because the next point in the boundary to the Merothath facing Shechem. But Eusebius and Jerome, in the Commentaries (ver. xvi. 4, "Askr"), it is mentioned, evidently from ancient knowledge, as still retaining its name, and lying on the high road from Nymphopolis (Nabla, that is Shechem, in Nephopolis (Becon), the ancient Beth-shan, fifteen Roman miles from the former. In the Antonine Itinerary (571) it occurs...
MANASSEH

12 miles N. E. of Nobla. There it ran to Michmæthath, described as facing Shechem (Nobla), though now unknown; then went to the right, i. e. apparently a northward, to the spring of Tappanu, also unknown; there it fell in with the watercourses of the torrent Kanah — probably the Naher Fudhak — along which it ran to the Mediterranean.

From the indications of the history it would appear that Manasseh took a very little part in public affairs. They either left all that to Ephraim, or were so far removed from the centre of the nation as to have little interest in what was taking place. That they attended David's coronation at Hebron has already been mentioned. When his rule was established over all Israel, each half had its distinct ruler — the western, Joel ben-Yeshah, the eastern, Ido ben-Zechariah (1 Chr. xxvii. 23, 24). From this time the eastern Manasseh fades entirely from our view, and the western is hardly kept before us by an occasional mention. Such scattered notices as we do find have almost all reference to the part taken by members of the tribe in the reforms of the good kings of Judah — the Jehovah-revival under Asa (2 Chr. xv. 9) — the Passover of Hezekiah (xxxi. 1, 10, 11, 18), and the subsequent enthusiasm among the people of Israel — the conclusion of Josiah (xxxvi. 6), and his restoration of the buildings of the Temple (ver. 9). It is gratifying to reflect that these notices, faint and scattered as they are, are all colored with good, and exhibit none of the repulsive traits of that most repulsive heathenism into which other tribes of Israel fell.

It may have been at some such time of revival, whether brought about by the invitation of Judah, or, as the title in the LXX. would imply, by the dread of invasion, that Ps. lxxvi. was composed. But on the other hand, the mention of Benjamin as in alliance with Ephraim and Manasseh, points to an earlier date than the disruption of the two kingdoms. Whatever its date may prove to be, there can be little doubt that the author of the psalm was a member of the house of Joseph.

A positive connection between Manasseh and Benjamin is implied in the genealogy (1 Chr. xvi. vii., where Machir is said to have married into the family of Huppim and Shuphim, chief houses in the latter tribe (ver. 15). No record of any such relation appears to have been yet discovered in the historical books, nor is it directly alluded to except in the genealogy just quoted. But we know that a connection existed between the tribe of Benjamin and the town of Jabesh-Gilead, inasmuch as from that town were procured wives for four hundred out of the six hundred Benjaminites who survived the slaughter of Gibeah (Judg. xii. 12); and if Jabesh-Gilead was a town of Manasseh — as is very probable, though the fact is certainly nowhere stated — it does appear very possible that this was the

relationship referred to in the genealogies. According to the statement of the narrative two-thirds of the tribe of Benjamin must have been directly descended from Manasseh. Possibly we have here an explanation of the apparent connection between King Saul and the people of Jabesh. No appeal could have been more feasible to an oriental chieftain than that of his blood-relationships when threatened with invasion (1 Sam. xi. 4, 5), while no duty was more natural than that which they in their turn performed to his remains (1 Sam. xxxi. 11).

G.

MANASSEH (מָנָּשֶׁה) [see above]: Manas-ṣâ: Mamatæa), the thirteenth king of Judah. The reign of this monarch is longer than that of any other of the house of David. There is none of which we know so little. In part, it may be, this was the direct result of the character and policy of the man. In part, doubtless, it is to be traced to the abhorrence with which the following generation looked back upon it as the period of lowest degradation to which their country had ever fallen. Chroniclers and prophets pass it over, gathering from its horrors and disasters the great, broad moral lessons in which they saw the workings of a righteous retribution, the tokens of a Divine compassion, and then they avert their eyes and will see and say no more. This is in itself significant. It gives a meaning and a value to every fact which has escaped the sentence of oblivion. The very reticence of the historians of the O. T. shows how free they were from the rhetorical exaggerations and inaccuracies of a later age. The struggle of opposing worshippers must have been fierce under Manasseh as it was under Antiochus, or Decius, or Diocletian, or Mary. Men must have suffered and died in that struggle, of whom the world was not worthy, and yet no contrast can be greater than that between the short notices in Kings and Chronicles, and the martyrlogies which belong to those other periods of persecution.

The birth of Manasseh is fixed twelve years before the death of Hezekiah, B.C. 690 (2 K. xx. 1). We must, therefore, infer other that there had been no heir to the throne up to that comparatively late period in his reign, or that any that had been born had died, or that, as sometimes happened in the succession of Jewish and other eastern kings, the elder son was passed over for the younger. There are reasons which make the former the more probable alternative. The exceeding bitterness of Hezekiah's sorrow at the threatened approach of death (2 K. xx. 2, 3, 2Chr. xxxii. 24; Is. xxxviii. 1-4) is more natural if we think of him as sinking under the thought that he was dying childless, leaving no heir to his work and to his kingdom. When, a little later, Isaiah warns him of the cap-

Van de Velde suggests that this may have been the spot on which the Midianites encamped when surprised by Gideon; but that was merely further to the north, nearer the spring of Chisdul and the plain of Edraclon.

a The right (ןְָּבַּרְבַּר) is generally taken to signify the South; and so Keil understands it in the passage; but it seems more consonant with common sense, and also with the probable course of the boundary which could hardly have gone south of Shechem to take it as the right of the person tracing the line from East to West, i. e. North.
tivity and blame which will fall or his children, he speaks of those children as yet future (2 K. xx. 18).

This circumstance will explain one or two facts in the contemporary history. Hezekiah, it would seem, recovering from his sickness, anxious to avoid the danger that had threatened him of leaving his kingdom without an heir, marries, at or about this time, Hephzibah (2 K. xxi. 1), the daughter of one of the citizens or princes of Jerusalem (Joseph. Ant. x. 3, § 1). The prophets, we may well imagine, would welcome the prospect of a successor named by a king who had been so true and faithful. Isaiah (in a passage clearly belonging to a later date than the early portions of the book, and apparently suggested by some conspicuous marriage), with his characteristic fondness for tracing anguies in names, finds in that of the new queen a prophecy of the ultimate restoration of Israel and the glories of Jerusalem (Is. xxxii. 4, 5; comp. Himm. Scripturæ Cœnîl. Part iii. 5). The city also should be a Hephzibah, a delightful one. As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so would Jehovah rejoice over his people. The child that is born from this union is called Manasseh. This name too is strangely significant. It appears nowhere else in the history of the kingdom of Judah. The only associations connected with it were, that it belonged to the tribe which was all but the most powerful of the hostile kingdom of Israel. How are we to account for so singular and unlikely a choice? The answer is, that the name embodied what had been for years the cherished object of Hezekiah's policy and hope. To take advantage of the overthrow of the rival kingdom by Shalmaneser, and the anarchy in which its provinces had been left, to gather round him the remnant of the population, to bring them back to the worship and faith of their fathers, this had been the second step in his great national reformation (2 Chr. xxx. 6). It was at least partially successful. "Livers of Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulun, humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem." They were there at the great passover. The work of destroying idols went on in Ephraim and Manasseh as well as in Judah (2 Chr. xxxi. 1). What could be a more acceptable pledge of his desire to receive the fugitives as on the same footing with his own subjects than that he should give to the heir to his throne the name in which one of their tribes excelled? What could better show the desire to let all past discord and offenses be forgotten than the name which was itself an amnity? (Genesis.)

The had twelve years of Hezekiah's reign were not, however, it will be remembered, those which were likely to influence for good the character of his successor. His policy had succeeded. He had thrown off the yoke of the king of Assyria, which Ahaz had accepted, had defied his armies, had been delivered from external danger, and had made himself the head of an independent kingdom, receiving tribute from neighboring princes instead of paying it to the great king, a successor of Assyria. But he gave a step further. Not content with independence, he enters on a policy of aggression. He contracts an alliance with the rebellious viceroy of Babylon against their common enemy (2 K. xx. 12; Is. xxxix.). He displays the treasures of his kingdom to the ambassadors, in the belief that that will show them how powerful an ally he can prove himself. Isaiah protested against this step, but the ambition of being a great potentate continued, and it was to the results of this ambition that the boy Manasseh succeeded at the age of twelve. His accession appears to have been the signal for an entire change, if not in the foreign policy, at any rate in the religious administration of the kingdom. At so early an age he can scarcely have been the spontaneous author of so great an alteration, and we may justly infer that it was the work of the idolatrous, or Ahaz party, which had been repressed during the reign of Hezekiah, but had all along, like the Roman clergy under Edward VI. in England, looked on the reform with a sufficient acquiescence, and thwarted it when they dared. The change which the king's measures brought about was after all superficial. The idolatry which was publicly disowned, was practiced privately (Is. xix. 29, ii. 20, lv. 3). The priests and the prophets, in spite of their outward orthodoxy, were too often little better than licentious drunkards (Is. xxviii. 7). The nobles of Judah kept the new moons and Sabbaths much in the same way as those of France kept their Lentis, when Louis XIV. had made devotion a court ceremonial (Is. i. 13, 14). There are signs that even among the king's subjects there was a certain spirit of debasing national sentiment. Is. xi. 13, 15, and Jer. ii. xxvii. "Observe how the policy was simply that of a selfish ambition, himself possibly a foreigner (comp. Himm. Scripturæ Cœnîl. iii. 4), and whom Isaiah saw through and distrusted. It was, moreover, the traditional policy of the princes of Judah (comp. one remarkable instance in the reign of Josiah, 2 Chr. xiv. 17) to favor foreign alliances and the toleration of foreign worship, as it was that of the true priests and prophets to protest against it. It would seem, accordingly, as if they urged upon the young king that scheme of a close alliance with Babylon which Isaiah had condemned, and as the natural consequence of this, the adoption, as far as possible, of its worship, and that of other nations whom it was desirable to conciliate. In the widening of the range of their knowledge and penetrating into the mysteries of other systems of belief, may possibly have contributed now, as it had done in the days of Solomon, to increase the evil (Jer. ii. 10-25; Ewald. Gesch. Isr. iii. 666). The result was a delusion which had not been equalled even in the reign of Ahaz, uniting in one centre the abominations which elsewhere existed separately. Not content with sanctioning their presence in the Holy City, as Solomon and Rehoboam had done, he defiled with it the Sanctuary itself (2 Chr. xxxiii. 14). The worship thus introduced was, as has been said, predominantly Babylonian in its character. He observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards" (ibid. ver. 6). The worship of the Lord God of Sabaoth (2 K. xxii. 12; Is. lv. 1; Zeph. i. 5; Jer. viii. 2, xix. 13, xxxii. 29). With this, however, there was associated the old Medie workflows of the Ammonites. The fires were rekindled in the Valley of Hinnom. Topkhet was (for the first time) built a stately fabric (2 K. xxvi. 20; Is. xxx. 33, as compared with Jer. vii. 31. x. 7, 8; Ewald. Gesch. Isr. iii. 667). Even the king's sons have
Menashe was 1773

Instead of being presented to Jehovah, received a horrible fire-baptism dedicating them to Molech (2 Chr. xxxiii. 6), while others were actually slaughtered (Ex. xxxiii. 37, 39). The Baal and Ashtaroth ritual, which had been imported under Solomon, from the Phoenicians, was revived with fresh splendor, and in the worship of the "Queen of heaven," fixed its roots deep into the habits of the people (Jer. vii. 18). Worse and more horrible than all, the Asherah, the image of Ashtaroth, or the obscene symbols of unholy worship (comp. Asherah, in addition to the authorities there cited, Mayer, De Reform. Juas., etc., in the Thes. theol. philol. Amstel. 1701,) was seen in the house of which Jehovah had said that He would there put His Name for ever (2 K. xxi. 7). All this was accompanied by the extreme moral degradation. The worship of those old Eastern religions has been well described as a kind of "sensuous intoxication," simply sensuous, and therefore associated inevitably with a fiendish cruelty, leading to the utter annihilation of the spiritual life of men (Hegel, Philos. of History, i. 3). So it was in Jerusalem in the days of Menasseh. Rival priests (the Chemarim of Zeph. i. 4) were consecrated for this hideous worship. Women dedicating themselves to a cultus like that of the Babylonian Mylitta, were hanged in the temple (Zach. ii. § 4). The Kadeshim, in closest neighborhood with them, gave themselves up to yet darker abominations (2 K. xxi. 7). The awful words of Isaiah (i. 10) had a terrible truth in them. Those to whom he spoke were literally "rulers of Sodom and princes of Gomorrah." Every faith was tolerated but the old faith of Israel. This was abandoned and proscribed. The altar of Jehovah was displaced (2 Chr. xxxiii. 16). The very ark of the covenant was removed from the sanctuary (2 Chr. xxxiv. 3). The sacred books of the people were so systematically destroyed, that fifty years later, men listened to the Book of the Law of Jehovah as a newly discovered treasure (2 K. xxii. 8). It may well be, according to a Jewish tradition, that this fanaticism of idolatry led Manasseh to order the name Jehovah to be erased from all documents and inscription. This, if true, was the most complete and systematic violation of the weekly Sabbath rest and the consequent loss of one witness against a merely animal life (Is. lv. 2, lvii. 13). The tide of corruption carried away some even of those who, as priests and prophets, should have been steadfast in resisting it (Zeph. iii. 4; Jer. ii. 26, v. 13, vi. 13).

It is easy to imagine the bitter grief and burning indignation of those who continued faithful. The fiercest zeal of Huguenots in France, of Covenanters in Scotland, against the hedges and symbols of the Latin Church, is perhaps but a faint shadow of that which grew to a white heat in the hearts of the worshippers of Jehovah. They spoke out in words of corresponding strength. Evil was coming on Jerusalem which should make the ears of men to tingle (2 K. xii. 12). The line of Samaritans and the plumes of the house of Ahab should be the "beaum of the Holy City. Like a vessel that had once been full of precious ointment (comp. the I.N.X. ἀραβάστρων), but had afterwards become bad, Jerusalem should be emptied and wiped out, and exposed to the winds of heaven till it was "drenched.

Foremost, we may well believe, among those who thus bore their witness, was the old prophet, now bent with the weight of fourscore years, who had in his earlier days protested with equal courage against the crimes of the king's grandfather. On him too, according to the old Jewish tradition, came the first shock of the persecution. [Isaiah.] Habakkuk may have shared his martyrdom (Kell on 2 K. xxi.; comp. Habakkuk). But the persecution did not stop there. It attacked the whole order of the true prophets, and those who followed them. Every day witnessed an execution (Joseph. Ant. x. 3, § 1).

The slaughter was like that under Ahab or Charles IX. (2 K. xxi. 16). The martyrs who were faithful unto death had to endure not torture only, but the mocks and taunts of a godless generation (Is. lvi. 1-4). Long afterwards the remembrance of that reign of terror lingered in the minds of men as a guilt for which nothing could atone (2 K. xxiv. 4). The persecution, like most other persecutions carried on with entire singleness of purpose, was for a time successful (Jer. ii. 30). The prophets appear no more in the long history of Manasseh's reign. The heart and the intellect of the nation were crushed out, and there would seem to have been no chroniclers left to record this portion of its history.

Rituation came soon in the natural sequence of events. There are indications that the neighboring nations — Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, &c. — who had been in the service of Assyria and were at some period in the reign of Manasseh, and asserted their independence (Zeph. ii. 4-15; Jer. xlvii., xlviii., xlix.). The Babylonian alliance bore the fruits which had been predicted. Hezekiah had been too hasty in attaching himself to the cause of the rebel-prince against Assyria. The rebellion of Merodach-Baladan was crushed, and then the wrath of the Assyrian king fell on those who had supported him. [Esdr. ii. 1-4.] Judah was again overrun by the Assyrian armies, and this time the invasion was more successful than that of Senacherib. The city apparently was taken. The king himself was made prisoner and carried off to Babylon. There his eyes were opened, and he repented, and his prayer was heard, and the Lord delivered him (2 Chr. xxxiii. 12, 13; comp. Maurice, Prophees and Kings, p. 362.)

Two questions arise at this point. (1.) Have we satisfactory grounds for believing that this statement is historically true? (2.) If we accept it, to what period in the reign of Manasseh is it to be assigned? It has been urged in regard to (1) that the silence of the writer of the books of Kings is conclusive against the trustworthiness of the narrative of 2 Chronicles. In the former there is no mention made of captivity or repentance or return. The latter, it has been said, yields to the temptation of pointing a moral, of making history appear more in harmony with his own notions of the Divine government than it actually is. His anxiety to deal leniently with the successors of David leads him to invent at once a reformation and the captivity which is represented as its cause (Winer, Reb. s. v. Manasseh; Rosenmiiller, Bibl. Alterth. i. 2, p. 101; Hitzig, begr. d. Kritik, p. 100, quoted by Kell). It will be necessary, in dealing with this objection, to meet the skeptical critic on his own ground. To say that he reasoning contradicts our belief in the inspiration of the historical books of Scripture, and is destructive of all reverence for them, would involve a petitio principii, and however strongly it may influence our feelings, we are bound to find another answer. It is believed that this answer is not far to seek. (1.) The silence of
a writer who sums up the history of a reign of 55 years in 19 verses as to one alleged event in it is surely a weak ground for refusing to accept that event on the authority of another historian. (2.)

The omission is in part explained by the character of the narrative of 2 K. xxi. The writer deliberately turns away from the history of the days of shame, and not less from the personal biography of the king. He looks on the reign only as it contributed to the corruption and final overthrow of the kingdom, and no after repentance was able to undo the mischief that had been done at first. (3.) Still keeping on the level of human probabilities, the character of the writer of 2 Chronicles, obviously a Levite, and looking at the facts of the history from the Levite point of view, would lead him to attach greater importance to a partial re-annunciation of the old ritual and to the cessation of persecution, and so to give them in proportion a greater prominence. (4.) There is one peculiarity in the history which is, in some measure, of the nature of an undisguised coincidence, and so confirms it. The captains of the host of Assyria take Manasseh to Babylon. Would not a later writer, inventing the story, have made the Assyrian, and not the Babylonian capital, the scene of the captivity; or if the latter were chosen for the sake of harmony with the prophecy of Is. xxxix., have made the king of Babylon rather than of Assyria the captor? As it is, the narrative fits in, with the utmost accuracy, to the facts of oriental history. The first attempt of Babylon to assert its independence of Nineveh failed. It was crushed by Esarhaddon (the first or second of that name; comp. ESayMAKOD, and Ewald, Gesch. Isr. iii. 654.), and for a time the Assyrian king held his court at Babylon, so as to effect more completely the reduction of the rebellious province. There is (5) the fact of agreement with the intervention of the Assyrian king in 2 K. xxi. 24, just at the same time. The king is not named there, but Ezra iv. 2, 10, gives Asnappar, and this is probably only another form of Assarpanar, and this = Esarhaddon (comp. Ewald, Gesch. iii. 678.; Tols. i. 21 gives Assarhaddon). The importation of tributes from Eastern Asia thus becomes part of the same policy as the attack on Judah. On the whole, then, the objection may well be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious. Like many other difficulties urged by the same school, it has in it something at once captious and puerile. Those who lay undue stress on them act in the spirit of a clever boy posing puzzling questions, or a sharp advocate getting up a case against the evidence on the other side, rather than in that of critics who have learnt how to construct a history and to value its materials rightly (comp. Keil, Comm. on 2 K. xxii.).

Ewald, a critic of a nobler stamp, whose fault is rather of fantastic reconstruction than needless skepticism (Gesch. Isr. iii. 678), admits the groundwork of truth. Would the prophecy of Isaiah, it may be asked, have been recorded and preserved if it had not been fulfilled? Might not Manasseh's release have been, as Ewald suggests, the direct consequence of the death of Esarhaddon?

The circumstance just noticed enables us to turn an approximate answer to the other question. The duration of Esarhaddon's Babylonian reign is calculated as from B.C. 680-667; and Manasseh's captivity must therefore have fallen within those limits. A Jewish tradition (Seder Olam Raba, c. 24) fixes the 221 year of his reign as the exact date; and this, according as we adopt the earlier or the later date of his accession, would give B.C. 676 or 673.

The period that followed is dwelt upon by the writer of 2 Chr. as one of a great change for the better. The discipline of exile made the king feel that the gods whom he had chosen were powerless to deliver, and he turned in his heart to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. The compulsion or death of Esarhaddon led to his release, and he returned after some uncertain interval of time to Jerusalem. It is not improbable that his absence from that city had given a breathing-time to the oppressed adherents of the ancient creed, and possibly had brought into prominence, as the provisional ruler and defender of the city, one of the chief members of the party. If the prophecy of Is. xxii. 15 received, as it probably did, its fulfillment in Shalman's sharing the captivity of his master, there is nothing extravagant in the belief that we may refer to the same period the notable words which speak of Eliasim the son of Hilkiah taken to Babylon as taken to Jerusalem, and who should leave vacant, and rising up is to be "a father unto the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah," having "the key of the house of David on his shoulder."

The return of Manasseh was at any rate followed by a new policy. The old faith of Israel was no longer persecuted. Foreign idolatries were no longer thrust, in all their falsities, into the sacred city. The altar of the Lord was again restored, and puerile offers and thank-offerings were sacrificed to Jehovah (2 Chr. xxxiii. 15, 16). But beyond this the reformation did not go. The ark was not restored to its place. The book of the Law of Jehovah remained in its concealment. Satisfied with the feeling that they were no longer worshipping the gods of other nations by name, they went on with a new mood of worship essentially idolatrous. "The people did sacrifice still in the high places, but to Jehovah their God only." (ibid. ver. 17.)

The other facts known of Manasseh's reign connect themselves with the state of the world round him. The Assyrian monarchy was tottering to its fall, and the king of Judah seems to have thought that it was still possible for him to rule as the head of a strong and independent kingdom. If he had to contend himself with a smaller territory, he might yet guard its capital against attack, by a new wall defending what had been before its weak side, "to the entering in of the fish-gate," and completing the tower of Ophel, which had been begun, with a like purpose, by Jotham (2 Chr. xxvi. 3). Nor were the preparations for defense limited to Jerusalem. "He put captains of war in all the fenced cities of Judah." There was, it must be remembered, a special reason for this attitude, over and above that afforded by the condition of Assyria. Egypt had emerged from the chaos of the Nebuchadnezzar and the Elamian intruders, and was become the city where it was most open to attack. Zephaniah points to the defenses, and says that they shall avail nothing. It is useless to trust in them; "There shall be no voice of a cry from the fish-gate."

A comparison of the description of these fortifications with Zeph. 10. 10 gives a special interest and force to the prophet's words. Manasseh had strengthened

MANASSEH

MANASSEH

"It may be noticed that this was actually done in later apocryphal traditions (see below)."
strong and aggressive under Pseudo-Aristeas. Pushing his arms northwards, he attacked the Philis-tines; and the twenty-nine years’ siege of Azotus must have fallen wholly or in part within the reign of Manasseh. So far his progress would not be unacceptable. It would be pleasant to see the old hereditary enemies of Israel, who had lately grown insolent and defiant, meet with their just deserts. About this time, accordingly, we find the thought of an Egyptian alliance again beginning to gain favor. The prophets, and those who were guided by them, dreaded this more than anything, and entered their protest against it. Not the less, however, from this time forth, did it continue to be the favorite idea which took possession of the minds of the lay-party of the princes of Judah. The very name of Manasseh’s son, Amon, barely admitting a possible Hebrew explanation, but identi-cal in form and sound with that of the great sun-god of Egypt (so Ewald, Gesch. iii. 665), is probably an indication of the gladness with which the alliance of Pseudo-Aristeas was welcomed. As one of its consequences, it involved probably the supply of troops from Judah to serve in the armies of the Egyptian king. Without adopting Ewald’s hypothesis, that this is referred to in Is. xxi. 18, it is yet likely enough in itself, and Jer. ii. 14-16 seems to allude to some such state of things. In return for this, Manasseh, we may believe, received the help of the chariots and horses for which Egypt was always famous (Is. xxxi. 1). (Comp. Aristaeus, Epist, et Philocr. in Havercomp’s Josephus, ii. p. 104). If this was the close of Manasseh’s reign, we can well understand how to the writer of the books of Kings it would seem hardly better than the beginning, leaving the root-evil uncorrected, preparing the way for worse evils than itself. We can understand how it was that on his death he was buried as Abaz had been, not with the burial of a king, in the sepulchres of the house of David, but in the garden of Uzza (2 K. xxi. 20), and that, long afterwards, in spite of its repenance, the Jews held his name in abhorrence, as one of the three kings (the other two are Jeroboam and Ahaz) who had no part in eternal life (San- hedr. ch. xi. 1, quoted by Patrick on 2 Chr. xxxiiii. 13).

And the evil was irreparable. The habits of a sensuous and delirious worship had eaten into the life of the people; and though they might be repressed for a time by force, as in the reformation of Josiah, they burst out again, when the pressure was removed, with fresh violence, and rendered even the zeal of the best of the Jewish kings fruitful chiefly in hypocrisy and unreality.

The intellectual life of the people suffered in the same degree. The persecution cut off all who trained in the schools of the prophets, were the thinkers and teachers of the people. The reign of Manasseh witnessed the close of the work of Isaiah and Habakkuk at its beginning; and the youth of Jeremiah and Zephaniah at its conclusion, but no prophetic writings illumine that dreary half century of debasement. The most fearful symptom of all is that a prophet’s voice was heard during the majority of Josiah, was the atheism which, then as in other ages, followed on the con-fused adoption of a confluent polytheism (Zeph. i. 12). It is surely a strained, almost a fantastic hypothesis, to assign (as Ewald does) to such a period two such noble works as Deuteronomy and the Book of Job. Nor was this dying-out of a true faith the only evil. The systematic persecution of the worshipers of Jehovah accustomed the people to the horrors of a religious war; and when they in their turn gained the ascendency, they used the opportunity with a fiercer sternness than had been known before. Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their reforms had been content with restoring the true worship and destroying the instruments of the false. In that of Josiah, the destruction extends to the priests of the high places, whom he sacrifices on their stones (2 K. xxii. 20).

But little is added by later tradition to the O. T. narrative of Manasseh’s reign. The prayer that bears his name among the apocryphal books can hardly, in the absence of any Hebrew original, be considered as identical with that referred to in 2 Chr. xxxiii., and is probably rather the result of an attempt to work out the hint there supplied than the reproduction of an older document. There are reasons, however, for believing that there existed at some time, or other, a fuller history, probably legendary, of Manasseh and his conversion, from which the prayer may possibly have been an excerpt preserved for devotional purposes (it appears for the first time in the Apostolical Constitutions) when the rest was rejected as worthless. Scattered here and there, we find the disjecta membra of such a work. Among the offenses of Manasseh, the most prominent is, that he places in the sanctuary an altar of Zeus (the Aramaic name for Zeus, is Άγις τετεμπόρος of Ionzus, 1 Macc. viii. 21). The charge on which he condemns Isaiah to death is that of blasphemy, the words, "I saw the Lord" (Is. vi. 1) being treated as a presumptuous boast at variance with Ex. xxxvii. 20 (Nic. de Lyra, from a Jewish treatise: Jethnadoth, quoted by Ananias, in Crit. Sacri on 2 K. xxi. ). Isaiah is miraculously rescued. A cedar opens to receive him. Then comes the order that the cedar should be sawn through (Ibid.). That which made this sin the greater was, that the king’s mother, Heph- zibah, was the daughter of Isaiah. When Manas-seth was taken captive by Merodach and taken to Babylon (Sidias), he was thrown into prison and...
fed daily with a scanty allowance of bran-bread and water mixed with vinegar. Then came his condemnation. He was execrated in a brazen image (the description suggests a punishment like that of the bull of Perillus), but he repented and prayed, and the image clave asunder, and he escaped (Suidas and Georg. Synellus). Then he returned to Jerusalem and lived righteously and justly.

E. H. P.

2. (Manasseh; [Vat. Massorah: Manasses].) One of the descendents of Phahath-Moab, who in the days of Ezra had married a foreign wife (Ezr. x. 30). In 1 Esdr. ix. 31 he is called Manasses.

3. One of the laymen, of the family of Hashum, who put away his foreign wife at Ezra's command (Ezr. x. 34). He is called Manasses in 1 Esdr. ix. 33.

4. (Manasseh; Alex. Massorah: Moseps.) In the Hebrew text of Judith, xviii. 30, the name of the priest of the graven image of the Danites is given as "Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh"; the last word being written כנשמ, and a Masoretic note calling attention to the מ� suspended." "The fate of this superscription letter," says Kennicott (Diss. p. 51), "has been very mysterious, sometimes placed over the word, sometimes suspended half way, and sometimes uniformly inserted." Jarchi's note upon the passage is as follows: "On account of the honor of Moses he wrote these words to change the name; and it is written suspended to signify that it was not Manasseh but Moses." The LXX., Peschito-Syriac, and Talmud all read "Manasseh," but the Vulgate retains the original and undoubtedly the true reading. Moseps.

Three of De Rossi's MSS. had originally כנשמ, "Moses," and this was also the reading of three Greek MSS. in the Library of St. Germain at Paris, of one in the Library of the Carmelites of the same place, of a Greek MS. No. 331, in the Vatican, and of a MS. of the Octateuch in University College Library, Oxford (? Barrington, Genizothica, i. 86). A passage in Theodoret is either an attempt to reconcile the two readings, or indicates that in some copies at least of the Greek they must have existed. He quotes the clause in question in this form, "אֲנְשֵׁי דֵילָא ... וֹאֵי מַנָּסָא וֹאֵי פְּרֹתָא וֹאֵי מָשָּא; and this apparently gave rise to the assertion of Biller (Arevanum Keri et Kelath, p. 187, quoted by Rosenmuller on Judg. xviii. 30), that the מ� suspended" denotes that the previous word is transposed. He accordingly proposes to read כנשֶּנ, but although his judgment on the point is accepted as final by Rosenmuller, it has not the smallest authority. Kennicott attributes the presence of the מ� to the corruption of M.S. by Jewish transcribers. With regard to the chronological difficulty of accounting for the presence of a grandson of Moses at an apparently late period, there is every reason to believe that the last five chapters of Judges are more or less in the order of the events of the period after which they are placed. In xx. 28 Phinehas the son of Eleazar, and therefore the grandson of Aaron, is said to have stood before the ark, and there is therefore no difficulty in supposing that a grandson of Moses might be alive at the same time, which was not long after the death of Joshua. Josephus places the episode of the Benjamites before that of the Gadites, and introduces them both before the invasion of Chushanrishathaim and the deliverance of Israel by Othniel, narrated in Judg. iii. (Ant. v. 2, § 8-4, § 3; see also Kennicott's Dissections, ii. 180, § 442). It may be as well to mention a tradition recorded by R. David Kimchi, that in the genealogy of Jonathan, Manasses is written for Moses because he did the deed of Manasses, the idolatrous king of Judah. A note from the margin of a Hebrew MS. quoted by Kennicott (Disser. gen. p. 10) is as follows: "He is called by the name of Manasses the son of Hezekiah, for he also made the graven image in the Temple." It must be confessed that the point of this is not very apparent.

2. MANASSES (Massorah; [Vat. Massorah: Manasses]). 1. MANasses 1, of the sons of Hashum (1 Esdr. ix. 34; comp. Ezr. x. 33).

2. MANasses, king of Judah (Matt. i. 10), to whom the apocryphal prayer is attributed.

3. MANasses, the son of Joseph (Rev. vii. 6).

4. A wealthy inhabitant of Bethulia, and husband of Judith, according to the legend. He was slain with a smite while superintending the laborers in his fields, leaving Judith a widow with great possessions (Judg. viii. 2, 7, x. 3, xvi. 22, 23, 24), and was buried between Dodhan and Baalhamon.

MANasses, the prayer of (prawr) Massorah). 1. The repentance and restoration of Manasses (2 Chr. xxxiii. 12 ff.) furnished the subject of many legendary stories (Fabric. Gen. Apocr. i. 7. i. 1101 f). "His prayer unto his God" was still preserved "in the book of the kings of Israel" when the Chronicles were compiled (2 Chr. xxxiii. 18), and, after this record was lost, the subject was likely to attract the notice of later writers. "The Prayer of Manasses," which is found in some MSS. of the LXX., is the work of one who has endeavored to express, not without true feeling, the thoughts of the repentant king. It opens with a description of the majesty of God (1-5), which passes into a description of the mercy of God in granting repentance to sinners (6-8, ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ). Then follows a personal confession and supplication to God as "the God of them that repent," "hymned by all the powers of heaven," to whom belongs "glory for ever" (9-15, εὐαγγελεῖ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰωναν). "And the Lord heard the voice of Manasses and pitied him," the legend continues, "and there came around him a flame of fire, and all the iron about him (τὸ ὁρτόν τοῦ μητρώου) were melted, and the Lord delivered him out of his affliction" (Const. Apost. ii. 22; comp. Jud. Afric. ap. Routh, Rel. Sac. ii. 288).

2. The Greek text is undoubtedly original, and not a mere translation from the Hebrew; and even within the small space of fifteen verses some peculiarities are found (ἄστεκος, κλίνει γενόντας καρδιάς, παραγειοντέον ἑαυτής μετὰ τοῦ τινος ἐκείνου). Jesus was well acquainted with the LXX. (τὰ κατατάσσεται τῆς γῆς, το πλῆθος τῆς χρονοτοπητος ομ. πάντα η δύνασιν τῶν οὐρανῶν); but beyond this there is nothing to determine the point of the text at least no trace of such an origin of the Greek text

a. Kershi (Griech. lit. 675) is inclined to think that the Greek may have been based on the Hebrew. There
MANASSITES. THE

3. The earliest reference to the Prayer is contained in a fragment of Julius Africanus (cir. 221 A. D.), but it may be doubted whether the words in their original form clearly referred to the present composition (Jul. Afr. fr. 40). It is, however, given at length in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. 22), in which it is followed by a narrative of the same apocryphal facts (§ 1) as are quoted from Africanus. The Prayer is found in the Alexandrine MS. in the collection of hymns and metrical prayers which is appended to the Psalter — a position which it generally occupies; but in the three Latin MSS. used by Schubert it is placed at the end of 2 Chr. (Sasbe. Bibl. Lett. iii. 1038).

4. The Prayer was never distinctly recognized as a canonical writing, though it was included in many MSS. of the LXX. and of the Latin version, and has been deservedly retained among the apocrypha in A. V. and by Luther. The Latin translation which occurs in Vulgate MS. is not by the hand of Jerome, and has some remarkable phrases (incipit solvete, importuna solvete, qui nos vitam cordebat); but there is no sufficient internal evidence to show whether it is earlier or later than his time. It does not, however, seem to have been used by any Latin writer of the first four centuries, and was not known to Victor Tunonensis in the 6th (Ambrosii, iv. 989, ed. Migne).

5. The Commentary of Fritzsche (Eexg. Histh. 1851) contains all that is necessary for the interpretation of the Prayer, which is, indeed, in little need of explanation. The Alexandrine text seems to have been interpolated in some places, while it also omits a whole clause; but at present the materials for settling a satisfactory text have not been collected.

B. F. W.

MANASSITES, THE (מָנֶאשָטִים), i. e. "the Manassite": מָנֶאשָׂי or מָנָאשׂי; Alex. in Deut. and Judg; מָנָאשׂ or מָנָאשׁי (Manasse), that is the son of the tribe of Manasseh. The word occurs but thrice in the A. V. namely, Deut. iv. 43; Judg. xii. 4; and 2 K. x. 33. In the first and last of these the original is as given above, but in the other it is "Manasses" — "Fugitives of Ephraim are you, Gilead; in the midst of Ephraim, in the midst of Manasses." It may be well to take this opportunity of remarking, that the point of the verse following that just quoted is lost in the A. V., from the word which in ver. 4 is rightly rendered "fugitive" being there given as "those which were escaped." Ver. 5 would more accurately be, "And Gilead seized the fords of the Jordan-of-Ephraim: and it was so that when fugitives of Ephraim said, 'I will go over,' the men of Gilead said to him, 'Art thou an Ephraimite?' — the point being that the taunt of the Ephraimites was turned against themselves.

MAN DRAKES (מָנֶדרָקִים), dudhim: מִנְדָּרָק, מִנְדָּרָק, מִנָּדָרָק: mandrakes: "It were a weariness and a superfluous task," says Oedmann (Vernich. Samml. i. v. 85), "to quote and pass judgment on the multitude of authors who have written about dudhiam;" but the reader who cares to know the literature of the subject will find a long list of authorities in Celsius (Hieroh. i. 1 ff) and in Rudebeck (De Dudhiam Rubenis, Upsal, 1733). See also Winer (Bibl. Rerolb. "Araun."). The dudhiam (the word occurs only in the plural number) are mentioned in Gen. xxx. 14, 15, 16, and in Cant. vii. 13. From the former passage we learn that they were found in the fields of Mesopotamia, where Jacob and his wives were at one time living, and that the fruit (מִנְדָּרָק, LXX.) was gathered in the days of wheat-harvest, i. e. in May. There is evidently also an allusion to the supposed properties of this plant to promote conception, hence Rachel's desire of obtaining the fruit, for as yet she had not borne children. In Cant. vii. 13 it is said, "the dudhiam give a smell, and at our gates are all manner of pleasant fruits." — from this passage we learn that the plant in question was strong-scented, and that it grew in Palestine. Various attempts have been made to identify the dudhiam. Rudbeck the younger — the same who maintained that the quails which fed the Israelites in the wilderness were "flying fish," and who, as Oedmann has truly remarked, seems to have a special gift for demonstrating anything he pleases — supposed the dudhiam were "ternable berries" (Rhamnus cathartica, Lin.), a theory which deserves no serious consideration. Celsius, who supposes that a kind of Rhamus is meant, is far from satisfactory in his conclusions; he identifies the dudhiam with what he calls Lotus Cyperaceum, the Sūra of Arabic authors. This appears to be the lotus of the ancients, Zizyphus lotus. See Shaw's Tretula, i. 253, and Sprengel, Hist. Reichg. herb. i. 251; Freytag, Ap. Lex. s. v. ḫumār.

Celsius's argument is based entirely upon the authority of a certain Rabbi (see Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. p. 1292), who asserts the dudhiam to be the fruit of the pūyāh (the lotus); but the authority of a single Rabbi is of little weight against the almost unanimous testimony of the ancient versions. With still less reason have Castell (Lev. Sched. p. 411) and Rudolph (Hist. Eth. i. c. 9), and a few others, advanced a claim for the Musa paradisiaca, the banana, to denote the dudhiam. Faber, following Ant. Deusing (Disc. de Dudhiam), thought the dudhiam were small sweet-scented melons (Cucumis dudhian), which grow in Syria, Egypt, and Persia, known by the Persians as dūshān, a word which means "fragrance in the hand;" and Sprengel (Hist. i. 17) has, for the sake of having entertained a similar belief. This theory is certainly more plausible than many others that have been adduced, but it is unsupported except by the Persian version in Genesis. Various other conjectures have come from time to time to be made, as that the dudhiam are "lilies," or "citrons," or "baskets of figs" — all mere theories.

a Various etymologies have been proposed for this word; the most probable is that it comes from the root תֵּלָה, "to love," whence תֵּלָה, "love."

ב This plant, according to Abulfedl, cor. 112.

c Responds with the Arabic مِشْرَ، which, however, Sprengel identifies with Zizyphus Palurna.
The most satisfactory attempt at identification is certainly that which supposes the mandrake (Atropa mandragora) to be the plant denoted by the Hebrew word. The LXX., the Vulg., the Syriac, and the Arabic versions, the Targums, the most learned of the Rabbis, and many later commentators, are in favor of the translation of the A. V. The arguments which Celsius has adduced against the mandrake being the dubhaim have been most ably answered by Michaelis (see Supp. ad Lex. Heb. No. 451). It is well known that the mandrake is far from odoriferous, the whole plant being, in European estimation at all events, very fetid: on this account Celsius objected to its being the dubhaim, which he supposed were said in the Canticles to be fragrant. Michaelis has shown that nothing of the kind is asserted in Scripture: the dubhaim “give forth an odor,” which, however, may be one of no fragrant nature; the invocation to plants, the fruit of which he says “is of the size and color for a small apple, round and of a most agreeable color.” Bede, after quoting a number of authorities to show that the mandrakes were prized by the Arabs for their odor, makes the following just remark: “It is known that the Orientals set an especial value on strongly smelling things that to more delicate European senses are unpleasing: the intoxicating qualities of the mandrake, far from lessening its value, would rather add to it, for every one knows with what relish the Orientals use all kinds of preparations to produce intoxication.”

The Arabic version of Saadias has lyurfk in mandrake; in Onkelos y'hbrdn,h, and in Syriac y'hbrnk e express the Hebrew dubhaim: now we learn from Mariti (Trer., iii. 146, ed. Lond. 1792) that a word similar to this last was applied by the Arabs to the mandrake — he says, “The Arabs call it y'hrdhn.” Celsius asserts that the mandrake has not the property which has been attributed to it; it is, however, a matter of common belief in the East that this plant has the power to aid in the preservation of offspring. Schulz, Mannrell, Mariti, all allude to it: compare also Dioscorides, i. 76, Sprenger's Annotations; and Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. ix. 9, § 1. Venus was called Mandragoritis by the ancient Greeks (Hesych. s. v.), and the fruit of the plant was termed “apples of love.”

That the fruit was fit to be gathered at the time of wheat-harvest is clear from the testimony of several travellers. Schulz found mandrake-apples on the 15th of May. Hassequist saw them at Nazareth early in May. He says: “I had not the pleasure to see the plant in blossom, the fruit now (May 5, 6, 8) hanging ripe on the stem which lay withered on the ground;” — he conjectures that they are Rachel's dubhaim. Dr. Thomson (The Land and the Book, p. 577) found mandrakes ripe on the lower ranges of Lebanon and Hermon towards the end of April.

From a certain rude resemblance of old roots of the mandrake to the human form, whence Pythagorians is said to have called the mandrake apxmyorapdov, and the Romans (10, 19 seminum) and Orientals (10, 19) to attribute strange superstitious notions have arisen concerning it. Josephus (B. J. vii. 6, § 3) evidently alludes to one of these superstitions, though he calls the plant huvovs. In a Vienna MS. of Dioscorides is a curious drawing which represents Eurus, the goddess of discovery, handing to Dioscorides a root of the mandrake; the dog employed for the purpose is depicted in the agonies of death (Daubeny's Euphoriam, p. 275).”

The mandrake is found abundantly in the Greek islands, and in some parts of the south of Europe. The root is spindle-shaped and often divided into two or three forks. The leaves, which are long, sharp-pointed, and hairy, rise immediately from the ground; they are of a dark-green color. The flowers are dingy white; stained with veins of purple. The fruit is of a pale orange color, and about the size of a nutmeg; but it would appear that the plant varies considerably in appearance.

---

The Mandrake (Atropa mandragora).

a “Qui quidem quod hicnum est quod manduca, videreque mandragora in Aphrodianus handumtur. amoribus auros periferre vic'tur et ad eos stimulatur.”

b d The Arabs call the fruit lyurfk, i.e., “the devil's apple,” from its power to excite voluptuousness.

c e Comp. also Shaksp., Henry IV., Pt. II. Act. i. Sc. 2; Rom. and jul., Act iv. Sc. 3; D'Herbelot, Elamitis Orientis, s. v., “Aboumanou.”
MANEHE. [Weights and Measures.]

MANGER. This word occurs only in connection with the birth of Christ in Luke ii. 7, 12, 16. The original term is φάρημα, which is found but once besides in the N. T., namely, Luke xii., 15, where it is rendered by "stall." The word in classical Greek undeniably means a manger, crib, or feeding-trough (see Liddell and Scott, Lex. s. v.); but according to Schleusner it has a different signification in the N. T. It is the open court-yard, attached to the inn or khan, and enclosed by a rough fence of stones, wattle, or other slight material, into which the cattle would be shut at night, and where the poorer travellers might unpack their animals and take up their lodging, when they were either by want of room or want of means excluded from the house. This conclusion is supported by the rendering of the Vulg. — pastor, and of the Peshito-Syriac, λέσολο, both which terms mean "enclosures," and also by the customs of Palestine. Stables and mangers, in the sense in which we understand them, are of comparatively late introduction into the East. The quotations from Chardin and others in Harmer’s Observations, ii. 250, 260, and although they have furnished material to painters and poets, do not enter into the circumstances attending the birth of Christ — and are hardly less inaccurate than the "cradle" and the "stable," which are named in some descriptions of that event. [Curt., Amer. ed.]

This applies, however, only to the painters of the later schools. The early Christian artists seem almost invariably to represent the Nativity as in an open and detached court-yard. A crib or trough is occasionally shown, but not prominently, and more as if symbolic of the locality than as actually existing.

The above interpretation of φάρημα is of course at variance with the traditional belief that the Nativity took place in a cave. Professor Stanley has however shown (S. of P. pp. 440, 441; see also 159) how destitute of foundation this tradition is. And it should not be overlooked that Schleusner is not the only apocryphal Gospels which appear to be its main foundation, the Protevangelion and the Gospel of the Infancy, do not represent the cave as belonging to the inn — in fact, do not mention the inn in connection with the Nativity at all, while the former does not introduce the manger and the inn till a later period, that of the massacre of the innocents [Protev. chap. xvi.].

G.

MANNA (Māna: Bounti). The same as ḤM, מanna (1 Esdr. ix. 39; comp. Ezra. x. 29).

-- Those who desire to see all that can be said on the meaning of φάρημα in the N. T. and in the L. X. may bearing in the N. T. will find it in the 9th chapter of the 24 book of P. Horreus, Miscel. criticorum libri duodecim, 1775.

MANLIUS, T. [Titus Mālius: Alex. Ald. with 5 MSS. T. Mānus: Titus Manlius]. In the account of the conclusion of the campaign of Lydias (6 B.C. 163) against the Jews given in 2 Mac. xi., four letters are introduced, of which the last purports to be from "G. Memmianus and T. Manlius, ambassadors (πρεσβύες) of the Romans" (vv. 34-38), confirming the concessions made by Lydias. There can be but little doubt that the letter is a fabrication. No such names occur among the many legates to Syria noticed by Polybius; and there is no room for the mission of another embassy between two recorded shortly before and after the death of Antiochus Ephiphanes (Polyb. xxxi. 9, 6; 12, 9; Grimm, ad loc.). If, as seems likely, the true reading is T. Manlius (not Memmianus), the writer was probably thinking of the former embassy when C. Sulpius and Manlius Sergius were sent to Syria. The form of the letter is no less fatal to the idea of its authenticity than the names in which it is written. The use of the era of the Seleucidae to fix the year, the omission of the name of the place at which it was dated, and the exact coincidence of the date of this letter with that of the young Antiochus, are all circumstances. Moreover, the first intercourse between the Jews and Romans is marked distinctly as taking place two years later (1 Mac. viii. 1 ff.), when Judas heard of their power and fidelity.

The remaining letters are of no more worth, though it is possible that some facts may have suggested special details (e. g. 2 Mac. xii. 29 ff.).

(Wernsdorff, De Fide Mass. § 66; Grimm, ad loc.; and on the other side Patrizius, De Cont. Mass. pp. 142, 280.)

B. E. W.

MANNA (מָנָה: Massa: Manha, Man, Menna). The most important passages of the O. T. on this topic are the following: Ex. xvi. 14-36; Num. xi. 7-9; Deut. viii. 3-10; Josh. v. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25; Wisd. xvi. 20, 21. From these passages we learn that the manna came every morning except the Sabbath, in the form of a small round seed resembling the hoar frost; that it must be gathered early, before the sun became so hot as to melt it; that it must be gathered every day except the Sabbath; that the attempt to lay aside for a succeeding day, except on the day immediately preceding the Sabbath, fell under the same penalty: being worn away and offensive; that it was prepared for food by grinding and baking; that its taste was like fresh oil, and like wafers made with honey. Equally agreeable to all palates; that the whole nation subsisted upon it for forty years; that it suddenly ceased when they first got the new corn of the land of Canaan; and that it was always regarded as a miraculous gift directly from God, and not a product of nature.

The natural products of the Arabian deserts and other oriental regions, which bear the name of manna, have not the qualities or uses ascribed to the manna of Scripture. They are all condiments or medicines rather than food, stimulating or purgative rather than nutritious; they are produced only three or four months in the year, from May to August, and not all the year round; they come only in small quantities, never affording anything like
15,909,000 of pounds a week, which must have been requisite for the subsistence of the whole Israelitic camp, since each man had an oven (or three English quarts) a day, and that for forty years; they can be kept for a long time, and do not become useless in a day or two; they are just as liable to deteriorate on the Sabbath as on any other day; nor does a double quantity fall on the day preceding the Sabbath; nor would natural products cease at once and for ever, as the manna is represented as ceasing in the book of Joshua. The manna of Scripture we therefore regard as wholly miraculous, and not in any respect a product of nature.

The etymology and meaning of the word manna are best given by the old authorities, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Josephus. The Septuagint translation of Ex. xvi. 15 is this: ἣ ποτες δε αὐτό οἴοι Ἰσραήλ ἴδε τῷ τοῦ ὑπ. τοῦ τοι ὡρ. τῇ ὁμβρίᾳ τοῦ ἔρημος ποιήσαται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῳ. "But the children of Israel saw it, and said to one another, What is that which the Lord hath given us?" The Vulgate, with a very careful reference to the Hebrew, thus: "Quod cum vidisset filii Israel, dixerunt ad invicem manna, quid significet? Quid est hoc? ignorantiam min quid esset." i. e. "Which when the children of Israel saw, they said to one another, MAnHH, which signifieth, What is this? for they knew not what it was." In Josephus (Ant. iii. 1, § 6) we have the following: Καλαίαν δὲ Εβραίων τῷ ἔρημῳ τοῦτο γίνεται, τῷ γὰρ μαν ἐπροστάσατο κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν διάλεκτον, τῇ τοσί' ἐστιν ἦμασῖν. "Now the Hebrews call this food MANNA, for the particle MAN, in our language, is the asking of a question, What is this?"

According to all these authorities, with which the Syriac also agrees, the Hebrew word man, by which this substance is always designated in the Hebrew Scriptures, is the neuter interrogative pronoun (what?); and the name is derived from the inquiry ממה (man hU, what is this?), which the Hebrews made when they first saw it upon the ground. The other etymologies, which would derive the word from either of the Hebrew verbs ממה or ממה, are more recent and less worthy of confidence, and do not agree with the sacred text; a literal translation of which (Ex. xvi. 15) is this: "And the children of Israel saw and said, a man to his neighbor, what is this (man hU); for they knew not what it was."

The Arabian physician Avicenna gives the following description of the manna which in his time was used as a medicine: "Manna is a dew which falls on stones or bushes, becomes thick like honey; and can be hardened so as to be like grains of corn." The substance now called manna in the Arabian desert through which the Israelites passed, is collected in the month of June from the tamarisk shrub (Tamarix gallica). According to Burckhardt it drops from the thorns on the sticks and leaves with which the ground is covered, and must be gathered early in the day, or it will be melted by the sun. The Arabs cleanse and boil it, strain it through a cloth, and put it in leather bottles; and in this way it can be kept for several years. They use it like honey or butter with their unleavened bread, but never make it into cakes or eat it by itself. It abounds only in very wet years, and in dry seasons it sometimes disappears entirely. Various shrubs, all through the oriental world, from India to Syria, yield a substance of this kind. The tamarisk gum is by some supposed to be produced by the puncture of a small insect, which Ehrenberg has examined and described under the name of Scopos notiopterum. See Symbola Phytorum, p. 1.; Transact. of Literary Society of Bourbon, i. 251. This surely could not have been the food of the Israelites during their forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, though the

Tamarix Gallica

name might have been derived from some real or fancied resemblance to it.

Ewald (Trans. i. 94) and some more recent travellers have observed that the dried grains of the oriental manna were like the coriander-seed. Gmelin (Trans. through Russia to Persia, pt. iii. p. 28) remarks this of the manna of Persia, which he says is white as snow. The peasants of Isphahan gather the leaves of a certain thorny shrub (the sweet thorn) and strike them with a stick, and the grains of manna are received in a sieve. Nicolai observed that at Mardini in Mesopotamia, the manna lies like meal on the leaves of a tree called in the East, balsam and afs or as, which he regards as a species of oak. The harvest is in July and August, and much more plentiful in wet than dry seasons.

a አር, which Freytag, however, identifies with some species of Capparis.

* The balsam here spoken of is the Arabs
It is sometimes collected before sunrise by shaking it from the leaves onto a cloth, and thus collected it remains very white and pure. That which is not shaken off in the morning melts upon the leaves, and accumulates till it becomes very thick. The leaves are then gathered and put in boiling water, and the manna floats like oil upon the surface. This the natives call manna sesmeina, i. e. heavenly manna. In the valley of the Jordan Burehhardt found manna like gum on the leaves and branches of the tree yarob, which is as large as the olive tree, having a leaf like the poplar, though somewhat broader. It appears like dew upon the leaves, is of a brown or gray color, and drops on the ground. When first gathered it is sweet, but in a day or two becomes acrid. The Arabs use it like honey or butter, and eat it in their oatmeal gruel. They also use it in cleaning their leather bottles and making them air-tight.

The season for gathering this is May or June. Two other shrubs which have been supposed to yield the manna of Scripture, are the Alhagi mauroorum, or Persian manna, and the Alhagi desertorum, — thorny plants common in Syria.

The manna of European commerce comes mostly from Calabria and Sicily. It is gathered during the months of June and July from some species of ash (Ornus europaea and Ornus rotundifolia), from which it drops in consequence of a puncture by an insect resembling the bouscaut, but distinguished from it by having a sting under its body. The substance is fluid at night, and resembles the dew, but in the morning it begins to harden.

Compare Rosenmüller's Alte Thaukumade, iv. pp 316-29: Winer, Reckelwirth, ii. pp. 53, 54; and the oriental travellers above referred to. C. E. S.

MANOA (םוֹא; [rest]: Manoeh: Joseph.
Manoeh shines: Manoeh, the father of Samson; a Danite, native of the town of Zorah (Judg. xiii. 2). The narrative of the Bible (xiii. 1-23), of the circumstances which preceded the birth of Samson, supplies us with very few and faint traits of Manoah's character or habits. He seems to have had some occupation which separated him during part of the day from his wife, though that was not field work, because it was in the field that his wife was found by the angel during his absence. He was hospitable, as his forefather Abiram had been before him; he was a worshipper of Jehovah, and reverent to a great degree of fear. These faint lineaments are brought into somewhat greater distinctness by Josephus (Ant. v. 8, §§ 2, 3), on what authority we have no means of judging, though his account is doubtless founded on some ancient Jewish tradition or record. "There was a certain Manoehes who was without controversy the best and choicest person of his country. This man had a wife of exceeding beauty, surpassing the other women of the place. Now, when they had no children, and were much distressed thereat, he besought God that He would grant unto them a lawful heir, and for that purpose resorted often with his wife to the suburbs (τὸ ποροτείων) of the city. And in that place was the great plain. Now the man loved his wife to distraction, and on that account was exceedingly jealous of her. And it came to pass that his wife being alone, an angel appeared to her ... and when he had said these things he departed, for he had come by the command of God. When her husband came she informed him of all things concerning the angel, wondering greatly at the beauty and size of the youth, insomuch that he was filled with jealousy and with suspicion thereof. Then the woman, desiring to procure her husband of his excessive grief, besought God that He would send again the angel, so that the man might behold him as well as she. And it came to pass that when they were in the suburbs again, by the favor of God the angel appeared the second time to the woman, while her husband was absent. And she having prayed him to tarry awhile till she should fetch her husband, went and brought Manoehes." The rest of the story agrees with the Bible.

We hear of Manoah once again in connection with the marriage of Samson to the Philistine of Timnath. His father and his mother remonstrated with him thereon, but to no purpose (xiv. 2, 3). They then accompanied him to Timnath, both on which the galls grow, which is some species of the oak.

G. E. P.

Sprangle (Hist. Rel. Herb. 1. 270) identifies the gharb or gharbah with the Salix babylonica.

Possibly to consult the Levites, whose special property the suburbs of the city were. But Zorah is no where stated to have been a Levites' city.
MANSIONS

the preliminary visit (xxv. 5, 6), and to the marriage itself (9, 10). Manoah appears not to have survived his son: not he, but Samson's brothers, went down to Gaza for the body of the hero, and bringing it up to the family tomb between Zorah and Eshtaol, reunited the father to the son (xxvi. 31), whose birth had been the subject of so many prayers and so much anxiety. Milton, however, does not take this view. In Samson Agonistes Manoah bears a prominent part throughout, and lives to bear his son, G.

* MANSIONS (mapn: mansions) in the A. V. John xiv. 2 ("in my Father's house are many mansions") is used in its primary signification of "abodes," or "places of abode," not in the more specific sense which now belongs to the term. Mr. Norton translates, "there are many rooms in my Father's house." The reference is to the abundant provision made for the future blessedness of the followers of Christ, not to the different degrees of their reward, a thought which is foreign from the context.

MANS-AYER. a The principle on which the "man-layer" was to be allowed to escape, namely, that the person slain was regarded as "delivered into his hand" by the Almighty, was obviously open to much willful perversion (1 Sam. xxiv. 4, 18; xxvi. 8: Philo, De Spec. Leg. iii. 21, vol. ii. 320), though the cases mentioned appear to be a sufficient sample of the intention of the lawgiver. (a) Death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (Num. xxxv. 22). (b) Death by a stone or missile thrown at random (ib. 22, 23). (c) By the blade of an axe flying from its handle (Deut. xix. 5). (d) Whether the case of a person killed by falling from a roof unprovided with a parapet involved the guilt of manslaughter on the owner, is not clear; but the law seems intended to prevent the imputation of malice in any such case, by preventing as far as possible the occurrence of the fact itself (Deut. xxii. 8). (Michaelis, On the Laws of Moses, arts. 229, 280, ed. Smith.) In all these and the like cases the man-layer was allowed to retire to a city of refuge. [CITIES OF REFUGE.]

Besides these the following may be mentioned as cases of homicide. (a) An animal, not known to be vicious, causing death to a human being, was to be put to death, and regarded as maled. But if it was known to be vicious, the owner was liable to fine and even death (Ex. xxii. 28, 31). (b) A thief overtaken at night in the act might lawfully be put to death, but if the sun had risen the act of killing him was to be regarded as murder (Ex. xxii. 2, 3). Other cases are added by the Mishna, which, however, are included in the definitions given above. (Sabad. ix. 1, 2, 3; Maimon. ix. 2: 10th, Lec. Rohb. "Homicida." )[MENDE.] H. W. P.

MANTLE. The word employed in the A. V. translate no less than four Hebrew terms, entirely distinct and independent both in derivation and meaning.

1. מַנְתָּל מְנִノー, s'michah. This word occurs but once, namely, Judg. iv. 18, where it denotes the thing with which Jael covered Sisera. It has the definite article prefixed, and it may therefore be inferred that it was some part of the regular furniture of the tent. The clue to a more exact significance is given by the Arabic version of the Polyglot, which renders it by alantifah, مَايَنِّؤُثَ, a word which is explained by Doyen, b on the authority of Ibn Battru and other oriental authors, to mean certain articles of a thick fabric, in shape like a plaid or shawl, which are commonly used for beds by the Arabs: "When they sleep they spread them on the ground." "For the under part of the bed they are doubled several times, and one longer than the rest is used for a coverlet." Or, such a bed on the floor of Heber's tent to which the weary Sisera threw himself, and such a coverlet must the s'michah have been which Jael laid over him. The A. V. perhaps derived their word "mantle" from the pallium of the Valgate, and the mantel of Luther. [First thinks that it the "tent-carpet," which Jael threw over Sisera, Mantel, s. v. — 11.]

2. מַנְתָּל, meil. (Rendered "mantle" in 1 Sam. xxv. 27, xxviii. 14; Ezek. ix. 3, 5; Job i. 20, ii. 12; and Ps. cds. 29.) This word is in other passages of the A. V. rendered "cont.," "cloak," and "robe." This inconsistency is undesirable; but in one case only—that of Samuel—is it of importance. It is interesting to know that the garment which his mother made and brought to the infant prophet, lower her annual visit to the Holy Tent at Shiloh was a miniature of the official priestly tunic or robe; the same that the great Prophet wore in mature years (1 Sam. xxv. 27), and by which he was on one occasion actually identified. When the witch of Endor, in answer to Saul's inquiry, told him that "an old man was come up covered with a mantle," this of itself was enough to inform the king in whose presence he stood—"Saul perceived that it was Samuel" (xxviii. 14).

3. מַנְתָּל, muntaloph (the Hebrew word is found in Is. iii. 22 only). Apparently some article of a lady's dress ("mantles," A. V.); probably an outer garment or ample mantle, the thick internal one, and provided with sleeves. See Gesenius, Jeosin, i. 214; Schroeder, de Vestitu Hebraeorum, ch. xv. § 1—5.

But the most remarkable of the four is—

4. מַנְתָּל, adonath (rendered "mantle" in 1 K. xix. 13, 22; 2 K. ii. 8, 13, 14; elsewhere "garment," and "robe"); since by it, and it only, is denoted the cape or wrapper, which with the exception of a strip of skin or leather round his loins, formed, as we have every reason to believe, the sole garment of the prophet Elijah.

Such clothing, or absence of clothing, is commonly assumed by those who aspire to extraordinary sanctity in the East at the present day—"樘mage figures, with a cloak woven of canes" hair thrown over the shoulders, and tied in front on the breast,

Ex. xxi. 13, 11; Lev. iv. 22; Num. xxxv. 22, 23

Deut. iv. 4, 5.)

b Dictionnaire des Verriments Arabes, p. 232. We gladly seize this opportunity to express our obligations to this admirable work.

c But see the curious speculations of Dr. Maltby in Essay on Early Worship, p. 170, etc.

a מַנְתָּל, part. of מַנְתָּל, "pierce" or "crush," see p. 135: dovrejia: homilia: used also in the sense of number. The phrase מַנְתָּל מְנִ网投, M. A. 420, according to ignorance, Ges. p. 1392, must therefore be included, to denote the distinction which the Law gave to being on magnificent and involuntary homicide.
MAOCH

zaked except at the waist, round which is a girdle of skin, the hair flowing loose about the head.'"

But a description still more exactly in accordance with the habit of the great Israelite derelish, and supporting in a remarkable manner the view of the LXX., who render οὐκρινεῖαν by μακραίς, i.e., "a loincloth," is found in the account of a French traveller* in the 13th century: "l'enseigne que les deris portent pour montrer qu'ils sont religieux, est une peau de brebis sur leurs épaules: et ne portent autre vêtement sur eux sinon une seule peau de mouton on de brebis, et quelque chose devant leurs parties honteuses."

Inaccurately as the word "mantle" represents such a garment as the above, it has yet become so identified with Elijah that it is improper now to alter it. It is desirable therefore to substitute "mantle" for "garment" in Zech. xiii. 4; a passage from which it would appear that since the time of Elijah his garb had become the recognized sign of a prophet of Jehovah. G.

MA'ON (מָאֹון) [a poor one, Fürst: a browntailed? Ges.]: "Madoa': Alex. Maola: Maooch. the father of Achish, king of Gath, with whom David took refuge (1 Sam. xvii. 2). In the Syriac version he is called Maacah; and in 1 K. ii. 39 we find Maacah described as the father of Achish, who was king of Gath at the beginning of Solomon's reign. It is not impossible that the same Achish may be intended in both cases (Keil, Coma, on 1 K. ii. 30, and Maooch and Maacah would then be identical; or Achish may have been a title, like Abimelech and Pharaoh, which would still leave Maooch and Maacah the same: "son" in either case denoting descendant. G.

MA'OON (מַאָאוֹן habituation): Mada', Mado': [Vat. in 1 Sam. Maor, in Chr. Meoa'] Alex. Meoa: Moun, one of the cities of the tribe of Judah, in the district of the mountains; a member of the same group which contains also the names of Carmel and Ziph (Josh. xv. 55). Its interest for us lies in its connection with David. It was in the "wild" or waste pasture-ground of Maon (A. V. "wilderness") that he and his men were lurking when the treachery of the Ziphites brought Saul upon them, and they had the narrow escape of the cliff of ham-Macalheth (1 Sam. xxiii. 24, 25). It seems from these passages to have formed part of a larger district called "the Arabah" (A. V. ver. 24, "plain"), which can hardly have been the depressed locality round the Dead Sea usually known by that name. To the north of it was another tract or spot called "the Jeshimon," possibly the dreary burnt-up hills lying on the immediate west of the Dead Sea. Close by was the hill or the cliff of Hachilah, and the milhoor itself probably extended over and about the mountain (ver. 29), round which Saul was pursuing his fugitives when the sudden alarm of the Philistine incursion drew him off. Over the pastures of Maon and Carmel ranged he three thousand sheep and the thousand goats of Nabal (xxv. 2). Those adjoining was the milhoor of Paran, which the LXX. make identical with Maon. Josephus's version of the passage is curious — "a certain man of the Ziphites from the city Emma" (Ant. vi. 13, § 6).

The name of Maon still exists all but unchanged in the months of the Arab herdsmen and peasants in the south of Palestine. Ma'nia is a lofty conical hill, south of, and about 7 miles distant from, Hebron. To the north there is an extensive prospect — on the one hand over the region bordering the Dead Sea, on the other as far as Hebron. Close in front is the lower eminence of Kurmul, the ancient Carmel, no less intimately associated with David's fortunes than Maon itself (Rob. i. 493, 494).

It is very much to be desired that some traveller would take the trouble to see how the actual locality of Maon agrees with the minute indications of the narrative cited above. See also Hacklau.

In the genealogical records of the trile of Judah in 1 Chronicles, Maon appears as a descendant of Hebron, through Rekem and Shammai, and in its turn the "father" or colonizer of Beth-sur (ii. 45). Hebron is of course the well-known metropolis of the southern country, and Beth-zur has been identified in Beitsur, 4 miles north of Hebron, and therefore about 16 from Maon.

It should not however be overlooked that in the original the name of Maon is identical with that of the Mehmim, and it is quite possible that before the conquest it may have been one of their towns, just as in the more central districts of Palestine there were places which preserved the memory of the Avites, the Zenarites, the Amonites, and other tribes who originally founded them. [Bick-

JAMIN, vol. i. p. 277.]

MA'ONITES, THE (מַאָאוֹנִים i. e. Maon, without the article [see above]: Madea in both MSS.: Μαονίων, a people mentioned in one of the addresses of Jehovah to the repellant Israelites, as having at some former time molested them: "the Ziphians also, and Amalek, and Maon did oppress you, and ye cried to me, and I delivered you out of their hand" (Judg. x. 12). The name agrees with that of a people residing in the desert far south of Palestine, elsewhere in the A. V. called Mehumim; but, as no invasion of Israel by this people is related before the date of the passage in question, various explanations and conjectures have been suggested as to the meaning of the LXX. — "Midian" — is remarkable as being found in both the great MSS., and having on that account a strong claim to be considered as the reading of the ancient Hebrew text. Ewald (Geach. i. 322 note) appeals to incline to this, which has also in its favor, that, if it be not genuine, Midian — whose ravages were then merely too recent to be forgotten — is omitted altogether from the enumeration. Still it is remarkable that no variation has hitherto been found in the Hebrew MSS. of this verse. Michaelis (Bibel für Ungelernte, and Suppeln. No. 1437), on the other hand, accepts the current reading, and explains the difficulty by assuming that Maon is included among the Bene-Kedem, or "children of the East," named in vi. 3: leaving, however, the equal difficulty of the omission of Israel's great foe, Midian, unnoticed. The reason which would lead us to accept Midian would lead us to

a Light, Travels in Egypt, etc., quoted by Stanley, p. 8. P. 311.

b See the instructive and suggestive remarks of Dr. Wolf, on the points of correspondence between the ancient Prophets and the modern Dervishes (Travels, etc., i. 453; also 329, 351); and Stanley's East. Chrest. p. 220.

c Belon, Observations (Paris, 1588), quoted by D'Arcy Dictionnaire, etc., p. 54.
A trace of the residence of the Moabites in the south of Palestine is perhaps extant in Ma'an, now Marah, the city of Judah so well known in connection with David.

A MARAH (Mara), or, according to the correction of the Kiri, "Mara", the name which Naomi adopted in the exclamation forced by her from the recognition of her fellow-citizens at Bethlehem (Ruth i. 20), "call me not Naomi (pleasant), but call me Mara (bitter), for Shalma hath dealt-bitterly (comely) with me." The LXX have preserved the play .... τεραστίον .... οὕτως; though hardly as well as Jerome, "İncute me Mara (hominem) quin amaritatem mea celebre Omnipotentibus." Marah is often assumed to have been the origin of the name Ma'an, but inaccurately, for Mary—in the N. T. Mariam—is merely a corruption of Miriam (see that article).

MARAH (Mara) [Bitterness]: Meppa, Popis, Popis [Vat. Popis]: Mara, a place which lay in the wilderness of Shur or Edom, three days' journey distant (Ex. xv. 23-24, Num. xxxiii. 8) from the place at which the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, and where was a spring of bitter water, sweated subsequently by the casting in of a tree which "the Lord showed" to Moses. It has been suggested (Burchardt, Syrie, p. 474) that Moses made use of the berries of the plant "Hibiscus" and which still it is implied would be found similarly to operate. Robinson, however (i. 67.), could not find that this or any tree was now known by the Arabs to possess such properties; nor would these berries, he says, have been found so early in the season as the time when the Israelites reached the region. It may be added that, had any such resource ever existed, its evident usefulness to the supply of human wants would hardly have let it perish from the traditions of the desert. Further, the expression "the Lord showed" seems surely to imply the miraculous character of the transaction. As regards the identity of Marah with any modern site, all travellers to look out for water which is bitter at this day, wherein if mirabes, the effort would surely have been permanent, as it clearly is intended to be in 2 K. ii. 21. On this supposition, however, Horvatok, distant 16 hours (Rob. Bibl. Res. i. 67) from Ayun Marah, has been identified by Robinson, as also by Burchardt, April 27, 1846, Schubert (274), and Wellbel, identified by them, apparently because it is the bitterest water in the neighborhood. Winer says (c. r.) that a still bitter well lies east of Marah, the claims of which Tischendorf, it appears, has supported. Lepsius prefers Judah Ginnul, Prof. Stanley thinks that the claim may be left between this and Horvatok, but adds in a note a mention of a spring south of Horvatok, "so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink it," of which "Dr. Graul (vol. ii p. 254) was told." The Ayun Marah, "wells of Marah," which local tradition assigns to Marah, are manifestly too close to the head of the gulf, and the probable spot of crossing it, to suit the distance of "three days' journey." The soil of this region is described as being alternately gravelly, stony and sandy; under the range of the Gebel Wardsch el-kawk and flints are plentiful, and on the direct line of route between Ayun Marah and Horvatok no water is found (Robinson, i. 67).

MAR'ALAH (Marahdah) [perh. earthquake, Ges.; declivity, Fasti]: Maryazda: Alex. Marala; [Comp. Mapalad]: Merada). one of the landmarks on the boundary of the tribe of Zebulun (Josh. xix. 11), which, with most of the places accompanying it, is unfortunately hitherto unknown. (Jes. Jeth, ad loc.) infers, though on the slightest grounds, that it was somewhere on the ridge of Carmel.

MARANATHA (Maranatad), an expression used by St. Paul at the conclusion of his first Epistle to the Corinthians (xvi. 22). It is a Grecized form of the Aramaic words 7787 27], "our Lord cometh.

The A. V. it is combined with the preceding "anathema," but this is unnecessary: at all events it can only be regarded as adding emphasis to the previous adjuration. It rather appears to be added as a weighty watch-word! to impress upon the disciples the important truth that the Lord was at hand, and that they should be ready to meet Him (Alford, Gr. Test. i. loc.). If, on the other hand, the phrase be taken to mean, as it may, "Our Lord has come," then the connection is, "the curse will remain, for the Lord has come who will take vengeance on those who reject Him." Thus the name "Maranite" is explained by a tradition that the Jews, in expectation of a Messiah, were constantly saying Maran, i. e. Lord: to which the Christians answered Maran atha, the Lord is come, why do you still expect Him? (Stanley, Corinthians, ad loc.).

MARBLE. Like the Greek ἱπαπάτω, No. 1 (see hot-note); the generic term for marble may be etymologically traced to almost any shining stone. The so-called marble of Solomon's architectural works, which Josephus calls Αριν ανατολής, may thus have been limestone—(a) from near Jerusalem; (b) from Lebanon (lava limestone), identified with the material of the Sun Temple at Baalbec; or (c) white marble from Arabia or elsewhere (Joseph. Ant. viii. 5, § 2; Bedd. Civ. ii. 52; Plin. H. N. xxi. 22; Jamieson, Mineralog., p. 41; Rümmer, Pol. p. 28; Vdove, Troj. ii. 211; Kittel, Phys. Geogr. of Pol. pp. 73, 88; Robinson, ii. 453, iii. 508; Stanley, S. O. P. pp. 307, 424; Wellsted, Troj. i. 426, ii. 141). That this stone must have been almost pure calcareous marble seems probable from the remark of Josephus, that whereas Solomon constructed his buildings of "white stone," he caused the roads which used in tessellated pavements, or one with circular spots (see G. B. 47). 5. Σικέρα: probably a stone with pearly appearance, like abalone (see G. S. 355). 5. Σικέρα: apparently copper, lapis marmaritae (see G. P. 12). The three last words used only in Esth 1. 6. 5. Marmor: mirror (Rev xxii. 12).
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ed to Jerusalem to be made of “black stone,” probably the black basalt of the Harun; and also from his account of the porticoes of Herod's temple, which he says were μωτολίας λευκοτάτης μαρμάριον (Joseph. Ant. l. 6, and B. J. v. 5, § 1, 6; Kitto, pp. 74, 75, 80, 89) that whether the "costly stone" employed in Solomon's buildings was marble or not, it seems clear from the expressions both of Scripture and Josephus, that some at least of the "great stones," whose weight can scarcely have been less than 40 tons, must have come from Lebanon (I K. v. 14-18, vii. 10; Joseph. Ant. viii. 2, § 9).

There can be no doubt that Herod, both in the Temple and elsewhere, employed Parian or other marble. Remains of marble columns still exist in abundance at Jerusalem (Joseph Ant. xv. 9, §§ 4, 6, and 11, §§ 3, 5; Williams, Holy City, ii. 330; Sandys, p. 190; Robinson, i. 301, 305).

The marble pillars and tesserfe of various colors of the palace at Susa came doubtless from Persia itself, where marble of various colors is found, especially in the province of Hamadan, Susiana. (Esth. i. 6; Marco Polo, Travels, § 78, ed. Bohn; Charlin, Vigi. iii. 290, 308, 358, and viii. 253; P. della Valle, Vitiggi, ii. 260; Winer, s. v. "Mar- mor.")

II. W. P.

MARESHVAN. [Month.]

MARCUS (Μάρκος: Marcas). The Evangelist, who was cousin to Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), and the companion and fellow-laborer of the Apostles Paul (Phil. ii. 24) and Peter (1 Pet. v. 13). [Marcii.]

MARDOCHEUS (Μαρδοχαῖος: Mordchoe- us). 1. MORDCEAI, the uncle of Esther, in the apocryphal additions (Esth. x. 1, xi. 2, xii. 1-6, xvi. 13; 2 Macc. xv. 36). The 14th of the month Adar, on which the feast of Purim was celebrated, is called in the last passage "Mardochen's day" (§ Μαρδοχαίου ἡμέρα: Mardochoei dies). 2. (Mordchoes) = MORDCEAI, who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esdr. v. 8; comp. Ezr. ii. 2).

* MARESHA is the reading of the A. v. ed. 1611, and other early editions, in 1 Chr. lii. 42, instead of MARESHABA (2).

A.

MARESHAH (מַּרְשֵׁה: possession, First; at the head = elevated city or fortress, Gov.), in Josh. only; elsewhere in the shorter form of מַרְשֶׁה. [In Chron. Μαρσά, Μαρσαὶ, Μαρσά; Vat. Μαρσά, Μαρσαῖ, Μαρσά;] Alex. Μαρσά: [In Mic. l. 15, LXX. Μαρσαί; Marcus.]

1. One of the cities of Judah in the district of the Shefelah or low country; named in the same group with Keilah and Nezib (Josh. xv. 44). If we may so interpret the notices of the I Chronicles (see below), Hebron itself was colonized from Maresah. It was one of the cities fortified and garrisoned by Rehoboam after the rupture with the northern kingdom (2 Chr. xi. 8). The natural inference is, that it commanded some pass or position of approach, an inference which is supported by the fact that it is named as the point to which the enormous horde of Zerah the Cushite reached in his invasion of Judaea, before he was met and repulsed by Asa (2 Chr. xiv. 9). A ravine (ver. 10; Ge: A. V. "valley") bearing the name of Zephathah was near. In the rout which followed the encounter, the flying Cushites were pursued to the Bedouin station of Gerar (vv. 14, 15).

Maresah is mentioned once or twice in the history of the Macedonian struggles. Judah probably passed through it on his way from Hebron, to avenge the defeat of Joseph and Azarias (1 Macc. v. 69).

The reading of the LXX. and A. V. is Samaria: but Josephus, Ant. xii. 5, § 6, has Mарсиаun, and the position is exactly suitable, which that of Sama- ria is not. The same exchange, but reversed, will be found in 2 Macc. xii. 85. [Marcus.]

A few days later it afforded a refuge to Geoсias when severely wounded in the attack of Dositheus (2 Macc. xii. 35); here, as just remarked, the Syriac version would substitute Samaria,—a change quite unallowable.

Its subsequent fortunes were bad enough, but hardly worse than might be expected for a place which lay as it were at the junction of two cross-roads, north and south, east and west, each the constant thoroughfare of armies. It was first burnt by Judas in his Idumaean war, in passing from Hebron to Azotus (Ant. xii. 8, § 61). About the year 110 B. C. it was taken from the Idumaeans by John Hyrcanus. Some forty years after, about B. C. 63, its restoration was decreed by the element Pompey (Ant. xiv. 4, § 4), though it appears not to have been really reinstated till later (xiv. 5, § 5).

It was but rebuilt to become again a victim (b. c. 59), this time to the Parthians, who plundered and destroyed it in their rage at not finding in Jerusalem the treasure they anticipated (Ant. xiv. § 9; B. J. i. 13, § 9). It was in ruins in the 4th century, when Eusebius and Jerome describe it as in the second mile from Eleutherop- ropolis. S. S. W. of Dei-lithin—in all probability Eleutheropolis—and a little over a Roman mile therefrom, is a site called Maresah, which is very possibly the representative of the ancient Maresah. It is described by the indefatigable Tylor (Jubilees, pp. 129, 142) as lying on a gently swelling hill leading down from the mountains to the great western plain, from which it is but half an hour distant. The ruins are not extensive, and Dr. Robinson, to whom their discovery is due, has ingeniously conjectured (on grounds for which the reader is referred to Edb. Res. ii. 67, 68) that the materials were employed in building the neighboring Eleutheropolis.

On two other occasions Maresah comes forward in the O. T. It was the native place of Elizer ben-Dodavah, a prophet who predicted the destruction of the ships which king Jehoshaphat had built in conjunction with Abaziah of Israel (2 Chr. xx. 37). It is included by the prophet Micah among the towns of the low country which he attempts to rouse to some sense of the dangers their misconduct is bringing upon them (Mic. l. 19). Like the rest, the apostrophe to Maresah is a play on the name: "I will bring your heir (yoresh) to you, oh city of inheritance" (Mares- shah). The following verse (16) shows that the inhabitants had adopted the heathen and forbidden custom of cutting off the back hair as a sign of mourning.

---

* Benjamin of Tudela (Asher, i. 77) identifies Ma- resah with "Belt Gabrin." Parchi, with unusual
2. (Rom. Mapo'a; Vat.) Mapo'r: [Alex. Ma-
po't], Father of Hebrew, and apparently a son
or descendant of Caleb the brother of Jerahmeel
(1 Chr. ii. 42), who derived his descent from Judah
through Pharez. "The sons of Caleb were...
Mesha, the father of Ziph, and the sons of Marsha
father of Hebrew." It is difficult not to suppose
that Mesha may have been a Transcriber's variation
for Marsha, especially as the text of the LXX,—
both MSS.,—actually stands so. It is however
only a probable conjecture. The names in these
lists are many of them no doubt those of per-
sons but of towns, and whether Mesha and Mar-
sha be identical or not, a close relationship
is equally denoted between the towns of Helron
and Marsha
. But,
3. (Rom. Mapo'a; Vat.) Mapa: [Alex. Ma-
po't] in 1 Chr. iv. 21 we find Marsha
again,
mentioned as deriving its origin from SHELIH, the
third son of Judah, through Laadsab, Whether
this Marsha be a man or a place, identical with
or distinct from the last mentioned, it is impos-
sible to determine.

MARIIMOTH (Marimoth). The same as
MEHIMOOTH the priest, one of the ancestors of
Ezra (2 Esdr. i. 2; comp. Ezr. vii. 3). He is also
called MERMOTH (1 Esdr. viii. 2).

* MARINER, Jon. i. 5. [Ship (11.), Aner.
cd.]

MARISA (Mapira: Morcan), the Greek form
of the name MARESHTA, occurring 2 Macc. xii. 33
only.

G.

MARISHES, Ez. xlviii. 11, an old spelling of
"marshes," found in the A. V. of 1611 (and the
Bishops' Bible), but changed in the current edi-
tions. The Hebrew is נצרה, elsewhere only in Is.
xxx. 14, translated "pit." 

H.

MARK (Mapos: Morcne). Mark the Evan-
gelist is probably the same as John whose sur-
name was Mark " (Acts xii. 25). Grotius in-
deed maintains the contrary, on the ground that
the earliest historical writers nowhere call the
Evangelist by the name of John, and that they
always describe him as the companion of Peter
and not of Paul. But John was the Jewish name,
and Mark, a name of frequent use amongst the
Romans, was adopted afterwards, and gradually
superseded the other. The places in the N. T.
enable us to trace the process. The John Mark
of Acts xii. 25, and the John of Acts xiii. 13,
becomes Mark only in Acts xv. 39, Col. iv. 10,
2 Tim. iv. 11, Philen. 24. The change of John
to Mark is anomalous to that of Saul to Paul;
and we cannot doubt that the choice of the Jewish
name in favor of the other is intentional, and has
reference to the putting away of his former life,
and entrance upon a proper ministry. No incon-
sistency arises from the accounts of his ministration
to two Apostles. The descent of Paul (Acts xiii.
13) may have been prompted partly by a wish to
rejoin Peter and the Apostles engaged in preaching
in Palestine (ibid.; see Kueinel's note), though
partly from a disinclination to a peripus and
doubtful journey. There is nothing strange in
the character of a warm impulsive young man,
drawn almost equally towards the two great
leaders of the faith, Paul and Peter. Had more
sovereign been the cause of his withdrawal, Bar-
alas would not so soon after have chosen him
for another journey, nor would he have accepted
the choice.

John Mark was the son of a certain Mary, who
dwelt at Jerusalem and was therefore probably
born in that city (Acts xii. 12). He was the con-
(ἀρέσκοντα) of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10). [Sts.
Peter's Son, Amer. ed.] It was to Mary's house
he went when Herod had him put in prison, but Peter
conferred his deliverance from prison (Acts xii. 12), and
there found "many gathered together praying;" and
probably John Mark was converted by Peter from
meeting him in his mother's house, for he speaks of
"Marcus my son" (1 Peter v. 13). This nat-
ural link of connection between the two passages
is broken by the supposition of two Marks, which
is on all accounts improbable. The theory that
he was one of the seventy disciples is without any
warant. Another theory, that an event of the
night of our Lord's betrayal, related by Mark
alone, is one that befall himself (Olskansen, Lange),
must not be so promptly dismissed. "There fol-
lowed Him a certain young man, having a linen
dress cast about his naked body; and the young
man laid hold on him: and he fell the linen cloth,
and fled naked." (Mark xiv. 51). The detail of facts is remarkably minute, the name only is
wanting. The most probable view is that St.
Mark suppressed his own name, whilst telling a
story which he had the best means of knowing.
Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it in
some house in the Valley of Cedron, he comes out
to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known
to him and in some degree beloved already. He is
so deeply interested in his fate that he follows Him
even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such
that some of the crowd are about to arrest him;
there, "fear overcoming shame" (Bengel), he leaves
his garment in their hands and flees. We
can only say that if the name of Mark is supplied,
the narrative receives its most probable explanation.
John (i. 40, xix. 20) introduces himself in this
undistructive way, and perhaps Luke the same (xiv.
18). Mary the mother of Mark seems to have
been a person of some means and influence, and
her house a rallying point for Christians in these
dangerous days. Her son, already an inquirer,
would soon become more. Anxious to work for
Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their
"minister" (ἐπίσκοπος) on their first journey; but
at Perga, as we have seen above, turned back (Acts
7. 25, xiii. 15). On the second journey Paul
would not accept him again as a companion, but
Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and
hence he became the cause of the memorable "sharp
convention" between them (Acts xv. 36-40).
Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation, it
did not separate him forever from Paul, for we
find him by the side of that Apostle in his first
improvement at Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philen. 24). In
the former place a possible journey of Mark to
Asia is spoken of. Somewhat later he is with
Peter at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13). Some consider
Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a
mystical sense; surely without reason, since the
date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure
of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon
there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that
he made the journey to Asia Minor (Col. iv. 10),
and thence went to join Peter at Babylon. On
his return to Asia he seems to have been with Tim-
othy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during
his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his return to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11).

When we desert Scripture we find the facts doubtful and even inconsistent. If Papias be trusted (quoted in Eusibius, H. E. iii. 39), Mark never was a disciple of our Lord; which he probably infers from 1 Pet. v. 13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the Evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples, who turned back from our Lord at the last saying in John vi. (Cont. Hier. i. 6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition). The same had been said of St. Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point.

The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make the Evangelist the interpreter (εμπνευστής) of the Apostle Peter (Papias in Euseb. H. E. iii. 35; Irenaeus, Hier. iii. 1, iii. 10, § 6; Tertullian, c. Marc. iv. 5; Hieronymus, ad Hebr. ix. &c.). Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic discourses of the Apostle (Eichhorn, Beltz, &c.); whilst others adopt the more probable view that Mark wrote a Gospel which conformed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the church at large (Valesius, Alford, Lange, Friedlaender, E. Tischendorf). The passage from Euseb. favors the latter view; it is a quotation from Papias. "This also [John] the elder said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them: for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but he was afterwards, as I [Papias] said, a follower of Peter." The words in italics refer to the word interpreter above, and the passage describes a disciple writing down what his master preached, and not an interpreter orally translating his words. This tradition will be further examined below. [MARK, GOSPEL OF.] The report that Mark was the companion of Peter at Rome is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for a tradition which he had received of the elders from the first. (Strom. ii. 15, 9; Tertullian, c. Marc. iv. 5; Hieronymus, H. E. vi. 14; Clem. Alex. Hær. iv. 5.) But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Pet. v. 13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome (Euseb. H. E. ii. 15; Hieron. De Vir. ill. 8). Sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter (Eiphanius, Hier. ii. 6, p. 457, Dindorf; Euseb. H. E. ii. 16), Mark there founded the church of Alexandria (Hieron. De Vir. ill. 8), and preached in various places (Nepheph. H. E. ii. 43), then returned to Alexandria, of which church he was bishop, and suffered a martyr's death (Nepheph. ibid., and Hieron. De Vir. ill. 8). But none of these later details rest on sound authority. (Sources — The works on the Gospels referred to under Luke and Gospels; also Frizsche, In Marcum, Leipzig, 1830; Lange, Bibelli传; part ii. etc.)

W. T.

MARK, GOSPEL OF. The characteristics of this Gospel, the shortest of the four inspired records, will appear from the discussion of the various questions that have been raised about it.

1. Sources of this Gospel. — The tradition that it got its teaching from Peter, rather than of the rest of the Apostles, has been alluded to above. The witness of John the Presbyter, quoted by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 39) through Papias, has been cited. [See Mark.] Irenaeus calls Mark "interpretes et sectator Petri," and cites the opening and the concluding words of the Gospel as we now possess them (iii. 10, § 6). He also alludes to a sect (the Cerinthians?) who hold "impassibilibus perscrucias Christum, passum vero Jeannium," and who prefer the Gospel of St. Mark to the rest (iii. 11, § 7). Eusebius says, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, that the hearers of Peter at Rome desired Mark, the follower of Peter, to leave with them a record of his teaching; upon which Mark wrote his Gospel, which the Apostle afterwards sanctioned with his authority, and directed that it should be read in the Churches (Eus. H. E. ii. 15). Elsewhere, quoting Clement again, we have the same account, except that Peter is there described as "neither hindering nor urging" the undertaking (H. E. vi. 14). The apparent contradiction has been conciliated by supposing that Peter neither helped nor hindered the work before it was completed, but gave his approval afterwards ("hic fieri ipsum non jussit, tamen factum non prohibuit,"iffinus: see note of Valesius in loc. Eus.). Tertullian (Cont. Marcionem, iv. 5) speaks of the Gospel of Mark as being connected with Peter, "equus interpretis Maronis," and so having come from the Apostle. Eusebius says that it was immediately after St. Matthew, the task was laid on St. Mark, "the follower of St. Peter at Rome," of writing a Gospel (Hær. i.). Hieronymus (De Vir. ill. 8) repeats the story of Eusebius; and again says that the Gospel was written, "Petro narrante, et illo scribente" (ad Hebr. 2). If the evidence of the Apostle's connection with this Gospel rested wholly on these passages, it would not be sufficient, since the witnesses, though many in number, are not all independent of each other, and there are marks, in the former of the passages from Eusebius, of a wish to enhance the authority of the Gospel by Peter's approval, whilst the latter passage does not allege the same sanction. But there are peculiarities in the Gospel which are best explained by the supposition that Peter in some way superintended its composition. Whilst there is hardly a passage which does not supply the Gospel with common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there lies a marked character, which puts aside at once the supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid: touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the Redeemer's doings. The most remarkable is the account of the demoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, where the following words are peculiar to Mark. And no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him. And the fetters in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always night and day he was in the mountains, crying and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran, etc. Here we are indebted for the picture of the fierce and hopeless wanderer to the Evangelist whose work is the briefest, and whose style is the least perfect. He sometimes adds to the account of the others a notice of our Lord's look (iii. 34, viii. 33, x. 21, x. 23); he dwells on human feelings and the tokens of them; on our Lord's pity for the leper, and his strict
charge not to publish the miracle (i. 41, 44); He "loved," the rich young man for his answers (x. 21); He "lashed round," with anger when another occasion called it out (iii. 5); He grieved in spirit (vii. 34, viii. 12). All these are peculiar to Mark; and they would be explained most readily by the theory that one of the disciples most near to Jesus had supplied them. To this must be added that whilst Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other Evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts and events in which prove that we are listening to an independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him (i. 16-20), and his connection with Cæcilia (i. 29); he tells us that Levi was "the son of Alphaeus" (i. 14), that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon (iii. 16), and Boanerges a surname added by Him to the names of two others (iii. 17); he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the Twelve (iii. 24, iv. 10, 36, viii. 34, xiv. 51, 52; we owe to him the name of Jairus (v. 22), the word "carpenter" applied to our Lord (vi. 3), the nation of the "Syrophænian woman" (vii. 26); he substitutes Dalmannutha for the "Magdala" of Matthew (viii. 10); he names Bartimæus (x. 46); he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel into the temple (xi. 16); and that Simon of Cyrene was the man who bore the cross; Alexander and Kneus (xxv. 21). All these are tokens of an independent writer, different from Matthew and Luke, and in the absence of other traditions it is natural to look to Peter. One might hope that much light would be thrown on this question from the way in which Peter is mentioned in the Gospel; but the evidence is not so clear as might have been expected. Peter is often mentioned without any special occasion for it (i. 36, v. 37, xi. 20-25, xii. 3, xvi. 7); but on the other hand there are passages from which it might seem that the writer knew less of the great Apostle. Thus in Matt. xv. 15, we have "Peter, in the parallel place in Mark only the disciples." The Apostle's walking on the sea is omitted: so the blessing pronounced on him (Matt. xvi. 17-19), and the protest made to all the other disciples in another form to him (Matt. xvi. 28). Peter was one of those who were sent to prepare the Passover: yet Mark omits his name. The word "bitterly" of Matthew and Luke is omitted by Mark from the record of Peter's resistance: whilst the account of his denials is full and circumstantial. It has been sought to account for these omissions on the ground of humility; but some may think that this cannot be the clue to all the places. But what we generalize from these passages is, that the name Peter is peculiarly dealt with, added here, and there withdrawn, which would be explained if the writer had access to special information about Peter. On the whole, in spite of the doublingfulness of Eusebius's sources, and the almost self-contradiction into which he falls, the internal evidence inclines us to accept the account that this inspired Gospel has some connection with St. Peter, and records more exactly the preaching which he, guided by the Spirit of God, uttered for the instruction of the world.

II. Relation of Mark to Matthew and Luke. — The results of criticism as to the relation of the three Gospels are somewhat humiliating. Up to the last of the old theories are maintained by equal authority: (a) that Mark's Gospel is the original Gospel out of which the other two have been developed; (b) that it was a compilation from the other two, and therefore was written last; and (c) that it was compiled from Mark alone, and forms a link of transition between the other two. (a.) Of the first view Thiersch may serve as the expositor "No one," he says, "will now venture to call Mark a mere epitomizer of Matthew and Luke. Were his Gospel an epitome of theirs, it would bear the marks of the attempt to combine in one the excellences of both; else the labor of epitome would have been unnecessary. But the very opposite is the case. We miss the peculiarities of Mark and Luke. We find that which is common to both. And therefore, were Mark's Gospel a mere epitome of the others, we should have a third repetition of that which had been already twice related, with so little additional or more exact matter, that the intention and conduct of the writer would remain a puzzle. This difficulty disappears, and a great step is made in threading the labyrinth of the Gospel harmony, when we see that Mark formed the basis of Matthew and Luke. Where they follow him they agree. Where they do not, as in the history of our Lord's childhood, in his discourses, and in his appearances after his resurrection, they differ widely, and each takes his own way" (Thiersch, Church History, p. 54, Carlyle's translation). But the assumption of an independent narrative is too great in each of the others, and Mark having derived their Gospels from Mark; and in the places which they have in common, each treats the events in an independent way, and not as a copist. Still this opinion has been held by Hengst, Storr, Wilke, Weiss, Reuss, Ewald, and others. (b.) The theory that Mark's Gospel is a compilation and abridgment of that of Matthew is maintained by Augustin, and after him by Euthymius and Michaelis. The facts on which it rests are clear enough. There are in St. Mark only about three events which St. Matthew does not narrate (Mark i. 23, viii. 22, xii. 41); and thus the matter of the two may be regarded as almost the same. But the form in St. Mark is, as we have seen, much briefer, and the omissions are many and important. The Markan Gospel that of Matthew would have been, before him, and only condensed it. But many would make Mark a compiler from both the others (Griesbach, De Wette, etc.), arguing from passages where there is a curious resemblance to both (see De Wette, Handbuch, § 94 o). (c.) Lastly, the theory that the Gospel before us forms a sort of transition-link between the other two, standing midway between the Judaic tendency of Matthew and the Universalist or Gentile Gospel of St. Luke need not trouble us much here [see above, p. 1257]. An account of these views may be found in Hilgenfeld's Francilet. It is obvious that they refute one another: the same internal evidence suffices to prove that Mark is the first, the last, and the intermediate. Let us return to the facts, and, taught by these contradictions what is the worth of "internal evidence," let us carry our speculations no further than the facts. The Gospel of Mark contains scarcely any events that are not recited by the others. There are verbal coincidences with each of the others, and sometimes peculiar words from both meet together in the parallel place in Mark. On the other hand, there are unmistakable marks of independence. He has passages peculiar to himself (ii. 19, 20, 24, 26, 31; Mark ii. 22-26, xi. 11-14, xiv. 51, 52, xvi. 9-11), and a peculiar fullness of detail where he goes over the
null ground as the others. The beginning of his gospel is peculiar; so is the end. Remarkable is the absence of passages quoted from the Old Testament by the writer him¬self, who, however, recites such passages when used by our Lord. There are only two exceptions to this, namely, the opening verses of the Gospel, where Mal. iii. 1 and Is. xi. 3 are cited; and a verse in the account of the crucifixion (xxv. 28), where he quotes the words, and He was numbered with the transgressors” (Is. lii. 12); but this is rejected by Alford and Tischendorf as spurious, inserted here from Luke xxii. 37. After deducting these exceptions, 25 quotations from or references to the Old Testament remain, in all of which it is either our Lord Himself who is speaking, or some one addressing Him.

The hypothesis which best meets these facts is, that whilst the matter common to all three Evangelists, or to two of them," is derived from the oral teaching of the Apostles, which they had purposely reduced to a common form, our Evangelist writes as an independent witness to the truth, and not as a commentator on this Josiah type of Gospel. He was written under the sanction of Peter, and its matter in some degree derived from him, is made probable by the evident traces of an eye-witness in many of the narratives. The omission and abridgment of our Lord’s discourses, and the sparing use of O. T. quotations, might be accounted for by the special destination of the Gospel, if we had super data for ascertaining it; but it was for Gentiles, with whom illustrations from the O. T. would have less weight, and the purpose of the writer was to present a clear and vivid picture of the acts of our Lord’s human life, rather than a full record of his divine doctrine. We may thankfully own that, with little that is in substance peculiar to himself, the Evangelist does occupy for us a distinct position, and supply a definite want, in virtue of these characteristics.

III. This Gospel written primarily for Gentiles. — We have seen that the Evangelist scarcely refers to the O. T. in his own person. The word Law (τοῦ νόμου) does not once occur. The genealogy of our Lord is likewise omitted. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are likewise omitted; such as the references to the O. T. and Law in Matt. xii. 5-7, the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign, Matt. xii. 38-42; the parable of the king’s son, Matt. xxii. 1-14; and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, in Matt. xxiii. Explanations are given in some places, which Jewish could not require: thus, Jordan is a “river” (Mark i. 5; Matt. iii. 6); the Pharisees, etc., “used to fast” (Mark ii. 18; Matt. ix. 14), and other customs of theirs are described (Mark vi. 1-4; Matt. xiv. 1, 2); “the time of firs was not yet” (al. c. at the season of the Passover (Mark xii. 13; Matt. xxi. 19); the Sadducees’ worst tenet is mentioned (Mark xii. 18); the Mount of Olives is “over against the temple” (Mark xiii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 3); at the Passover men eat “ unleavened bread” (Mark xiv. 1, 12; Matt. xxvii. 7, 17), and explanations are given which Jews would not need (Mark xvi. 5, 10, 42; Matt. xxvii. 57, 57). Matter that might offend is omitted, as Matt. v. 6, vi. 7, 8. Passages, not always peculiar to Mark, abound in his Gospel, in which the antagonism between the pharisaic legal spirit and the Gospel come out strongly (i. 22, ii. 19, 22, x. 5, viii. 15), which hold out hopes to the hopes of admission to the kingdom of heaven even without the Jews (xii. 9), and which put ritual forms below the worship of the heart (ii. 13). Mark alone preserves those words of Jesus, “The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath” (ii. 27). Whilst he omits the invective against the Pharisees, he indicates by a touch of his own how Jesus condemned them “with anger” (iii. 5). When the Lord purges the Temple of those that polluted it, He quotes a passage of Isaiah (vii. 9), but Mark alone reports ii. 13, and the words, “of all nations” (xi. 17). Mark alone makes the Scribe admit that love is better than sacrifices (xii. 33). From the general testimony of these places, whatever may be objected to an inference from one or other amongst them, there is little doubt but that the Gospel was meant for use in the first instance amongst Gentiles. But the facts give no warrant for the dream that the first Evangelist wrote for the benefit of the second. It is a theory of the third the Pauline: and that Mark occupies an intermediate position, marking the transition from one to the other! In St. Mark we have the Gospel as it was preached to all the world, and it is so presented as to suit the wants of Gentiles. But there is not a trace of the wish, conscious or unconscious, to assist in any change of Christian belief or modes of thinking. In all things it is a calm history, not a polemical pleading.

IV. Time when the Gospel was written. — It will be understood from what has been said, that nothing positive can be asserted as to the time when this Gospel was written. The traditions are contradictory. Irenaeus says that it was written after the death (εξ ζωῆς, but Grabe would translate, wrongly, διαφορα from Rome) of the Apostle Peter (Euseb. H. E. v. 8); but we have seen above, that in other passages it is supposed to be written during Peter’s lifetime (Eus. H. E. v. 14, and ii. 15). In the Bible there is nothing to decide the question. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 10), where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this epistle was written about A. D. 62. If after coming to Asia Minor on Paul’s sending he went on and joined Peter at Babylon, he may have then acquired, or rather completed, that knowledge of Peter’s preaching, which tradition teaches us to look for in the Gospel, and of which there is so much internal evidence; and soon after this the Gospel may have been composed. On the other hand, it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem (xiii. 13, 24-30, 33, &c.). Probably, therefore, it was written between A. D. 65 and 70. But nothing can be certainly determined on this point.

V. Place where the Gospel was written. — The place is as uncertain as the time. Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius, pronounce for Rome, and many moderns take the same view. The Latin expressions in the Gospel prove nothing; for there is little doubt that, wherever the Gospel was written, the writer had been at Rome, and so knew its language. Chrysostom thinks Alexandria; but this is not confirmed by other testimony.

VI. Language. — The Gospel was written in Greek; of this there can be no doubt if ancient testimony is to weigh. Baronius indeed in the
authority of an old Striae translation, asserts that Latin was the original language; and some MSS., referred to in Scholz "Greek Test. p. xxx." repeat the same; but this arises no doubt from the belief that it was written at Rome and for Gentiles. This opinion and its grounds Walf has travelled by supposing that the Gospel was written at Alexandria in Greek. A Latin Gospel written for the use of Roman Christians would not have been lost without any mention of it in an ancient writer.

VII. "Genesis of the Gospel." Schlierenmacher was the first perhaps to question that we have in our present Gospel that of which Papias speaks, on the ground that his words would apply to a simpler and less orderly composition ("Schaude u. Kirchten", 1832). Accordingly the usual assumption of a later editor is brought in, as in the case of St. Luke's Gospel [see p. 1607]. But the words of Papias require no such aid (Eisenh. II. E. iii. 30), nor would such authority be decisive if they did. All ancient testimony marks Make the author of a certain Gospel, and that this is the Gospel which has come down to us, there is not the least historical ground for doubting. Owing to the very few sections peculiar to Mark, evidence from patristic quotation is somewhat difficult to produce. Justin Martyr, however, quotes ch. ix. 44, 46, 48, xii. 30, and Irenaeus cites both the opening and closing words (iii. 10, 6). An important testimony in any case, but doubly so from the doubt that has been cast on the closing verses (xii. 9-19).

Concerning these verses see Meyer's, Alford's, and Tischendorf's notes. The passage is rejected by the majority of modern critics, on the testimony of MSS. (particularly the Vatican and the Sinaitic) and of old writers and on the internal evidence of the diction. Though it is probable that this section is from a different hand, and was annexed to the Gospel soon after the time of the Apostles, it must be remembered that it is found in three of the four great mixed MSS. (A C D), and is quoted without any question by Irenaeus. Among late critics Olshausen still pronounces for its genuineness.

With the exception of these few verses the genuineness of the Gospel is placed above the reach of reasonable doubt.

VIII. Style and Diction. — The purpose of the Evangelist seems to be before us a vivid picture of the earthy acts of Jesus. The style is peculiarly suitable to this. He uses the present tense instead of the narrative aorist, almost in every chapter. The word ἀπεκρίθη, "straightway," is used by St. Mark forty-one times. The first person is preferred to the third (ix. 39. v. 8, 9, 12. vi. 2, 3, 31, 33, ix. 25, 33, vii. 6). Precise and minute details as to persons, places, and numbers, abound in the narrative. All these tend to give force and vivacity to the picture of the human life of our Lord. On the other side, the facts are not very exactly arranged; they are often connected by nothing more definite than καί and παλιρ. Its slowness sometimes makes this Gospel more obscure than the others (I. 13, ix. 5, 6, iv. 10-34).

Many peculiarities of diction may be noticed: amongst them the following: 1. Hebrew (Aramaic) words are used, but explained for Gentile readers (iii. 17, 22, v. 41, vii. 11, 34. ix. 43, 4 x. 46, xiv. 36, xx. 22, 34). 2. Latin words are very frequent, as δημάρχον, λεγέων, στεκόλοβος, κεντρον, κεντρον, κοιμάσθω, ψηφιλλωμα, ξυπνησθω, ἐκπέφανθον, κατενθημεν, προσευχήθος, ἐκπέφανθον, ix. 8; ἐσπονθήκε, ix. 25; προσευχήθος, x. 34; τόβας πιστικΗ, xiv. 3; ἐσπονθήκε, xiv. 40; ὄψε, i. 34, xi. 16; προσευχήθειοι (of προσευχήθειοι), xvi. 37; εἰς τα ρεπεπέλευσαν καθά, iv. 38; προσεβλέψεις, xiv. 8. 4. Dinitimative are frequent. 5. The substantive is often repeated instead of the pronoun: as (to cite from ch. ii. only) ii. 16, 18, 20, 22, 27, 28. 6. Negatives are accumulated for the sake of emphasis: as τότε ἐκείνη τῷ ημέρῃ; ii. 20; διαταγός φυσικός καὶ ήμερας; iv. 27; εἰ δολός μετά σπανίζει, vi. 23; also vi. 21, viii. 4, x. 20, xii. 29, xiv. 30, 43. 8. The same idea is often repeated under another expression, as i. 42, ii. 25, viii. 15, xiv. 68, etc. 9. And sometimes the repetition is effected by means of the opposite, as in i. 22, 44, and many other places. 10. Sometimes emphasis is increased by simple reiteration, as in ii. 13, 19, 11. The elliptic use of οἷς, like that of ὅτι in classical writers, is found, ver. 23. 12. The word ἐπιστράφης is used twenty-five times in this Gospel. 13. Instead of συμβολικος λαβανάριν of Matt., Mark has συμβολικος ποιεις, iii. 6, x. 14. There are many words peculiar to Mark; thus ἄλας, vii. 37, ix. 17, 29; ἡμερακρι- βίσιαν, ix. 15, xiv. 33, xiv. 5, 6; ἐναγιαλείρισθαι, ix. 30, x. 16; κεντρικά, ix. 39, 44, 45; προμορι- σμοι, xiii. 11; προσευχήθειοι, x. 35; σταῦλος, ix. 3; σταυρίζω, x. 8; συνθελής, x. 24, 31; σταῦλος, x. 44, 46, 48; παθωδηθε, x. 21; συμφο- ρίζω, x. 23.

The diction of St. Mark presents the difficulty that whilst it abounds in Latin words and in expressions that recall Latin equivalents, it is still much more akin to the Hebraistic diction of St. Matthew than to the purer style of St. Luke.

IX. Quotations from the Old Testament. — The following list of references to the Old Testament is nearly or quite complete: —


X. Contents of the Gospel. — Though this Gos- pel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to sup- pose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the vivid and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between the
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deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the histo-
ry of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that He dwelt as a Man
among men. Its motto might well be, as Lange
observes, those words of Peter: "How God anointed
Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with
power; who went about doing good, and healing
all that were oppressed of the Devil: for God was
with Him." (Acts x. 38). It develops a series of
acts of this conflict, broken by intervals of rest
and refreshment in the wilderness or on the moun-
tain. It records the exploits of the Son of God in the
war against Satan, and the retirement in which af-
fter each He returned to commune with His Father,
and bring back fresh strength for new
encounters. Thus the passage from ii. 1 to iii. 6
describes his first conflict with the Pharisees, and
it ends in a conspiracy of Pharisees and Herodians
for his destruction, before which He retires to the
sea (iii. 7). The passage from iii. 13 to vi. 6 con-
tains the account of his conflict with the unbeliev-
able of his own countrymen, urging with those remark-
able words, "And He could there do no mighty
work, save that He laid his hands upon a few sick
folk and healed them;" then, constrained (so to
speak) in his working by their resistance, He retired
for that time from the struggle, and "went about
the towns teaching" (iii. 31-38).

The principal divisions in the Gospel are these:
1. John the Baptist and Jesus (i. 1-13). 2. Acts of
Jesus in Galilee (i. 14-ix. 50). 3. Teaching in
Perea, where the spirit of the new kingdom of
the Gospel is brought out (x. 1-34). 4. Teaching,
trials, and sufferings in Jerusalem. Jesus revealing
Himself as Founder of the new kingdom (x. 35-
and xv. 47). 5. Resurrection (xvi.).

SOURCES.—The works quoted under Luke, and
besides them, Davidson, Introduction to N. T.
(Bagster, 1848); Lange, Bibeldieke, part ii., and
Leben Jesu: Fröitzschke on St. Mark (Leipzig,
1830); Kuhn, Leben Jesu, vol. i. (Mainz, 1838),
and Sepp, Leben Christi (1843-46). W. T.

* Additional Literature.—The most important
works on the Gospel of Mark are mentioned in the
supplement to the article Gospels, vol. ii. p. 959
ff. In addition, however, to the critical works of
Wilke (1838), Hilgenfeld (1850), Baur (1851),
James Smith of Jordanhill (1853), Holtzmann
(1863), Weissicker (1864), with others there re-
ferred to, and the commentaries of Kühnel, Oes-
hausen, DeWette, Meyer, Bleek, Lange, Nest, etc.,
the following deserve to be noted: Knobel, De
En. Marci Origine, Vratisl. 1831; Hitzig, Ueber
Johannes Marcus u. seine Schriften, oder welcher
Johannes hat die Offenerbarung verfasst? Zürich,
1843; Güder, art. Marcus Evangelist, in Herzog's
Real-Encycl. iv. 41-51 (1858); Kenrick, The
Gospel of Mark the Prophetic Evangelist, in his Biblical
Encyc. Lond. 1894, 12mo, pp. 1-68; Hilgenfeld,
Das Marcus-Evangelium und die Marcus-Hypothese,
273-332; and Marcus zwischen Matthäus u. Lucas, ibid.,
1896, ix. 82-113; Zeller, Zum Marcus-Evangel-
ium, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1865,
vi. 308-328, 385-408; H. U. Mailjohm, Gesch.
chiede en Critiek der Marcus-Hypothesen, Amst.
1866; J. H. A. Michelsen, Het Evangelie van
Mark's 1e gedeelte, Amst. 1867; Ang. Kloster-
mann, Der Marcus-Evangelium noch seinem Quel-
nenwerke f. d. evang. Geschicht, Göt. 1887;
J. H. Scholten, Het oudeste evangelie Critische
onderzoek van de zamenstelling . . . de his-
torie en der opkomst der evangelien naar Mat-
theus en Marcus, Leiden, 1868; Davidson, Intro-
duction to the Study of the N. T., Lond. 1882, ii.
76-123. For an historical outline of the discussions respecting the relation of Mark's Gospel to that of Matthew
and Luke, see Holtzmann in Bunsen's Bibelwerk,
vii. (1866), pp. 29-53. Many recent critics, besides
those mentioned in the preceding article (p. 178),
such as Smith of Jordanhill, Kenrick, Bleek,
(Theol. Jour., 1851), Holtzmann, Weiss (Theol.
Stud. u. krit. 1861), Schenkel, Weissicker, and
Meyer in the later editions of his Kommentar, re-
mark Mark as the earliest and most original of the
first three Gospels, most of them, however, resort-
ting to the hypothesis of an earlier, perhaps Petrine
Gospel, which forms its basis. The subject has been
discussed with great fullness by Holtzmann. On
the other hand, Hilgenfeld strenuously maintains the
secondary and derivative character of Mark's Gos-
pel, and Davidson, in his new Introduction (1893),
as well as Bleek, adheres substantially to the view
of Griesbach, arguing that it was mainly compiled
from Matthew and Luke. Against the supposition
that any one of the Evangelists copied from the
others, see particularly the dissertation of Mr. Nor-
ton, "On the Origin of the Three Evangelists among
his Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels," in his Evidences of the
Genuineness of the Gospels, 2d ed. (1840), vol. i.
Add, Note D, pp. cvii—cxi.

Among the special commentaries we may notice
the following: Victor Antiochenus (5, 0. d. 401),
ed. by C. F. Matthäus (Bickel's proel). Amt. kal
ähnliche passa der Sphinxios v. 6i. kata Mā-
rop a.n. eveng. 276), Moscow, 1775, Latin trans-
Lardner, Works, iv. 591 ff., ed. 1829); Pessinus,
Catenae Grecororum Patrum in Marcus, Rome,
1867, fol.; Cramer, Catenae Grecororum Patra
in Ev. Matth. u. Marci, Oxon. 1840; Enthynus
Ziegenbus (in Migne's Patrolog. Grec, vol. cxxix.),
and Theophylact (ibid. vol. cxxiii.); see more full-
y under Luke, Gospel of, p. 1659; G. A. Heupe-
lius, Marci Evangel. Notas grammatico-criticas.
I, Mainz, 1764; J. A. Idris, Kommentar zu,
En. Marci, Truj. ad Athen. 1775; C. F. Fritzsche,
Evang. Marci recensuit et cum Com. perpetuo edidit,
Lips. 1830, a very elaborate philo-
logical commentary; James Ford, The Gospel of St.
Mark illustrated from Ancient and Modern Au-
thors, Lond. 1849; J. A. Alexander, The Gospel
according to Mark explained, New York, 1858,
perhaps the best commentary in English, being at
the same time scholarly and popular (N. N. Whit-
ing), The Gospel according to Mark, translated
from the Greek, on the Basis of the Common Eng-
lish Version, with Notes, New York, 1858 (Amer.
Bible Union). The translation of Lange's Com-
mentary by Prof. W. G. T. Sheed, New York,
1866, forming, with Osterzee on Luke, vol. ii. of
the N. T. series, and the new (5th) edition of Meyer's
Krit. exeg. Handb. d. G. des Marcus u. Lukas
(Göt. 1857), should also be mentioned here.

A.

MARMOTH (מָרְמוֹת; v. l. Māri-moth; Marı́mūth) = Mehrimoth the priest, the son of
Uriah (1 Esdr. viii. 62; comp. Ezra viii. 33).

MARTH (מָרָת; בֵּיתָנֵיה, pl. Ges.) in
both MSS.: and so also Jerome, in
MARKET

Amritsalinbana), one of the towns of the western
bowlad of Judah whose names are alluded to or
placed upon by the prophet Micah in the warning
with which his prophecy opens (i. 12). The allu-
sion turns on the signification of Maroth — “bit-
ternesses.” It is not elsewhere mentioned, nor
has the name been encountered by travellers.
Schwarz’s conjecture (107), that it is a contraction
of Maarath, is not very happy, as the latter con-
tains the letter ain, which but very rarely disap-
ppears under any process to which words are sub-
jected.

G.

* MARKET occurs in the O. T. only in the
27th chap. of Ezekiel (vv. 13, 17, 19, 25), where it
is the rendering of the Hebr. דָּשַׁר, which in
the same chapter is five times (in vv. 9, 27, 33, 34)
translated “merchandise.” In the N. T. it is used
as the equivalent of the Greek word διασκόρ, which
however, is rendered market-place in Matt. xx. 3;
Mark xii. 38; Luke vii. 32; Acts xvi. 19: and in
Mark vi. 56 is translated “street” (apparently after
the Vulg. in plateis).

The market was not only a place of traffic, but
also of general resort. It was frequented by per-
sons in search of amusement (cf. Matt. xi. 16; Luke
vii. 32) or of employment (Matt. xx. 3), and in
time of calamity (Eccles. xii. 5 LXX.; cf. Is. xv. 3).

There justice was commonly administered, and
many other public affairs transacted; there, too,
prophets and public teachers found their auditors
(cf. Jer. xvii. 19; Prov. i. 20 f., vii. 1 f.; Luke
xiii. 25). They were “market-browsers” (γυράραδε
who aided the Jewish persecutors of Paul at Thes-
salonic (Acts xvii. 5). Accordingly, the word
sometimes appears to designate little more than
a place of publicity (Matt. xiii. 7; Mark xii. 38;
Luke xi. 43, xx. 46).

The market-places in the cities of Palestine, at
least in the earlier times, lay just within the gates
[GATES, vol. i. p. 871; see also Thomson’s Land
and Book, i. 29 ff.]. They sometimes consisted of
something more than a bare, open space, if we
may judge from 1 Esdr. ii. 18 (17), where we read
of a building (οἰκοδομοιον) the market-places; ”
Icf. Joseph. B. J. i. 21, § 8. And it is doubtful
whether they were always situated close to the city
gates (Joseph. B. J. v. 4, § 1; v. 12, § 3; Vit. p.
22). Certainly in Jerusalem trade seems not to
have been confined to the neighborhood of the
gates, for we read in Jer. xxxvii. 21 of the bakers’
street (יַהְכָּר) (cf. also Neh. iii. 32), in Josephus
(B. J. v. 8, § 1), of the wool-mart, the copper-
smiths’ shops, the clothes market, and (B. J. v. 4,
§ 1) of the valley of the cheese-makers, while in
the rabbinical writings still other associated trades
are mentioned, as the corn-market, meat-market,
etc. (For illustrations of modern usages, see Tobler’s
Denkschiter aus Jerusalem, pp. 139 ff., 142 f., 373 f.,
&c.) Accordingly, the supposition is not impro-
bable one that in the larger cities a market for
the sale of country produce, cattle, etc., was held
in piazza near the gates, while traffic in manufac-
tured articles was grouped in bazaars, or collections
of shops within a usage not unknown in the East
at the present day [STREET] (see Hackett’s I11u-
trations of Scripture, p. 69 ff.). On the approach
of the Sabbath, or of a festival, a signal from a
trumpet was given “between the two evenings” [DAY,
vol. i. p. 568] that work should cease and the
markets be closed. They remained shut also on
days of public mourning. Foreigners seem to have
been free to engage in traffic (Neh. xiii. 16, x. 31);
indeed, the wandering habits of oriental traders
are indicated by the primary signification (“one
who travels about”) of יַהְכָּר and יַהְכָּר, two of
the most common Hebrew words to denote a mer-
chant, (see Josh. iv. 13, and Hackett’s Illustrations,
etc. p. 76 f.). The falsification of weights and
measures was rigorously proscribed by Moses and
the prophets (Lev. xix. 35, 36; Deut. xxv. 15;
Ezek. xlv. 10 f.); Amos viii. 5; Micah vi. 10 f.; cf.
Prov. xi. 1, xvi. 11, xx. 10, 23). On the medium of
trade see MONEY.

Respecting “the market” at Athens, where Paul
“disputed daily,” according to the practice of pub-
lc teachers, at least from the time of Socrates, see
ATHENS, vol. i. p. 194. A detailed account (of
course somewhat conjectural) of this place and its
environs is given in Conybeare and Howson’s Life
and Epp. of St. Paul, i. 354 f., Am. ed., and a lively
description of the scenes that were to be witnessed
there may be found in Felton’s Lectures on Anci-
ent and Modern Greece, i. 375 ff.; cf. Beeler’s Char-
icles, 21 Eng. ed., p. 277 ff. The “market-place”
of Philippippi, and the proceedings before the “pres-
tors” there, must derive illustration from the foreni-
sis usages of Rome, of which Philippippi as a Roman
colony was a miniature likeness.

J. H. T.