

your younger brother, of whom ye spake unto me? And he said, God be gracious unto these, my son. And Joseph made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought [where] to weep; and he entered into [his] chamber, and wept there. And 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 were served separately, and the brethren were placed according to their age. But though the youngest thus had the lowest place, yet when Joseph sent messes from before him to his brethren, he showed his favour 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 unto the Egyptians" (32). The scenes of the Egyptian tombs show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great, that guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainer. These points of agreement in matters of detail are well worthy of attention. There is no evidence as to the entertaining foreigners, 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), "Wherefore 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 laid 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 hitherto he 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, I [am]

Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now therefore be 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 [hath] the famine [been] in the land: and yet [there are] five years in the which [there shall] neither [be] earing nor harvest. And God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. So now [it was] not you [that] sent me hither, but God" (xlv. 2-8). He then desired them to bring his father, that he and all his offspring and flocks and herds might be preserved in the famine, and charged them to tell his father of his greatness and glory. "And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck, and wept; and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover he kissed all his brethren, and wept upon them" (14, 15). Pharaoh and his servants were well pleased that Joseph's brethren were come, and the king commanded him to send for his father according to his desire, and to take wagons for the women and children. He said, "Also let not your eye spare your stuff; for the good of all the land of Egypt [is] yours" (20). From all this we see how highly Joseph was regarded by Pharaoh and his court. Joseph then gave presents to his brethren, distinguishing Benjamin as before, and sent by them a present and provisions to his father, dismissing them with this charge. "See that ye fall not out by the way" (24). He feared that even now their trials had taught them nothing.

Joseph's conduct towards his brethren and his father, at this period, must be well examined before we can form a judgment of his character. We have no evidence that he was then acting under the Divine directions: we know indeed that he held that his being brought to Egypt was providentially ordered for the saving of his father's house: from some points in the narrative, especially the matter of the cup, which he said that he used for divination, he seems to have acted on his own judgment. Supposing that this inference is true, we have to ask whether his policy towards his brethren were founded on a resolution to punish them from resentment or a sense of justice, as well as his desire to secure his union with his father, or again, whether the latter were his sole object. Joseph had suffered the most grievous wrong. According to all but the highest principles of self-denial he would have been justified in punishing his brethren as an injured person: according to these principles he would have been bound to punish them for the sake of justice, if only he could put aside a sense of personal injury in executing judgment. This would require the strongest self-command, united with the deepest feeling, self-command that could keep feeling under, and feeling that could subdue resentment, so that justice would be done impartially. These are the two qualities that shine out most strongly in the noble character of Joseph. We believe therefore that he punished his brethren, but did so simply as the instrument of justice, feeling all the while a brother's tenderness. It must be remembered what they were. Reuben and Judah, both at his selling and in the journeys into Egypt, seem better than the rest of the elder brethren. But Reuben was guilty of a crime that was lightly punished by the loss of his birthright, and Judah was profligate and cruel. Even at the time of reconciliation Joseph saw, or thought, as his parting

* This is the most probable rendering.

charge shows, that they were either not less wicked or not wiser than of old. After his father's death, with the suspicion of ungenerous and deceitful men, they feared Joseph's vengeance, and he again tenderly assured them of his love for them. Joseph's conduct to Jacob at this time can, we think, be 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 perhaps that Jacob would 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" (xlv. 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 "parcel of ground" at Shechem, his future buryingplace (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" (l. 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 Machpelah, the buryingplace 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, 26), 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" (l. 26). His trust Moses kept, and laid 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 most things human, and do not anywhere distinctly discover the results of the conflict of motives that generally occasions such great difficulty in judging men's actions. We have as full an account of Joseph as of Abraham and Jacob, a fuller one than of Isaac; and if we compare their histories, Joseph's character is the least marked by wrong or indecision. His first quality seems to have been the greatest resolution. He not only

believed faithfully, but could endure patiently, and could command equally his good and evil passions. Hence his strong sense of duty, his zealous work, his strict justice, his clear discrimination of good and evil. Like all men of vigorous character, he loved power, but when he had gained it he used it with the greatest generosity. He seems to have striven to get men unconditionally in his power that he might 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 them where they could multiply and prosper in the interval before the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. In the latter days of Joseph's life, he is the leading character among the Hebrews. He makes his father come into Egypt, and directs the settlement. He protects his kinsmen. Dying, he reminds them of the promise, charging them to take his bones with them. Blessed with many revelations, he is throughout a God-taught leader of his people. In the N. T. Joseph is only mentioned: yet the striking particulars of the persecution and sale by his brethren, his resisting temptation, his great degradation and yet greater exaltation, the saving of his people by his hand, and the confounding of his enemies, seem to indicate that he was a type of our Lord. He also connects the Patriarchal with the Gospel dispensation, as an instance of the exercise of some of the highest Christian virtues under the less distinct manifestation of the Divine will granted to the fathers.

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of EPHRAIM and MANASSEH. Sometimes these tribes are spoken of under the name of Joseph, which is even given 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 hankering after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

[R. S. P.]
2. Father of Igal who represented the tribe of Issachar among the spies (Num. xiii. 7).
3. A lay Israelite of the family of Bani who was compelled by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 42). In 1 Esdr. it is given as JOSEPHUS.

4. Representative of the priestly family of Shebaniah, in the next generation after the Return from Captivity (Neh. xii. 14).

5. (*Ἰωσήφ*). A Jewish officer defeated by Gorgias c. 164 B.C. (1 Macc. v. 8; 56, 60.).

6. In 2 Macc. viii. 22, x. 19, Joseph is named among the brethren of Judas Maccabaeus apparently in place of John (Ewald, *Gesch.* iv. 384 note; Grimm, *ad* 2 Macc. viii. 22). The confusion of *Ἰωάννης*, *Ἰωσήφ*, *Ἰωσή* is well seen in the various readings in Matt. xiii. 55.

7. An ancestor of Judith (Jud. viii. 1). [B.F.W.]

8. One of the ancestors of Christ (Luke iii. 30), son of Jonan, and the eighth generation from David inclusive, about contemporary therefore with king Ahaziah.

9. Another ancestor of Christ, son of Judah or Abiud, and grandson of Joanna or Hananiah the son of Zerubbabel, Luke iii. 26. Alford adopts the reading *Josek*, a mistake which seems to originate with the common confusion in Heb. MSS. between *ך* and *ק*.

10. Another, son of Mattathias, in the seventh generation before Joseph the husband of the Virgin.

11. Son of Heli, 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 Matthat, 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 Caesar which obliged him to leave Nazareth with his wife and go to Bethlehem. He was there with Mary and her 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 Simeon, as he held him in his arms. When the wise men from the East came to Bethlehem to worship Christ, Joseph was there; and he went down to Egypt with them by night, when warned by an angel of the danger which threatened them; and on a second message he returned with them to the land of Israel, intending to reside at Bethlehem the city of David; but being afraid of Archelaus he took up his abode, as before his marriage, at Nazareth, where he carried on his trade as a carpenter. When Jesus was 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 given 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, *Proleg.* xiii.). The same stories are repeated in the other apocryphal Gospels. The monophysite Coptic Christians are said to have first assigned a festival to St. Joseph in the Calendar, viz., on the 20th July, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic almanack:—"Requies sancti senis justi Josephi fabri lignarii, Deiparae Virginis Mariae sponsi, qui pater Christi vocari promeruit." The apocryphal *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii*, which now exists in Arabic, is thought by Tischendorf to have been originally written in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to have been transferred to the Western Churches from the East as late as the year 1399.* The above-named history is acknowledged to be quite fabulous, though it belongs probably to the 4th century. It professes to be an account given by our Lord Himself to the apostles on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and makes him old and the father of 4 sons and 2 daughters before he espoused Mary. It is headed with this sentence: "Benedictiones ejus et preces servant nos omnes, o fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to know the opinion of the ancients on the obscure subject of Joseph's marriage may consult Jerome's acrimonious tract *Contra Helvidium*. He will see that Jerome highly disapproves the common opinion (derived from the apocryphal Gospels) of Joseph being twice married, and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men," in favour of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were his cousins only, or at all events against the opinion of Helvidius, which had been held by Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentine, that they were the children of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opinion were called *Antidicommaricitae*, as enemies of the Virgin. (Epiphanius, *Adv. Haeres.* l. iii. t. ii.;

* Calmet, however, places the admission of Joseph into the calendar of the Western Church as early as before the year 900. See Tischendorf, *ut sup.*

Haer. lxxviii., also *Haer.* li. See also Pearson on the *Creed*, Art. Virgin Mary; Mill, on the *Brethren of the Lord*; Calmet, *de S. Joseph. S. Mar. Virg. conjuge*; and for an able statement of the opposite view, Alford's note on *Matt.* xiii. 55; Winer, *Rub. s. v. Jesus and Joseph.* [A. C. H.]

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHAEA (Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας), 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 birth-place Arimathaea, a city supposed by Robinson to be situated somewhere between Lydda and Nobe, now *Beit Nuba*, a mile north-east of *Falo* (*Bibl. Res.* ii. 239-41, iii. 142).

Joseph is denominated by St. Mark (xv. 43) an honourable counsellor, by which we are probably to understand that he was a member of the Great Council, or Sanhedrim. He is further characterised as "a good man and a just" (*Luke* xxiii. 50), one of those who, bearing in their hearts the words of their old prophets, was waiting for the kingdom of God (*Mark* xv. 43; *Luke* ii. 25, 38, xxiii. 51). 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 fears of the chosen disciples, had the effect of inspiring him with a boldness and confidence to which he had before been 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 in boldly unto Pilate and craved the body of Jesus." The fact is mentioned by all four Evangelists. Pilate, having assured 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 brought 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 yet 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 rumour 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 Arimathaea must also be regarded as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 9): according to the literal rendering of Bishop Lowth "with the rich man was His tomb." Nothing, but of 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 disciples. Another, whether authentic or not, deserves to be mentioned as generally current, namely—that Joseph being sent to Great Britain by the Apostle St. Philip, about the year 63, settled with his brother disciples at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire; and there erected of wicker-twigs the first Christian oratory in England, the parent of the majestic abbey which was afterwards founded on the same site. The local guides to this day show the miraculous thorn (said to bud and blossom every Christmas-day) that sprang from the staff which Joseph stuck in the ground as he stopped to rest himself on the hill top. (See Dugdale's *Monasticon*, i. 1; and Hearne, *Hist. and Ant. of Glastonbury*; Asseman, *Bibl. Orient.* iii. 319). Winer refers to a monograph on Joseph—Broemel, *Diss. de Josepho Arimath.* Viteb. 1683, 4to. [E. H. . . . s.]

JOSEPH, called **BAR'SABAS**, and surnamed Justus; one of the two persons chosen by the assembled church (*Acts* i. 23) as worthy to fill the place in the Apostolic company from which Judas 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.* iii. 39) 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 Josès Barnabas (*Acts* iv. 36) and from Judas Barsabas (*Acts* xv. 22). The signification of Barsabas is quite uncertain. Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.* *Acts* i. 23) gives five possible interpretations of it, viz., 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 Josès the son of Alphaeus, and that Judas Barsabas may be his brother the Apostle. [W. T. B.]

JOSEPHUS (Ἰωσήφος), 1 *Esd.* ix. 34. [JOSEPH, 3.]

JOSE-S (Ἰωσῆς, Ἰησοῦς, Alford; Ἰωσή is the genitive case). 1. Son of Eliezer, in the genealogy of Christ (*Luke* iii. 29), 15th generation from David, *i. e.* about the reign of Manasseh.

2. 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. 56).

3. JOSÈS BARNABAS (*Acts* iv. 35). [BAR-NABAS.] [A. C. H.]

JO'SHAH (יהושׁא: Ἰωσία; Alex. Ἰωσίας *Josa*), a prince of the house of Simeon, son of Amaziah, and connected with the more prosperous branch of the tribe, who, in the days of Hezekiah, headed a marauding expedition against the peaceable Hamite shepherds dwelling in Gedor, exterminated them, and occupied their pasturage (*1 Chr.* iv. 34, 38-41).

JO'SHAPHAT (יהושׁפָּת: Ἰωσαφάτ; Cod. Fred. Aug. Ἰωσαφάς: *Josaphat*), the Mithnite, one of David's guard, apparently selected from among the warriors from the east of Jordan (*1 Chr.* xi. 43). Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* p. 1284) gives Mathnan as the Chaldee equivalent of Bashan, by

which the latter is always represented in the Targ. Onk.; and if this were the place which gave Joshaphat his surname he was probably a Gadite. In the Syriac Joshaphat and Uzziah (ver. 44) are interchanged, and the latter appears as "Azi of Anathoth."

JOSHAVIAH (יֵשׁוּעָה): *Ἰωσία*; Cod. Fred. Aug. *Ἰωσεία*: *Josāia*, the son of Elnaam, and one of David's guards (1 Chr. xi. 46). The LXX. make him the son of Jeribai, by reading יְרִבְיָהּ for יֵשׁוּעָה. The name appears in eight, and probably nine, different forms in the MSS. collated by Kennicott.

JOSHBKA'SHAH (יֵשׁוּבְכָאֶשָׁה): *Ἰεσβασακά*; *Ἰεσβακαράν*, Cod. Alex.: *Jesbacassa*, head of the 16th course of musicians. [JESHARELAH.] He belonged to the house of Heman (1 Chr. xxv. 4, 24). [A. C. H.]

JOSHUA (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ): *Ἰησοῦς*: *Josua*: *i. e.* "whose help is Jehovah," Gesen., or rather "God the Saviour," Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. II., p. 89, ed. 1843: on the import of his name, and the change of it from Oshea or Hoshea, Numb. xiii. 16 = "wellfare" or "salvation," see Pearson, *l. c.*: it appears in the various forms of HOSHEA, OSHEA, JEHOHUA, JESHUA, and JESUS. 1. The son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Chr. vii. 27). The future captain of invading hosts grew up a slave in the brick-fields of Egypt. Born about the time when Moses fled into Midian, he was a man of nearly forty years when he saw the ten plagues, and shared in the hurried triumph of the Exodus. The keen eye of the aged Lawgiver soon discerned in Hoshea those qualities which might be required in a colleague or successor to himself. He is mentioned first in connexion with the fight against Amalek at Rephidim, when he was chosen (Ex. xvii. 9) by Moses to lead the Israelites. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive for the first time (compare Ex. xxiv. 13, and xxxiii. 11) the two Tables, Joshua, who is called his minister or servant, accompanied him part of the way, and was the first to accost him in his descent (Ex. xxxii. 17). Soon afterwards he was one of the twelve chiefs who were sent (Num. xiii. 17) to explore the land of Canaan, and one of the two (xiv. 6) who gave an encouraging report of their journey. The 40 years of wandering were almost passed, and Joshua was one of the few survivors, when Moses, shortly before his death, was directed (Num. xxvii. 18) to invest Joshua solemnly and publicly with definite authority in connexion with Eleazar the priest, over the people. And after this was done, God Himself gave Joshua a charge by the mouth of the dying Lawgiver (Deut. xxxi. 14, 23).

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. Ai fell: and the law was inscribed on Mount Ebal, and read by their leader in the presence of all Israel.

The treaty which the fear-stricken Gibeonites obtained deceitfully was generously respected by Joshua. It stimulated and brought to a point the hostile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hailstorm, and a miraculous prolongation of the day, obtained a decisive victory over them at Makedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country as far as Kadesh-barnea and Gaza. He returned to the camp at Gilgal, master of half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confederacy of the Canaanitish chiefs in the north, under Jabin king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations with thirty-one kings swell the roll of his conquests; amongst others the Anakim—the old terror of Israel—are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve and did not achieve the complete extirpation of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land.

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

After an interval of rest, Joshua convoked an assembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvellous fulfilment of God's promises to their fathers, and warning them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended; and lastly, he caused them to renew their covenant with God, at Shechem, a place already famous in connexion 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 chiefly kindled the imagination of Western chroniclers and poets in the middle ages: the character of a devout warrior, blameless and fearless, who has been taught by serving as a youth how to command as a man; who earns by manly vigour a quiet honoured old age; who combines strength with gentleness, ever looking up for and obeying the Divine impulse with the simplicity of a child, while he wields great power and directs it calmly, and without swerving, to the accomplishment of a high unselfish purpose.

* It has been questioned whether the Captain of the Lord's Host was a created being or not. Dr. W. H. Mill discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favour of the former alternative (*On the Historical Character of St. Luke's*

First Chapter, Camb. 1841, p. 92). But J. G. Abicht (*De Duce Exercitus, &c.*, ap. *Nov. Theol. Philolog.* i. 503) is of opinion that He was the uncreated Angel, the Son of God. Compare also Pfeiffer, *Diff. Script.* *Loc.* p. 173.

All that part of the book of Joshua which relates 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 unguarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (iv. 14) with awe; the mild father who remonstrated with Achan; 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, save one, of a famous generation; the honoured old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshipped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

The great work of Joshua's life was more exciting but less hopeful than that of Moses. He gathered the first fruits of the autumn harvest where his predecessor had sown the seed in spring. It was a high and 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 gleamed upon the calm close of Joshua's life. Solemn words, and dark with foreboding, fell from him as he sat "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord in Shechem." The excitement of his battles was past; and there had grown up in the mind of the pious leader a consciousness that it is the tendency of prosperity and success to make a people wanton and worldly-minded, idolaters in spirit if not in act, and to alienate them from God.

Holy Scripture itself suggests (Heb. 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 Creed*, 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 among the tribes; Jesus brings His people into the presence of God, and assigns to them their mansions; (3.) as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so the Gospel of Christ succeeding the law, announced One by whom all that believe are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses (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. xv. 8, ii. 29).

The treatment of the Canaanites by their Jewish conquerors is fully discussed by Dean Graves *On the Pentateuch*, Pt. 3, Lect. i. He concludes that the extermination of the Canaanites was justified by their crimes, and that the employment of the Jews in such extermination was quite consistent with God's method of governing the world. Prof. Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*, bk. iii. ch. 4, §1, ed. 1854), argues with great force and candour in favour 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, none has led to so much discussion as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (x. 12-14). No great difficulty is found, in deciding as Pfeiffer has done (*Diff. Script. lcc. p. 175*), between the lengths of this day and that of Hezekiah (2 K. xx. 11); and in connecting both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by Herodotus, ii. 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it away. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Dathe, and others, as no miracle but an optical illusion; by Rosenmüller, following Ilgen, as a mistake of the time of day; by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to O. T. p. 644*) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Jasher. So Ewald (*Gesch. Isr. ii. 326*) traces in the latter part of verse 13 an interpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet: and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Peru. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text as intended to describe a miracle is sufficiently vindicated by Deyling, *Observ. Sacr. i. § 19, p. 100*; and J. G. Abicht, *De statione Solis ap. Nov. Thes. Theol.-Philol. i. 516*; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the 4th letter in his *Apology for the Bible*.

Procopius, who flourished in the 6th century, relates (*Vandal. ii. 10*) that an inscription existed at Tingis in Mauritania, set up by Phœnician refugees from Canaan, and declaring in the Phœnician 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 Lecture, for 1859, iii. 91*).

Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. in Matt. i. 5, and Choroz. Lucae praeemis. 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 Ajalon. The LXX. and the Arab. Ver., add to Josh. xxiv. 30 the statement that in his sepulchre were deposited the flint-knives which were used for the circumcision 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. bks. 7, 8, and 9*.

2. An inhabitant of Bethshemesh, 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 Bethshemesh (1 Sam. vi. 14, 18).

3. A governor of the city who gave his name to a gate of Jerusalem (2 K. xxiii. 8).

4. (Called Jeshua in Ezra and Nehemiah), a high-priest, who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel. For details see JESHUA, No. 4. [W. T. B.]

JOSHUA, BOOK OF. 1. Authority.—The claim of the book of Joshua to a place in the Canon of the O. T. has never been disputed. [See

CANON.] (Bp. Cosin's *Scholastical History of the Canon*; Dr. Wordsworth's *Discourses on the Canon*.) Its authority is confirmed by the references, in other books of Holy Scripture, to the events which are related in it; as Ps. lxxviii. 53-65; Is. xxviii. 21; Hab. iii. 11-13; Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8, xi. 30-32; James ii. 25. The miracles which it relates, and particularly that of the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah have led some critics to entertain a suspicion of the credibility of the book as a history. But such an objection does not touch the book of Joshua only. It must stand or fall with nearly every historical book of the Bible. Some Christians may be more or less disposed by excess of candour, or a desire to conciliate opposition, to regard as the effect of natural and ordinary causes, occurrences which have always been and still are commonly regarded as miraculous; and such persons cannot be blamed so long as their views are consistent with a fair interpretation of the Bible. But it cannot be allowed that any canonical book is the less entitled to our full belief because it relates miracles.

The treatment of the Canaanites which is sanctioned in this book has been denounced for its severity by Eichhorn and earlier writers. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice, or with God's ordinary way of governing the world. Therefore the sanction which is given to it does not impair the authority of this book. Critical ingenuity has searched it in vain for any incident or sentiment inconsistent with what we know of the character of the age, or irreconcilable with other parts of canonical Scripture. Some discrepancies are alleged by De Wette and Hauff to exist within the book itself, and have been described as material differences and contradictions. But they disappear when the words of the text are accurately stated and weighed, and they do not affect the general credibility of the book. Thus, it cannot be allowed that there is any real disagreement between the statement xi. 16 and xii. 7 that Joshua took all the land and gave it to Israel, and the subsequent statement xviii. 3 and xvii. 1, 16 that the people were slack to possess the land which was given to them, and that the Canaanites were not entirely extirpated: of course it was intended (Ex. xxiii. 28, 30) that the people should occupy the land by little and little. It cannot be allowed that there is any irreconcilable contradiction between the statement xii. 10-12, that the kings of Jerusalem and Gezer were smitten and their country divided, and the statement xv. 63, xvi. 10, that their people were not extirpated for some time afterward. It cannot be allowed that the general statement xi. 23 that Joshua gave the land unto all Israel according to their divisions by their tribes is inconsistent with the fact (xviii. 1, xix. 51), that many subsequent years passed before the process of division was completed, and the allotments finally adjusted. Other discrepancies have been alleged by Dr. Davidson, with the view not of disparaging the credibility of the book, but of supporting the 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 (xiii. 3) that Ekron, &c., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (xv. 45) that it was assigned to Judah. Dr. Davidson gives no proof either of his assertion that the former text is in fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekron was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment. Again, it would seem that Dr. Davidson pushes a theory too far when he assumes (*Introd. to O. T.* 637-8) 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 "priests," and in another as "sons 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 purpose, which it fulfils completely. 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 connexion between it and the Pentateuch than exists between Judges and it. The references in i. 8, viii. 31, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 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. xxxiv. 13; xiii. 17 with Num. xxxii. 37; xiii. 21, 22 with Num. xxxi. 8; xiii. 14, 33, and xiv. 4 with Deut. xviii. 1, 2; and Num. xviii. 20, xxi. with Num. xxxv.).

Perhaps no part of Holy Scripture is more injured 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 (vers. 5, 6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn

preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen Power, the Jewish leader rises high and calm amid all.

The second part of the book (ch. xiii.-xxi.) has been aptly compared to the Domesday-book of the Norman conquerors of England. The documents 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 Chr. vi. 54, &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; the capture of Jericho, 6; the conquest of the south, 7-10; the conquest of the north, 11; recapitulation, 12.

b. Territory assigned to Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, 13; the lot of Caleb and of the tribe of Judah, 14, 15; Ephraim and half Manasseh, 16, 17; Benjamin, 18; Simeon, Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali and Dan, 19; the appointment of six cities of refuge, 20; the assignment of forty-eight cities to Levi, 21; the departure of the transjordanic tribes to their homes, 22.

c. Joshua's convocation of the people and first 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 B.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 acquiesce 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 Phinehas by Lightfoot; Eleazar by Calvin; Samuel by Van Til; Jeremiah by Henry; one of the elders who survived Joshua, by Keil. Von Lengerke thinks it was written by some one in the time of Josiah; Davidson by some one in the time of Saul, or somewhat later; Masius, Le Clerc, Maurer, and others by some one who lived after the Babylonish captivity. The late date is now advocated for the most part in connexion 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 Elohistic, the other supplementary, called Jehovistic; 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. 299-305. 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 (xxiv. 29-33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some subordinate events, as the capture of Hebron, of Debir (Josh. xv. 13-19, 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, xvii. 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 favour of him when compared with any other person who has been named, may be thus briefly stated:—(a) It is evident (xxiv. 26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book; (b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (i. 1, iii. 7, iv. 2, v. 2, 9, vi. 2, vii. 10, viii. 1, x. 8, xi. 6, xiii. 1, 2, xx. 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.

Hävernick'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 Hävernick 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. 3, 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, xv. 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 Leven in 1848, with the title "Liber Josuae; Chronicon Samaritanum, edidit, Latine vertit, &c., T. G. J. Juynboll." Its contents were known previously from the accounts given of it by Hottinger and others. It was written in the 13th century. It recounts the late acts of Moses amplified from the book of Numbers, a history of Joshua interspersed with various legends, portions of the Jewish law, and several unconnected historical passages more or less falsified, extending down to the time of Hadrian.

5. *Literature.*—The best Commentary, which is accessible to the English reader, is the translation of Keil's *Commentary on Joshua* (Clark, Edinburgh). A complete list of commentaries may be found in Rosenmüller's *Scholia*. Among the Fathers, Ephrem Syrus has written an explanation, and Augustine and Theodoret have discussed questions connected with the book. The following commentaries may be selected as most useful:—That of *Jarchi* or *Rashi* (Solomon ben Isaac), translated into Latin by Breithaupt, Gothae, 1710; the commentary of Masius, Antwerp, 1574, inserted in the *Critici Sacri*; those of Le Clerc, Amsterdam, 1708; Rosenmüller, Leipsic, 1833; and Keil, Erlangen, 1847. [W. T. B.]

JOSIAH (יְהוֹשִׁיָּא: *Yosias; Josias*) 1. The son of Amon and Jedidah, succeeded his father B.C. 641, in the eighth year of his age, and reigned 31 years. His history is contained in 2 K. xxii.—xxiv. 30; 2 Chr. 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 in his twelfth year, and for 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 more recently, now ceased to pollute the land of Judah; and in Israel the purification began with Jeroboam's chapel 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. xiii. 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 ardent 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 scantiness of the opportunities which were then open to laymen of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. 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 ordinary public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction Deut. xxxi. 10 was obeyed once in seven years), though God was worshipped there with daily sacrifice, psalmody, 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 26th year of his age he should find the most awful words in which God denounces sin come 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 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 munificent offerings, better arranged services, and a larger concourse of worshippers than had been seen on any previous occasion.

After this, his endeavours 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 Hadrachmon, to die before he could arrive at Jerusalem.

He was buried with extraordinary honours; and

* Such is at least the conjecture of Prideaux (*Connexion*, anno 610), and of Milman (*History of the Jews*, i. 313). But the Bible ascribes no such chivalrous motive to Josiah; and it does not occur to Josephus, who attributes (*Ant.* x. 5, §1) Josiah's resistance merely to Fate urging him to destruction; nor to the author of 1 Esd. i. 28, who describes him as acting wilfully against Jeremiah's advice; nor to Kwald, who (*Serech. Isr.* iii. 707) conjectures that it

may have been the constant aim of Josiah to restore not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered as his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is somewhat derogatory to the character of Josiah.

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. xxii. 10, 18, and Zech. xii. 11, and with Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. viii. ch. 23, p. 878. The prediction of Huldah, that he should "be gathered into the grave in peace," must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in Jer. 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 horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herodotus, i. 104-106). A detachment of them went towards Egypt by the way of Philistia; somewhere southward of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetichus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah's reign. But Ewald (*Die Psalmen*, 165) conjectures that the 59th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Scythians. The town Bethshan is said to derive its Greek name, Scythopolis (Reland, *Pal.* 992; Lightfoot, *Chor. Marc.* vii. §2), from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his authority in the land of Israel is adduced as an indication that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach. The same people are described at a later period by Ezekiel (xxviii.). See Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii. 689. Abarbanel (ap. Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jud.* i. 858) records an oral tradition of the Jews to the effect that the Ark of the Covenant, which Solomon deposited in the Temple (1 K. vi. 19), was removed and hidden by Josiah, in expectation of the destruction of the Temple; and that it will not be brought again to light until the coming of Messiah. [W. T. B.]

2. The son of Zephaniah, at whose house the prophet Zechariah was commanded to assemble the chief men of the captivity, to witness the solemn and symbolical crowning of Joshua the high-priest (Zech. vi. 9). It has been conjectured that Josiah was either a goldsmith, or treasurer of the Temple, or one of the keepers of the Temple, who received the money offered by the worshippers, but nothing is known of him. Possibly he was a descendant of Zephaniah, the priest mentioned in Jer. xxi. 1, xxxvii. 3, and if Hen in Zech. vi. 15 be a proper name, which is doubtful, it probably refers to the same person, elsewhere called Josiah. [W. A. W.]

JOSIAS. 1. (*Ἰωσίας*: *Josias*). Josiah, king of Judah (1 Esd. i. 1, 7, 18, 21-23, 25, 28, 29, 32-34; Ecclus. xlix. 1, 4; Bar. i. 8; Matt. i. 10, 11).

2. (*Ἰωσίας*; Alex. *Ἰεσσαίας*: *Maasias*). Jeshaiiah the son of Athaliah (1 Esd. viii. 33; comp. Ezr. viii. 7).

JOSIBIAH (*יֹשִׁבִּיָּא*, i. e. Joshibiah: *Ἀσαβία*; Alex. *Ἰσαβία*: *Josabias*), the father of Jehu, a Simeonite, descended from that branch of the tribe of which Shimei was the founder, and which afterwards became most numerous (1 Chr. iv. 35).

JOSIPHIAH (*יֹסִפִּיָּא*: *Ἰωσηφίος*: *Josphius*) the father or ancestor of Shelomith, who returned with Ezra (Ezr. 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 Esd. viii. 36. The LXX. supply *Βααρί*, i. e. *בְּנֵי*, which, from its resemblance to the preceding word *בְּנֵי*, might easily have been omitted by a transcriber. The verse would then read, "of the sons of Bani, Shelomith the son of Josiphiah." In the Syriac Shelomith is repeated, but this is not likely to have been correct. Josiphiah is called in Esdras *JOSAPHIAS*.

JOT'BAH (*יֹטְבָּא*): *Ἰετέβα*; Alex. *Ἰεραχάλα*; Jos. *Ἰαβάρη*: *Jeteba*), the native place of Meshullemeth, 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 Jotbath, or Jotbathah, mentioned below. This there is nothing either to prove or disprove. [G.]

JOT'BATH, or **JOT'BATHAH** (*יֹטְבָּתָּא*): *Ἰερεβαθά*; Alex. *Ἰεραβαθάβ*: Deut. x. 7; Num. xxxiii. 33), a desert station of the Israelites: it is described as "a land of torrents of waters;" there are several confluences of Wady's 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. [H. H.]

JO'THAM (*יֹתָם*): *Ἰωθάμ*: *Jotham*.) 1. The youngest son of Gideon (Judg. ix. 5), who escaped when his brethren, to the number of 69 persons, were slain at Ophrah by their half-brother Abimelech. When this bloody 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. The son of king Uzziah or Azariah and Jerushah. After administering the kingdom for some years during his father's leprosy, he succeeded to the throne B.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. xv. and 2 Chr. xxvii. He did right in the sight of the Lord, and his reign was prosperous, although the high-places were not removed. He built the high gate 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 Jahdai (1 Chr. ii. 47).

JO'ZABAD. 1. (*יֹזָבָד*): *Ἰωζαβὰδ*; Alex. *Ἰωζαβὰδ*: *Jozabad*.) A captain of the thousands of Manasseh, who deserted to David before the battle of Gilboa, and assisted him in his pursuit of the marauding band of Amalekites (1 Chr. xii. 20). One of Kennicott's MSS. reads *יֹחָבֵד*, i. e. *Jochabed*.

2. (*Ἰωζαβὰθ*; Alex. *Ἰωζαβέδ*.) A hero of Manasse, like the preceding (1 Chr. xii. 20).

3. (Ἰωζαβὰδ; Alex. Ἰωζαβὰθ, 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 Cononiah and Shimei, after the restoration of the true worship.

4. (*Josabad*.) One of the princes of the Levites, who held the same office as the preceding, and took part in the great Passover kept at Jerusalem in the reign of Josiah (2 Chr. xxxv. 9).

5. A Levite, son of Jeshua, who assisted Meremoth and Eleazar in registering the number and weight of the vessels of gold and silver belonging to the Temple, which they brought with them from Babylon (Ezr. viii. 33). He is called JOSABAD in the parallel narrative of 1 Esd. viii. 63, and is probably identical with 7.

6. (Ἰωζαβὰδ in Ezra; Ἰωζαβὰδ in 1 Esd. ix. 23; *Jozabed*.) A priest of the sons of Pashur, who had married a foreigner on the return from the captivity (Ezr. x. 22). He appears as OCIDELUS in the A. V. of 1 Esd.

7. (Ἰωζαβὰδος in 1 Esd. ix. 23; *Jozabed*, Ezr. x. 22; *Jorabtus*, 1 Esd. ix. 23.) A Levite among those who returned with Ezra and had married foreign wives. He is probably identical with Jozabad the Levite, who assisted when the law was read by Ezra (Neh. viii. 7); and with Jozabad, one of the heads of the Levites who presided over the outer work of the Temple (Neh. xi. 16). [W.A.W.]

JO'ZACHAR (יֹזָכָר; Ἰεζιχαίρ; Alex. Ἰωζαχάρ; *Josachar*), the son of Shimeath the Ammonitess, and one of the murderers of Joash king of Judah (2 K. xii. 21). The writer of the Chronicles (2 Chr. xxiv. 26) calls him Zabad, 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 עליו. In 18 MSS. of Kennicott's collation the name in the Kings is יֹזָכָר, i. e. Jozabad, and the same is the reading of 32 MSS. collated by De Rossi. Another MS. in De Rossi's possession had יֹזָכָר, i. e. Jozachad, and one collated by Kennicott יֹזָכָר, or Jozabar, which is the reading of the Peshito-Syriac. Burrington concludes that the original form of the word was יֹזָכָר, or Jozabad; but for this there does not seem sufficient reason, as the name would then be all but identical with that of the Moabite Jehozabad, 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 Zechariah, as Josephus intimates (*Ant.* ix. 8, §4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehoiada. The care of the Chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm a suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the Chronicler as an instance of Divine retribution. On the accession of Amaziah the conspirators were executed. [W. A. W.]

JO'ZADAK (יֹזָדָק; Ἰωζεδῆκ; *Josedec*), Ezr. iii. 2, 8; v. 2; x. 18; Neh. xii. 26. The name is a contraction of JEHOZADAK.

JUBAL (יֹבָב; Ἰουβάβ; *Jubal*), a son of Lamech by Adah, and the inventor of the "harp and organ" (Gen. iv. 21; *kinnór ve'ugab*, probably general terms for stringed and wind instruments). His name appears to be connected with this subject, springing from the same root as *yobel*, "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 connexion 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 (שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל; and simply יֹבָב; ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως, ἀφέσεως σημάσια, and ἀφεσις; *annus jubilaei*, and *jubilaeus*), the fiftieth 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. 16-25. There is no mention of the Jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manasseh, on account of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num. xxxvi. 4: see below, §VI. note †).

II. The year was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement^b with the blowing of trumpets^c throughout

* Ewald observes that vers. 17-22 in this chapter should be read immediately after ver. 7, since they carry on the account of the sabbatical year, and have no reference to the year of Jubilee.

† It does not seem likely that the rites of solemn humiliation which marked the great fast of the year were disturbed. The joyful sound probably burst forth in the afternoon, when the high-priest had brought the services of Atonement to a conclusion. The contrast between the quiet of the day and the loud blast of the trumpets at its close, must have rendered deeply impressive the hallowing of the year of release from poverty and bondage. But Hapfeld is so offended with the incongruity of this arrangement, that he would fain repair what he thinks must be a defect in the Hebrew text, in order that he may put back the commencement of the year of Jubilee from the Day of Atonement, on the 10th, to the Feast of Trumpets, on the 1st of Tisri. "Hic (i. e. in ver. 8) vetus mendam latere suspicor,

forte in die numero, בְּעֵשֶׂר, primitus positum (pro בְּאַחַד) cui deinde glossa accessit 'die expiationis'" (*Comment. de vera fest. rat.* pt. 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.

‡ 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 Moses*, p. 131, Eng. trans.), are the only ones represented in Egyptian sculptures and paintings. The straight trumpet was called הַצִּצְרָה, the other, שׁוֹפָר and קָרָן. The jubilee horns used in the siege of Jericho are called שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבֵלִים (Josh. vi. 4); and, collectively, in the following verse

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. [SABBATICAL 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:—if a Hebrew urged by poverty,^d had to dispose of a field, the price was determined according to the time of the sale in reference to the approach of the next Jubilee. The transfer was thus, not of the land itself, but of the usufruct for a limited time. Deduction was systematically made on account of the number of Sabbatical years, which would deprive the purchaser of certain crops within that period.^e

(b) The possession of the field could, at any time, be recovered by the original proprietor, if his circumstances improved, or by his next of kin^f (קָרֵב, i. e. *one who redeems*). The price to be paid for its redemption was to be fixed according to the same equitable rule as the price at which it had been purchased (ver. 16).

(c) Houses in walled cities^g were not subject to the law of Jubilee, but a man who sold his house could redeem it at any time within a full year of the time of its sale. After that year, it became the absolute property of the purchaser.

(d) Houses and buildings in villages, or in the country, being regarded as essentially connected with the cultivation of the land, were not excepted, but returned in the Jubilee with the land on which they stood.

קָרֵב הַיְבֵל. (See Keil on Josh. vi. 4.) It is not quite certain whether they were the horns of oxen or formed of metal (Kranold, p. 50), but the latter seems far more probable. Connected with the mistake as to the origin of the word יְבֵל (which will be noticed below), was the notion that they were rams' horns. R. Jehuda, in the Mishna, says that the horns of rams (זְרוֹיִם) were used at the Feast of Trumpets, and those of wild goats (זְרוֹיִם) at the Jubilee. But Maimonides and Bartenora say that rams' horns were used on both occasions (*Rosh Hashana*, p. 342, edit. Surea.). Bochart and others have justly objected that the horns of rams, or those of wild goats, would form but sorry trumpets. [CORNET.]

It is probable that on this, as on other occasions of public proclamation, the trumpets were blown by the priests, in accordance with Num. x. 8. (See Kranold, *Comment. de Jubilæo*, p. 50; with whom agree Ewald, Bähr, and most modern writers.) Bähr supposes that, at the proclamation of the Jubilee, the trumpets were blown in all the priests' cities and wherever a priest might be living; while, on the Feast of Trumpets, they were blown only in the Temple. Maimonides says that every Hebrew at the Jubilee blew nine blasts, so as to make the trumpet literally "sound throughout the land" (Lev. xxv. 9). Such a usage may have existed, as a mere popular expression of rejoicing, but it could have been no essential part of the ceremony.

^d It would seem that the Israelites never parted with their land except from the pressure of poverty. The objection of Naboth to accept the offer of Ahab

(e) The Levitical cities were not, in respect to this law, reckoned with walled towns. If a Levite sold the use of his house, it reverted to him in the Jubilee, and he might redeem it at any previous time. The lands in the suburbs of the Levitical cities could not be parted with under any condition, and were not therefore affected by the law of Jubilee (ver. 34).

(f) If a man had sanctified a field of his patrimony unto the Lord, it could be redeemed at any time before the next year of Jubilee, on his paying one-fifth in addition to the worth of the crops, rated at a stated valuation (Lev. xxvii. 19). If not so redeemed, it became, at the Jubilee, devoted for ever. If the man had previously sold the usufruct of the field to another, he lost all right to redeem it (vers. 20, 21).

(g) If he who had purchased the usufruct of a field sanctified it, he could redeem it till the next Jubilee, that is, as long as his claim lasted; but it then, as justice required, returned to the original proprietor (ver. 22-24).

3. All Israelites who had become bondmen, either to their countrymen, or to resident foreigners, were set free in the Jubilee (Lev. xxv. 40, 41), when it happened to occur before their seventh year of servitude, in which they became free by the operation of another law (Ex. xxi. 2). Those who were bound to resident foreigners might redeem themselves, if they obtained the means, at any time; or they might be redeemed by a relation. Even the bondman who had submitted to the ceremony of having his ears bored (Ex. xxi. 6) had his freedom at the Jubilee.^h

Such was the law of the year of Jubilee, as it is given in the Pentateuch. It was, of course, like the law of the Sabbatical Year, and that of those rites of the great festivals which pertain to agriculture, delivered proleptically. The same formula is used—"When ye be come into the land which

(1 K. xxi. 1) appears to exemplify the sturdy feeling of a substantial Hebrew, who would have felt it to be a shame and a sin to give up any part of his patrimony—"The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers to thee." If Michaelis had felt as most Englishmen do in such matters, he would have had more respect for the conduct of Naboth. (See *Comment. on the Mosaic Law*, art. 73.) But the conduct of Naboth has been questioned on different ground in a dissertation by S. Andreas, in the *Critical Sacri*, vol. xiii. p. 608.

^e This must be the meaning of the price being calculated on "the years of fruits," שְׁנֵי תְבוּאָה (Lev. xxv. 15, 16), the years of tillage, exclusive of the years of rest.

^f Kranold observes (p. 54) that there is no record of the *goel* ever exercising his right till after the death of him who had sold the field. But the inference that the *goel* could not previously exercise his power seems to be hardly warranted, and is opposed to what is perhaps the simplest interpretation of Ruth iv. 3, 4. See note ^g, §V.

^g A Jewish tradition, preserved by Maimonides and 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.

^h Maimonides says that the interval between the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement, in the year of Jubilee, was a time of riotous rejoicing to all servants. If there is any truth in the tradition that he records (which is in itself probable enough) the eight days must have been a sort of Saturnalia.

I give unto you"—both in Lev. xxv. 2, and Lev. xiii. 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 connexion with the Sabbatical Year (Deut. xv. 1, 2). [SABBATICAL YEAR.] 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.

Philo (*De Septenario*, ch. 13, 14, vol. v. v. 37, edit. Tauch.) gives an account of the Jubilee agreeing with that in Leviticus, and says nothing of the remission of debts.¹

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 *κερατῖναι τοῦ Ἰωβήλ*, and *σάλπιγξ τοῦ Ἰωβήλ*). In Lev. xxv. they generally render it by *ἄφεσις*, or *ἀφέσεως σημάσια*; but where the context suits it, by *φώνη σάλπιγγος*. In Ex. xix. 13 they have *αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες*. The Vulgate retains the original word in Lev. xxv., as well as in Josh. vi. (buccinae quarum usus est in Jubilaeo), and by *buccina* 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—*ἐλευθερίαν δὲ σημαίνει τοῦ νόμου*; and by St. Jerome—*Jobel est demittens aut mittens*. 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 *בְּמִשְׁחָה יוֹבֵל*; similar to that in Josh. vi. 5, *בְּמִשְׁחָה בְּקֶרֶן יוֹבֵל*. The question seems to be, can *יֹבֵל* here mean the peculiar sound, or the instrument for producing the sound? Ewald favours the latter notion, and so does Gesenius (*Theo. sub* *מִשְׁחָה*), following the old versions (with which our own agrees), though under *יֹבֵל* he explains *יֹבֵל* as *clangor*. De Wette inclines the same way, rendering the words in Ex. xix. 13—*beim Blazen des Jubelhorns*. Luther translates the same words—*wenn es wird aber lange tönen* (though he is not consistent with himself in rendering Josh. vi. 5)—Bähr renders them, *cum trahetur 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."²

As regards the derivation of the word, it is now very generally ascribed to the root *יָבַל*, *undavit, copiose et cum quodam impetu fluxit*. Hence Kranold explains *יֹבֵל*, *id quod magno strepitu fluit*; and he adds, "duplex igitur in ea radice vis distinguitur, fluendi et sonandi altera in *מְבוּבֵל* (diluvium), Gen. vi. 17, altera in *יֹבֵל* (artis musicae inventor), Gen. iv. 21, conspicua." The meaning of *Jubilee* would thus seem to be, *a rushing, penetrating sound*.³ 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 xxvii., than that which was taken by Luther, who has rendered it by *Halljahr*.

2. *Was the Jubilee every 49th or 50th year?*—If the plain words of Lev. xxv. 10 are 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

¹ The Mishna contains nothing on the Jubilee but unimportant scattered notices, though it has a considerable treatise on the Sabbatical year (Shebith).

² The grounds on which the opposite view rests are stated elsewhere. [See CORNER.]

³ Carpozov (App. p. 449) appears to have been the first who put forth this view of the origin and meaning of the word. The figure of the pouring along 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, *יֹבֵל*, *jubilare*, which he ascribes to onomatopoeia, like the Latin *jubilaris*, and the Greek *ἀλοῦξεν*.

The fanciful notion that *יֹבֵל* signifies a ram has some merit, from its being held by the Jews so generally and by the Chaldee Paraphrast; and from its having influenced our translators in Josh. vi. to call the horns on which the Jubilee was sounded, *trumpets*

of rams' horns. 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. Bechval in Ex. xix. ap. Kranold) that after the ram was burnt, God miraculously restored the body. His muscles were deposited in the golden altar; from his viscera were made the strings of David's harp; his skin became the mantle of Elijah; his left horn was the trumpet of Sinai; and his right horn was to sound when Messiah comes (Is. xxvii. 13). R. Akiba, to connect this with the Jubilee, affirms that *יֹבֵל*

is the Arabic for a ram, though the best Arabic scholars say there is no such word in the language.

The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (*Misc. Sac.* p. 1026, sq.; *Critici Sacri*, vol. ix.), in Carpozov (p. 448, sq.), and, most completely given, in Kranold (p. 11, sq.).

overthrow a clear unequivocal statement, involving no inconsistency, or physical impossibility.^m

Hug has suggested that the Sabbatical year might have begun in Nisan and the Jubilee Year in Tisri (Winer, *sub voce*). In this way the labours of the husbandmen would only have been intermitted for a year and a half. But it is surely 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 year of Jubilee both began in Tisri, as is stated in the Mishna (*Rosh Hashana*, 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 caseⁿ (cf. Lev. xxiii. 15-16, xxv. 8-10).

3. *Were debts 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^o was a point of distinction between the Sabbatical year and the Jubilee. The Mishna is to the same effect (*Shebiith*, cap. x. p. 194, edit. Suren.). It seems that Josephus must either have wholly made a mistake, or that he has drawn too wide 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, p. 316, and SABBATICAL YEAR.

V. Maimonides, and the Jewish writers in general, 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

^m The only distinguished Jewish teacher who advocated the claims of the 49th year was R. Jehuda. He was followed by the Gaonim, certain doctors who took up the exposition of the Talmud after the work was completed, from the seventh to the eleventh century (Winer, *sub voce*). The principal Christian writers on the same side are, Scaliger, Petavius, Uesher, Cunaeus, and Schroeder.

ⁿ Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p. 419), and others, have referred the words of Is. xxxvii. 30 to the jubilee year succeeding the sabbath year. 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 desolation occasioned by the war for two years.

The language of Josephus and of Philo, and of every eminent Jewish and Christian writer, except those that have been mentioned, are in favour of the fiftieth year. Ideler has taken up the matter very satisfactorily (*Handb. der Chron.* i. p. 505).

^o Whether this was an absolute remission of debts,

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. lxi. 1, 2; Ez. vii. 12, 13; Ez. xlvi. 16, 17, 18. Regarding Is. xxxvii. 30, see note^k, § IV. Some have doubted whether the law of Jubilee ever came into actual operation (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, art. lxxvi., and Winer, *sub voce*), others have confidently denied it (Kranold, p. 80; Hupfeld, pt. 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. 23, xxiii. 12, xlvi. 44 denotes the punishment of those who, in the Jubilee, withheld by tyranny or fraud the possessions or the liberty of the poor.^p From Jer. xxxii. 6-12 he infers that the law was restored to operation in the reign of Josiah^q (*Alterthümer*, 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. [FEASTS.] The rest and restoration of each 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 institutions, 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 sabbatical month; nor even by anything like the reading of the law in the sabbatical year. But in the Hebrew state, polity and religion were never separated, nor was their essential connexion ever dropped out of sight. Hence the year was hallowed, 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 general fast, 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.

or merely a *justitium* for the year, will be considered under SABBATICAL YEAR.

^p The words of Issiah (v. 7-10) may, it would seem with more distinctness, be understood to the same effect, as denouncing woe against those who had unrighteously hindered the Jubilee from effecting its object.

^q Is there not a difficulty in considering this passage to have any bearing on the Jubilee, from its relating, apparently, to a priest's field? (See § II. 2 (e).) 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, 4, appears to go further in illustrating the Jubilee principle.—Naomi is about to sell a field of Elimelech's property. Boaz proposes 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.

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 sold for ever: for the land is mine; for 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 as 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 upon it in its more special character, as a part of the divine law appointed for the chosen people, its practical bearing was to vindicate the right of each Israelite to his part in the covenant which Jehovah had made with his fathers respecting the land of promise. The loud notes of the Jubilee horns symbolised the voice of the Lord proclaiming the restoration of political order, as (according to Jewish tradition) the blast in the Feast of Trumpets had, ten days before, commemorated the creation of the world and the completion of the material kosmos.

In the incurable uncertainty respecting the fact of the observance of the Jubilee, it is important that we should keep in mind that the record of the law, whether it was obeyed or not, was, and is, a constant witness for the truth of those great social principles on which the theocracy was established.¹ Moreover, from the allusions which are made to it by the prophets, it must have become a standing prophecy in the hearts of the devout Hebrews. They who waited in faith for the salvation of Israel were kept in mind of that spiritual Jubilee which

was to come (Luke iv. 19), in which every one of the spiritual seed of Abraham was to have, in the sight of God, an equality which no accident could ever disturb; and a glorious freedom, in that liberty with which He that was to come was to make him free, and which no force or fraud could ever take from him.

[There are several monographs on the Jubilee, or which Kranold has given a catalogue. There is a treatise by Maimonides, *de Anno Sabbatico et Jubilaeo*. Of more recent works, the most important are that of J. T. Kranold himself, *Commentatio de anno Hebraeorum Jubilaeo*, Göttingen, 1837, 4to, and that of Carpov, first published in 1730, but afterwards incorporated in the *Apparatus Historico Criticus*, p. 447, sq.; Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p. 415, sq.) and Bähr (*Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 572, sq.), but especially the latter, have treated the subject in a very instructive manner. Hupfeld (*Commentatio de Hebraeorum Festis*, pt. iii. 1852) has lately dealt with it in a wilful and reckless style of criticism. Of other writers, those who appear to have done most to illustrate the Jubilee are Cunaeus (*de Rep. Hebr.* c. ii. §iv., in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. ix. p. 378, sq.), and Michaelis (*Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, vol. i. p. 376, sq., English translation. Vitringa notices the prophetic bearing of the Jubilee in lib. iv. c. 4, of the *Observationes Sacrae*. Lightfoot (*Harm. Evang. in Luc.* iv. 19) pursues the subject in a fanciful manner, and makes out that Christ suffered in a Jubilee year. For this he is well rebuked by Carpov (*App. Hist. Crit.* p. 468). Schubert (*Symbolik des Traums*) has followed in nearly the same track, and has been answered by Bähr.] [S.C.]

JUCAL (יִכָּל: 'Ιωδαλ: *Juchal*), son of Shelemiah (Jer. xxxviii. 1). Elsewhere called JEHUCAL.

JUDA ('Ιουδας, i. e. Judas; 'Ιουδα being only the genitive case).

1. Son of Joseph in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii. 30), in the ninth generation from David, about the time of king Joash.

2. Son of Joanna, or Hananiah [HANANIAH, 8] (Luke iii. 26). He seems to be certainly the same person as Abiud in Matt. i. 13. His name, יהודה, is identical with that of יהודה, only that נח is prefixed; and when Rhesa is discarded from Luke's line, and allowance is made for St. Matthew's omis-

* The foundation of the law of Jubilee, appears to be so essentially connected with the children of Israel, that it seems strange that Michaelis should have confidently affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he acknowledges that he can produce no specific evidence on the subject (*Mos. Law*, art. 73). The only well-proved instance of anything like it in other nations appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by Strabo, lib. vii. (p. 315, edit. Casaub.). He says that they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald, following the statement of Plutarch, refers to the institution of Lycurgus; but Mr. Grote has given another view of the matter (*Hist. of Greece*, vol. ii. p. 530).

* 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 rectified, and that disputed claims might be, as far as possible, authoritatively met.

Its effect in maintaining the distinction of the tribes is illustrated in the appeal made by the tribe of Manasseh in regard to the daughters of Zelophehad (Num. xxxvi. 4). The sense of the passage is, however, obscured in most versions. It is, "And ever when the Jubilee comes, their inheritance will be in another tribe." The rendering the particle נח by *etiamsi* is satisfactorily vindicated by Kranold, p. 33.

As regards the reason of the exception of houses in towns from the law of Jubilee, Bähr has observed that, as they were chiefly inhabited by artificers and tradesmen, 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 tradesmen were foreign proselytes, who could not hold property in the land which was subject to the law of Jubilee.

¹ This view is powerfully set forth by Bähr.

sion of generations in his genealogy, their times will agree perfectly. Both may be the same as Hodaiah of 1 Chr. iii. 24. See Hervey's *Genealogies*, p. 118, sqq.

3. One of the Lord's brethren, enumerated in Mark vi. 3. [JOSIAS; JOSEPH.] On the question of his identity with Jude the brother of James, one of the twelve Apostles (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13), and with the author of the general Epistle, see p. 1163, seq. In Matt. xiii. 55 his name is given in the A. V. as JUDAS.

4. The patriarch JUDAH (Sus. 56; Luke iii. 33; Heb. vii. 14; Rev. v. 5, vii. 5). [A. C. H.]

JUDAE'Ä or JUDE'Ä (Ἰουδαία), a territorial division which succeeded to the overthrow of the ancient landmarks of the tribes of Israel and Judah in their respective captivities. 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 (Hebr. 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. 9; Dan. vi. 1). In the Apocryphal Books the word "province" is dropped, and throughout the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees, the expressions are the "land of Judaea," "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 (Ezr. 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 x. 5; Neh. vii. 73), and others whose pedigree 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.* vi. 17, see also viii. 35). There had indeed been more or less of an amalgamation from the days of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxx-xxxii.), 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. 36; comp. Acts xxvi. 7; and Prideaux, *Connection*, vol. i. p. 128-30, ed. M'Caul.) On the other hand the schismatical temple upon Mount Gerizim drew many of the disaffected Jews from their own proper country (Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8); Nazareth, a city of Galilee, was the residence of our Lord's own parents; Bethesda, 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 "the 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 was 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. 4, §11; comp. Josh. xix. 34), if the usual rendering of these passages is to be followed (see Reland, *Palest.* i. 6), "He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry (καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας) beginning from Galilee, unto this place," said the chief priests of our Lord (St. Luke xxiii. 5). With Ptolemy, moreover (see Reland, *ibid.*), and with Dion Cassius (xxxviii. 16), Judaea is synonymous with Palestine-Syria; the latter adding that the term Palestine had given place to it. With Strabo (xvi. p. 760 seq.) it is the common denomination for the whole inland country between Gaza and Anti-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 affixed to it, 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 Anuath, its southern another village named Jardas. Its general breadth was from the Jordan to Joppa, though its coast did not end there, and it was latterly subdivided into eleven lots or portions, with Jerusalem for their centre (Joseph. *ibid.*). In a word it embodied "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, *Heb. Repub.* 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.* xvii. 13, §5; xviii. 1, §1; 2, §1; 3, §1). Its history as a Roman province is related under JERUSALEM (p. 1008, seq.), and the physical features of the country are described in the article PALESTINE. [E. S. FF.]

JU'DAH (יהודה), *i. e.* Yehûda: Ἰούδας in Gen. xxix. 35; Alex. Ἰούδα; elsewhere Ἰούδας in both MSS. and in N. T.; and so also Josephus: *Juda*, the fourth son of Jacob and the fourth of Leah, the last before the temporary cessation in the births of her children. His whole-brothers were Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, elder than himself—Issachar and Zebulun younger (see 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 (יהודה, *ôdeh*) Jehovah,' and she called his name Yehudah" (Gen. xxix. 35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob—"Judah.

Thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (xlix. 8). The name is not of frequent occurrence in the O. T. In the Apocrypha, however, it appears in the great hero Judas Maccabaeus; in the N. T. in Jude, Judas Iscariot, and others. [JUDA; JUDAS.]

Of the individual Judah more traits are preserved 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 favourable 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" (1 Chr. v. 2), and we find him subsequently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the detention of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (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 band. In that thoroughly Oriental scene it is Judah who unhesitatingly acknowledges the guilt which had never been committed, throws himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, offers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of their disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (xlv. 14, 16-34). So too it is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (xlvi. 28). This ascendancy over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed to him by his father—Thou whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father's sons shall bow down before thee! unto him shall be the gathering of the people (Gen. xlix. 8-10).^a In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier than the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to bear to Jacob the fragrant robe of Joseph (Weil's *Biblical Legends*, 88-90).

His sons were five. Of these three were by his Canaanite wife Bath-shua; they are all insignificant, two died early, and the third, SHELAIH, does not come prominently forward, either in his person, or his family. The other two, PHAREZ and ZERAH—twins—were illegitimate sons by the widow of Er, the eldest of the former family. As is not unfrequently the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the elder, were descended the royal, and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which, centuries after, was repossessed by his descendants—amongst villages which retain their names unaltered in the catalogues of the time of the conquest. The three sons went with their father into Egypt at the time of the final removal thither (Gen. xlv. 12; Ex. i. 2).

When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. The numbers of the tribe at the census 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 76,500 (xvii. 22), Dan being still the nearest. The chief of the tribe at the former census was NAHSHON, the son of Amminadab (Num. i. 7, ii. 3, vii. 12, x. 14), an ancestor of David (Ruth iv. 20). Its representative amongst the spies, and also among those appointed to partition the land, was the great Caleb the son of Jephunneh (Num. xiii. 6; xxxiv. 19). During the march through the desert Judah's place was in the van of the host, on the east side of the Tabernacle, with his kinsmen Issachar and Zebulun (ii. 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 incidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are—(1) the misbehaviour 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 nephew and son-in-law Othniel (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 conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors of each locality. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land whereon his feet had trodden" (Josh. xiv. 9; comp. Num. xiv. 24), 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. 20-63. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchy resided with Judah, and when more care would naturally be bestowed on them than on those of any other tribe; or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in 1 Chr. ii. iii. iv. no doubt arises from the former reason. However this may be, we have in the records of Joshua 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 embouchure of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at, or about the present road from Jericho, ran westward to En-shemesh—probably the present *Ain-Haud*, below Bethany—thence over the Mount of Olives to *Enrogel*, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, under the precipices of the city, climbed the hill in a N. W. direction to the water of Nephtoah (probably *Lifta*), and thence by Kirjath-Jearim (probably *Kuriet el-Enab*), Bethshemesh (*Ain-Sheems*), Timnath, and Ekron to Jabneel on the sea-coast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the *Wady el-Arish*; but between these two points it passed through Maaleh Acrabim, the Wilderness of Zin, Hezron, Adar, Karkaa, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin the extreme south

^a The obscure and much disputed passage in verse 10 will be best examined under the head SULLOU.

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 regions. (1.) THE SOUTH—the undulating pasture country, which intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (Josh. xv. 21; Stanley, *S. & P.*). It is this which is designated as the wilderness (*midbar*) of Judah (Judg. i. 16). It contained thirty-seven cities, with their dependent villages (Josh. xv. 20-32), of which eighteen of those farthest south were ceded to Simeon (xix. 1-9). Amongst these southern cities the most familiar name is Beersheba.

(2.) THE LOWLAND (xv. 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 Sea; the lower portion of that maritime plain, which extends through the whole of the sea board of Palestine, from Sidon in the north, to Rhinocolura at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (Neh. xiii. 23, 24). There, planted at equal intervals along the level coast, were their five chief cities, each with its circle of smaller dependents, overlooking, from the natural undulations of the ground, the "standing corn," "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excited the ingenuity of Samson, and are still 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. & P.* 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immediate shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of corn-fields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the constant contests between Israel and the Philistines (*S. & P.* 258). From them were gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat, which were transmitted to Phœnicia by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of the Herods still "nourished" the country of Tyre and Sidon (Acts xii. 20). There were the olive trees, the sycamore trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (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 = cucumbers; GEDERAH, GEDEROTH, GEDEROTHAIM, sheepfolds; ZOREAH, wasps; EX-GANNIM, spring of gardens, &c. &c. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew; and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of earlier originals, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations. The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to

^b 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 (*Pal.* 405-410) to show that the villages of Jair are intended. But the difficulty—*maximus atque insolubilis nodus*,

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 we should not find cities enumerated as in the lowland plain, whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains. [JARMUTH; JIPHTAH, &c.] (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tobler's *3tte Wanderung*, 1859.)

(3.) The third region of the tribe—THE MOUNTAIN, 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 undulations, yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hilly district of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Esdraelon, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonous enough. Round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat bolder proportions than those immediately north of Jerusalem, which, though in early times probably covered with forests [HARETH], have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf-oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even in the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flowers. The number of towns enumerated (Josh. xv. 48-60) 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 enclosures of stone walls protecting the vineyards. Streams there are none, but wells and springs are frequent—in the neighbourhood of "Solomon's Pools" at *Urtas* most abundant.

(4.) The fourth district is THE WILDERNESS (*Midbar*), which here and here only appears to be synonymous with *Arabah*, and to signify the sunken district immediately adjoining the Dead Sea. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Engedi, 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*.^b

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (Josh. xxi. 9-19). The Levites had no^c cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

In the partition of the territory by Joshua and

qui plurimos interpretes torsit—has defied every attempt; and the suggestion of Ewald (*Gesch.* ii. 380, note) is the most feasible—that the passage is corrupt, and that Cisneroth or some other word originally occupied the place of "at Judah."

^c But Bethlehem appears to have been closely connected with them (Judg. xvii. 7, 9; xix. 1).

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 (x. 28-35), and had even penetrated thence into the mountains as far as Hebron and Debir (36-39); 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 surpassed by the Canaanites, and in some places,^d where the ground admitted of their iron chariots being employed, the latter remained masters of the field. But wherever force and vigour 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. 18, 19). The latter was constantly changing hands as one or the other side got stronger (1 Sam. iv., v., vii. 14, &c.); 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 the Bethlehem of which IBZAN was a native (xii. 8, 9) may have been Bethlehem-Judah. But even if these two judges belonged to Judah, the tribe itself was not molested, and with the one exception mentioned in Judg. xx. 19, when they were called by the divine oracle to make the attack on Gibeah, they had nothing to do during the whole of that period but settle themselves in their home. 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 *Wady es-Sunt*, 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, MAON, HACHILAH, &c.

The main inference deducible from these considerations is the determined manner in which the tribe keeps aloof from the rest—neither offering its aid nor asking that of others. The same independent mode of action characterises 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 Ephraim 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. 41-43).

The same independent temper will be found to characterise 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 Temple after the return from captivity (Ezr. iii. 9). Lord Hervey has shown cause for believing (*Genealogies, &c.*, 119) that the name is the same as HODAVIAH and HODEVAH. In 1 Esd. v. 58, it appears to be given as JODA.

3. (Ἰούδας, Ἰουδαί.) A Levite who was obliged by Ezra to put away his foreign wife (Ezr. x. 23). Probably the same person is intended in Neh. xii. 8, 36. In 1 Esd. his name is given as JUDAS.

4. A Benjamite, son of Senuah (Neh. xi. 9). It is worth notice, in connexion 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 Benjamite, Hodaviah, son of Has-senuah, is given (ver. 7). [G.]

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 conceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situate within the borders of Benjamin (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 Israel (2 Sam. ii. 9) was cancelled; though at least two Benjamite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (1 Sam. xxvii. 6; 1 K. ix. 3; cf. Josh. xix. 1) and of Dan (2 Chr. xi. 10; cf. Josh. xix. 41, 42) was recognised 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 (2 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 neighbour. The southern border of Judah, resting on the uninhabited Desert, was not agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to

^d The word here (Judg. i. 19) is *Emek*, entirely a different word from *Shefelah*, and rightly rendered "valley." It is difficult, however, to fix upon any

"valley" in this region sufficiently important to be alluded to. Can it be the valley of ELAH, where contests with the Philistines took place later?

Tyre. And though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggressive as a neighbour 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. xxiv. 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. xiii. 3); Asa (2 Chr. xiv. 8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors: Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii. 14-19), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,160,000, exactly double the army of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four inglorious reigns the energetic Amaziah could muster only 300,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (2 Chr. xxvi. 11) force of 307,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question which has been raised as to the accuracy of these numbers. 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 store to invite so frequently the hand of the spoiler. Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon, had each in succession a share of the pillage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (1 K. xiv. 26), again by Asa (1 K. xv. 18), by Jehoash of Judah (2 K. xii. 18), by Jehoash of Israel (2 K. xiv. 14), by Ahaz (2 K. xvi. 8), by Hezekiah (2 K. xviii. 15), and by Nebuchadnezzar (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 hardier and more united, a fixed and venerated centre of administration and religion, an hereditary aristocracy in the sacerdotal caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and spiritual as well as the material prosperity of their people; still more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, was yet a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal; and lastly the popular reverence for 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 135 years; and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.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 works cited in that 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, deference, perhaps vassalage to the Assyrian king.

(a.) The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of re-establishing their authority over the Ten Tribes; for sixty years there was war between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the disbanding of Rehoboam's forces by the authority of Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the fraternal hostility. The victory achieved by the daring Abijah brought to Judah a temporary accession of territory. Asa appears to have enlarged it still farther; and to have given so powerful a 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; he repelled an alarming irruption of an Ethiopian horde; he hired the armed intervention of Benhadad I., king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of the true God by severe penal laws.

(b.) Hanani's remonstrance (2 Chr. xvi. 7) prepares us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Damascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange rapidity between Judah and Israel. For eighty years, till the time of Amaziah, there was no open war between them, and Damascus appears as their chief and common enemy; though it rose afterwards from its overthrow to become under Rezin the ally of Pekah against Ahaz. Jehoshaphat, active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from the desert, curbed the aggressive spirit of his nearer neighbours, and made his influence felt even among the Philistines and Arabians. A still more lasting benefit was conferred on his kingdom by his persevering efforts for the religious instruction of the people, and the regular administration of justice. The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu. Athaliah, the granddaughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood-stained throne of David, till the followers of the ancient religion put her to death, and crowned Jehoash the surviving scion of the royal house. His preserver, the high-priest, acquired prominent personal influence for a time; but the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand the power of Syria, was murdered by his own officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the recovery of Edom, provoked a war with his more powerful contemporary Jehoash the conqueror of the Syrians; and Jerusalem was entered and plundered by the Israelites. But their energies were sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the subjugation of Damascus. Under Uzziah and Jotham, Judah long enjoyed political and religious prosperity till the wanton Ahaz, surrounded by united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of Tiglath-Pileser.

(c.) Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah was yet spared for a chequered existence of almost another century and a half after the termination of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the republic

of Sennacherib, 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 four feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by their treachery and imbecility, their Assyrian master drained in successive deportations all the strength of the kingdom. The consummation of the ruin came upon them in the destruction of the Temple by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailings of prophets, and the taunts of heathen tribes released at length from the yoke of David.

7. The national life of the Hebrews seemed now extinct; but there was still, as there had been all along, a spiritual life hidden within the body.

It was a time of hopeless darkness to all but those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence as interpreted by prophecy. The time of the division of the kingdoms was the golden age of prophecy. In each kingdom the prophetic office was subject to peculiar modifications which were required in Judah by the circumstances of the priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the House of Baal and the Altar in Bethel. If, under the shadow of the Temple, there was a depth and a grasp elsewhere unequalled, in the views of Isaiah and the prophets of Judah, if their writings touched and elevated the hearts of thinking men in studious retirement in the silent night-watches; there was also, in the few burning words and energetic deeds of the prophets of Israel, a power to tame a lawless multitude and to check the high-handed tyranny and idolatry of kings. The organization and moral influence of the priesthood were matured in the time of David; from about that time to the building of the second Temple the influence of the prophets rose and became predominant. Some historians have suspected that after the reign of Athaliah, the priesthood gradually acquired and retained excessive and unconstitutional power in Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such power would have been manifest in the exorbitant wealth and luxury of the priests, and in the constant and cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of Asa, against irreligion. But the peculiar offences of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God's word, neglect of the instruction of the laity, untruthfulness, and partial judgments, are the offences specially imputed to them, just such as might be looked for where the priesthood is an hereditary caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor powerful. When the priest either, as was the case in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, ceased to be really a teacher, ceased from spiritual communion with God, ceased from living sympathy with man, and became the mere image of an intercessor, a mechanical performer of ceremonial duties little understood or heeded by himself, then the prophet was raised up to supply some of his deficiencies, and to exercise his functions so far as was necessary. Whilst the priests sink into obscurity and almost disappear, except from the genealogical tables, the prophets come forward appealing everywhere to the conscience of individuals, in Israel as wonder-workers, calling together God's chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in Judah as teachers and seers,

supporting and purifying all that remained of ancient piety, explaining each mysterious dispensation of God as it was unfolded, and promulgating his gracious spiritual promises in all their extent. The part which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in preparing the Jews for their captivity, cannot indeed be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeeding efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influence which they exercised on the national mind was too important to be overlooked in a sketch however brief of the history of the kingdom of Judah. [W. T. B.]

JU'DAS (Ἰούδας), the Greek form of the Hebrew name JUDAH, occurring in the LXX. and N. T. [JUDAH.]

1. 1 Esd. ix. 23. [JUDAH, 3.]
 2. The third son of Mattathias, "called Maccabaeus" (1 Macc. ii. 4). [MACCABEES.]
 3. The son of Calphi (Alphaeus), 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 Essene, conspicuous for his prophetic gifts (Jos. Ant. xiii. 11, 2; B. J. i. 3, 5); and with Judas Maccabaeus (Grimm *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 Ptolemaeus the usurper, either at the same time (c. 135 B.C.), with his father (1 Macc. xvi. 15 ff.), or shortly afterwards (Jos. Ant. xiii. 8, 1; cf. Grimm, *ad Macc. l. 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 Bazaars," a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city which, as in all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so-called "House of Judas" is still shown in an open space called "the Sheyk's Place," a few steps out of the "Street of Bazaars;" it contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to Maundrell (*Early Trav.* Bohn, 494) as the "tomb of Ananias." The house is an object of religious respect to Mussulmans as well as Christians (Stanley, *S. & P.* 412; Conyb. and Hows. i. 102; Maundrell, *l. c.*; Pococke, ii. 119). [E. V.]

JU'DAS, SURNAMED BAR'SABAS

(Ἰούδας ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Βαρσαβᾶς: *Judas qui cognominabatur Barsabas*), a leading member of the Apostolic church at Jerusalem (ἀνθρ ἡγούμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Acts xv. 22, and "perhaps a member of the Presbytery" (Neander, *Pl. & Tr.* i. 123), endued 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 accredit their commission 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 xv. 34 is uncertain; and while some MSS., followed by the Vulgate, ἀλλ' ἔμεινεν

Ἰούδας δὲ ἐπορεύθη, the best omit the verse altogether) or speedily returned thither. Nothing further is recorded of Judas.

The form of the name Barsabas = Son of Sabas, has led to several conjectures: Wolf and Grotius probably enough suppose him to have been a brother of Joseph Barsabas (Acts i. 23); while Schott (*Isagog.* §103, p. 431) 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 "Epistle of Jude." Augusti, on the other hand (*Die Katholisch. Briefe, Lemzo*, 1801-8, ii. 86), advances the opinion, though with considerable hesitation, that he may be identical with the Apostle Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. [E. V.]

JUDAS OF GALILEE (Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος: *Judas Galilaeus*), 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. U. C. 759), referred to by Gamaliel in his speech before the Sanhedrim (Acts v. 37). According to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 1, §1), Judas was a Gaulonite of the city of Gamala, probably taking his name of Galilean from his insurrection having had its rise in Galilee. His revolt had a theocratic character, the watchword of which was "We have no Lord nor master but God," and he boldly denounced the payment of tribute to Caesar, and all acknowledgment of any foreign 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 drew vast numbers to his standard, by many of whom he was regarded as the Messiah (*Orig. Homil. in Luc.* xxv.), 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, Sadducees, 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 Gaulonites, as his followers were called, may be regarded as the doctrinal ancestors of the Zealots 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 armoury of Herod in the fortress of Massada, 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 and put to death Aug. 15, A. D. 66 (*Milman, Hist. of Jews,*

ii. 152, 231; *Joseph. l. c.*; *Orig. in Matt. T. xvii* §25).

[E. V.]

JUDAS ISCARIOT (Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης: *Judas Iscariotes*). 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, *et al.*). 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 Kerioth (*Josh.* xv. 25), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. קְרִיּוֹת אִישׁ, ISH K'RIOTH, passing into Ἰσκαριώτης in the same way as טוֹב אִישׁ—Ish Tob, a man of Tob—appears in Josephus (*Ant.* vii. 6, §1) as Ἰστωβος (*Winer, Rub. s. v.*). In connexion with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in *John* vi. 71, ἀπὸ Καριώτου, and that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscariot belong to Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis his position, among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (*Acts* ii. 7), would be exceptional; and this has led to

(2) From Kartha in Galilee (*Kartan, A. V.*, *Josh.* xxi. 32; *Ewald, Gesch. Israels*, v. p. 321).

(3) As equivalent to Ἰσακαριώτης (*Grotius* *o. i. Matt.* x. 4; *Hermann, Miscell. Groning.* iii. 598, in *Winer, Rub.*).

(4) From the date-trees (καριωτίδες) in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (*Bartolucci, Bibl. Rabbin.* iii. 10, in *Winer, l. c.*; *Gill, Comm. on Matt.* x. 4).

(5) From אֶסְקָרְטָא (= SCORTEA, *Gill, l. c.*)—a leathern apron, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and = Judas with the apron (*Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt.* x. 4).

(6) From אֶסְכָּרְטָא, ascara = strangling (angina), as given after his death, and commemorating it (*Lightfoot, l. c.*), or indicating that he had been subject to a disease tending to suffocation previously (*Heinsius in Suicer. Thes. s. v. Ἰούδας*). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by *Origen, Tract. in Matt.* xxv.

Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the Apostles, we know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sad vision of a poet (*Keble, Lyra Innocentium*, ii. 13) or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (*Thilo, Cod. Apoc. N. T. Evang. Infant. c. 35*) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. 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 baser 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 infancy which afterwards rested on his name, but, poor to that guilt, it would seem that he took his place in the group of four which always

stand last in order, as if possessing neither the love, nor the faith, nor the devotion which marked the sons of Zebedee and Jonah.

The choice was not made, we must remember, without a prevision of its issue. "Jesus knew from the beginning . . . who should betray Him" (John vi. 64); and the distinctness with which that Evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (John xii. 4, xiii. 2, 27), leaves with us the impression that he too shrank instinctively (Bengel describes it as "singularis antipathia," *Gnomon N. 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 foreknowledge, and then content ourselves with saying with Calvin that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (*Sündlosigk. 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 belonged to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (John ii. 25; Matt. ix. 4; Mark xii. 15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (Mark iii. 5), or astonishment (Mark vi. 6; Luke vii. 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 overcome the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many parts of our Lord's teaching to remember that they must have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and Mammon (Matt. vi. 19-34), and the destructive power of the "cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches" (Matt. xiii. 22, 23), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "unrighteous 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 "calling and election," frustrating the purpose of his Master, in giving him so high a work, and educating him for it (comp. Chrysost. *Hom. on Matt.* xxvi. xxvii., John vi.).

The germs (see Stier's *Words of Jesus, infra*) of the evil, in all likelihood, unfolded themselves gradually. The rules to which the Twelve were subject in their first journey (Matt. x. 9, 10) sheltered him from the temptation that would have been most dangerous to him. The new form of life, of which we find the first traces in Luke viii. 3, brought that temptation with it. As soon as the Twelve were recognised as a body, travelling hither and thither with their Master, receiving money and other offerings, and redistributing what they received to the poor, it became necessary that some one should act as the steward and almoner of the small society, and this fell to Judas (John xii. 6, xiii. 29), either, as having the gifts that qualified him for it, or, as we may conjecture, from his character, because he sought it, or, as some have imagined, in rotation from time to time. The Galilean or Judean peasant (we have no reason

for thinking that his station differed from that of the other Apostles) found himself entrusted with larger sums of money than before (the three hundred denarii of John xii. 5, are spoken of as a sum which he might reasonably have expected), and with this there came covetousness, unfaithfulness, embezzlement. It was impossible after this that he could feel at ease with One who asserted so clearly and sharply the laws of faithfulness, duty, unselfishness; and the words of Jesus, "Have I not chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (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 leading him on to a fiendish malignity.

In what way that evil was rebuked, 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 out-pouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utters himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft.

The narrative of Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv. places this history in close connexion (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. It leaves the motives of the betrayer to conjecture (comp. Neander, *Leben Jesu*, §264). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clutch at the bribe offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (Matt. xxvii. 15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get the thirty shekels as his own. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial" of Jesus, and the lukewarmness of the people, and the conspiracies of the priests led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, v. p. 441-446.) There may have been the thought that, after all, the betrayal could do no harm, that his Master would prove his innocence, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 886, in Winer, and Whitby on Matt. xxvii. 4). Another motive has been suggested (comp. Neander, *Leben Jesu*, l. c.; 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 revenge, nor fear, nor disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter, or James, or John; this it was that made him the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position, from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by

* Awful as the words were, however, we must remember that like words were spoken of and to Peter (Matt. xvi. 23).

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.^b It attributes to the Galilaean 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 motives rushing with bewildering fury through the mind of the criminal.

Luring the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the Paschal or quasi-Paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to and fro from Bethany to Jerusalem, and looked on the acted parable of the barren and condemned tree (Mark xi. 20-24), and shared the vigils in Gethsemane (John xviii. 2). 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.^c Then come the sorrowful words which showed him that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me." Others ask, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He too must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (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).^d 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. 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 xxii. 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 Archbp. Whately (*Essays on Dangers, l. c.*) 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 enough, indeed, that he who had gone out with the high-priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (Matt. xxvii. 3). He repented, and his guilt and all that had tempted him to it became hateful.^e 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 (*vads*) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or propitiation.^f 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"^g (Acts i. 25).

We have in Acts i. another account of the circumstances of his death, which it is not easy to harmonise 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 (*ἐκτίσαστο*) a field with it.

(2) That, instead of hanging himself, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out."

(3) That for this reason, and not because the priests had bought it with the price of blood, the field was called *Aceldama*.

^b Comp. the remarks on this hypothesis, in which Whately followed (unconsciously perhaps) in the footsteps of Paulus, in *Ersch u. Gruber's Allgem. Encycl.* art. "Judas."

^c 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. 36.)

^d 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.

^e This passage has often been appealed to, as illustrating the difference between *μεταμελεια* and *αετανοια*. It is questionable, however, how far the N. T. writers recognise that distinction (comp. Grotius in *loc.*). Still more questionable is the notion above-referred to, that St. Matthew describes his disappoint-

ment as a result so different from that which he had reckoned on.

^f It is characteristic of the wide, far-reaching sympathy of Origen, that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there (*γυμνητῇ τῇ ψυχῇ*) meet his Lord, and confess his guilt and ask for pardon (*Tract. in Matt.* xxxv. : comp. also Theophanes, *Hom.* xxvii., in Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. 'Ιουδας).

^g The words *ἰδὸς τόπος* 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. xxxi. 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.

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 ooth 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 ἀπῆγατο, in Matt. xxvii. 5, includes death by some sudden spasm of suffocation (*angina pectoris*?), such as might be caused by the overpowering misery of his remorse, and that then came the fall described in the Acts (Suicer, *Theo. s. v. ἀπάγω*; Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot, and others). By some this has even been connected with the name Iscariot, as implying a constitutional tendency to this disease (Gill).

(b) That the work of suicide was but half-accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (from a fig-tree, in one tradition) across the road, and was mangled and crushed by the carts and waggons that passed over him. This explanation appears, with strange and horrible exaggerations, in the narrative of Papias, quoted by Oecumenius on Acts i., and in Theophylact. on Matt. xxvii.

As to (3) we have to choose between the alternatives—

(a) That there were two Aceldamas. [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.; if words are used which imply 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, uncontrolled; 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 where God is," or determined by an inexorable 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 Cainites, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honoured him as the only Apostle that was

in possession of the true GNOSIS, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a Gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander, *Church History*, ii. 153, Eng. transl.; Iren. *adv. Hæc.* i. 35; Tertull. *de Præsc.* c. 47). For the general literature connected with this subject, especially for monographs on the motive of Judas and the manner of his death, see Winer, *Rub.* 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, Eng. transl. [E. H. P.]

JUDE, or JU'DAS, LEBBEUS and THADDEUS (Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου: *Judas Jacobi*: A. V. "Judas the brother of James"), one of the Twelve Apostles; a member, together with his namesake "Iscariot," James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, 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" among the Apostles), but the Apostle has been generally identified with "Lebbeus whose surname was Thaddeus" (Λεββαῖος ἢ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος), 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 Λεββαῖος, or Θαδδαῖος alone; others introducing the name Ἰούδας or Judas Zelotes in St. Matt., where the Vulgate reads *Thaddæus* 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.* i. 13) that the true name of Thomas (the twin) was Judas (Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμᾶς), and that Thaddeus was one of the "Seventy," identified by Jerome in *Matt. x.* with "Judas Jacobi" [THADDEUS]; as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the "Levi" (Λεβὶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) of Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27, who is called "Lebes" (Λεβῆς) by Origen (*Cont. Cels.* l. i. §62), as the same with Lebbeus. The safest way out of these acknowledged difficulties is to hold fast to the ordinarily received opinion that Jude, Lebbeus, and Thaddeus, were three names for the same Apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome (*in Matt. x.*) to have been "trionimus," rather than introduce confusion into the Apostolic catalogues, and render them erroneous either in excess or defect.

The interpretation of the names Lebbeus and Thaddeus is a question beset with almost equal difficulty. The former is interpreted by Jerome "hearty," *corculum*, as from כּוֹר, *cor*, and Thaddeus has been erroneously supposed to have a cognate signification, *homo pectorosus*, as from the Syriac ܛܕܝܐ, *pectus* (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 235, Bengel; *Matt. x. 3*), the true signification of ܛܕܝܐ being *mamma* (Angl. *teat*), Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* 2565. Winer (*Rub. s. v.*) would combine the two and interpret them as meaning *Herzenskind*. Another interpretation of Lebbeus is the young lion (*leunculus*) as from לְבַיִל, *leo* (Schleusner, *s. v.*), while Lightfoot and Baumg. Crus. would

derive it from *Lebba*, a maritime town of Galilee mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v. 19), where, however, the ordinary reading is *Lebba*. Thaddæus appears in Syriac under the form Adai, Thaddæus, and Michaelis admits the idea that Adai, Thaddæus, and Judas, may be different representations of the same word (iv. 370), and Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.* in Matt. x. 3) identifies Thaddæus with Judas, as both from יהודה, "to praise." Chrysostom, *De*

Prod. Jud. l. i. c. 2, says that there was a "Judas Zelotes" among the disciples of our Lord, whom he identifies with the Apostle. In the midst of these uncertainties 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 Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. The generally received opinion is that there is an ellipse of the word ἀδελφός, and that the A. V. is right in translating "Judas the brother of James." This is defended by Winer (*Rueb. s. v.*; *Gramm. of N. T. Dict.*, Clark's edition, i. 203), Arnaud (*Recher. Crit. sur l'Ep. de Jude*), and accepted by Burton, Alford, Tregelles, Michaelis, &c. 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 favour 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 Peshito and Arabic versions, the Benedictine editor of Chrysostom, *Hom. XXXII.*, 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," that is, either "James the son of Alphaeus," 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.

Nothing 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 connexion with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus king of Edessa" (*Euseb. H. E.* i. 13; Jerome, *Comment in Matt. x.*) [THADDAEUS]. Nicephorus (*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 in Phœnicia on his return; while that of the west makes Persia the field of his labours 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. 3) occurs a "Judas," who has been sometimes identi-

fied with the Apostle of the same name; a theory which rests on the double assumption that Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (Luke vi. 16) is to be rendered "Judas the brother of James," and that "the sons of Alphaeus" were "the brethren of our Lord," and is sufficiently refuted by the statement of St. John vii. 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 Joses" (Origen in Matt. xiii. 55; Clem. Alex. *Adumb.* 6; Alford, *Gk. Test.*, Matt. xiii. 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" (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5), were seized 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 themselves by their labour, and having learnt the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, dismissed them in contempt, and ceased from his persecution of the church, whereupon they returned to Palestine and took a leading place in the churches, "as being at the same time confessors and of the Lord's family" (ὡς ἂν δὴ μάρτυρας ἑμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένεος ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου), and lived till the time of Trajan. Nicephorus (i. 23) tells us that Jude's wife was named Mary. [E. V.]

JUDE, EPISTLE OF. I. Its authorship.—

The writer of this Epistle styles himself, ver. 1, "Jude the brother of James" (ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου), and has been usually identified with the Apostle Judas Lebbaeus or Thaddæus, called by St. Luke, vi. 16, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, A. V. "Judas the brother of James." It has been seen above [JUDAS LEBBAEUS] that this mode of supplying the ellipse, though not directly contrary to the *usus loquendi*, is, to say the least, questionable, and that there are strong reasons for rendering 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 Calmet, Calvin, Hammond, Hänlein, 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 *Adumbrationes* be rightly assigned to him) Clemens Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (*Hom.* 43 in *Joan.*), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syriac versions, and is accepted by most modern commentators, Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jessien, Olshausen, Tregelles, &c. 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 "Adumbrationes" (Bunsen, *Analect. Anteo-Nicæen.* i. 330), who says, "Jude, who wrote the Catholic

Epistle brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself His brother; but what said he? 'Jude the servant of Jesus Christ' as his Lord, but 'brother of James.' We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them, and Him who had been "declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (cf. 2 Cor. v. 16), 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 Jessien (*de Authent. Ep. Jud. Lips.* 1821), and Arnaud (*Recher. Critiq. sur l'Ep. de Jude*, Strasb. 1851, translated *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Jul. 1859); 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 Alphaeus, but the Bishop of Jerusalem, of whose dignity and authority in the Church he avails himself to introduce his Epistle to his readers.

II. *Genuineness and canonicity.*—Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called *Antilegomena*, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of Holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the Canon.

This question was gradually decided in its favour, and the more widely it was known the more generally was it 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 sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duae in Catholica" (Bunsen, *Analect. Arte-Nic.* i. 152, reads "Catholicis") "habentur."

Clement of Alexandria is the first father of the Church by whom it is recognised (*Paedag.* i. iii. c. 8, p. 259, Ed. Sylburg.; *Stromat.* i. iii. c. 2, p. 431, *Adumbr. 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, *Analect. Ante-Nic.* i. 330-333) gives some notes on this Epistle drawn from the same source.

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.* xiii.; *in Josu.* vii.; *in Ezech.* iv.; *Comment. in Matt.* t. xiii. 27, xv. 27, xvii. 30; *in Joann.* t. xiii. §27; *in Rom.* l. ii. §6, v. §1; *De*

Princip. l. iii. c. 2, §1), though he implies in one place the existence of doubts 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 recognised by the majority of Christians; and asserts (ii. 23) that in common with the Epistle of James, it was "deemed spurious" (*vobēberai*), 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. Mulieb.* i. 3), as does Jerome, "from whom (Enoch) the Apostle Jude in his Epistle has given a quotation" (*in Tit.* c. i. 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. Scriptor. Eccles.*). He refers to it as the work of an Apostle (*Epist. ad Paulin.* iii.).

The Epistle is also quoted by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrys. *Opp.* t. xiii., *Dial.* cc. 18, 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A.D. 363), Carthaginian (397), and so-called Apostolic Catalogues, as well as in those emanating from the churches of the East and West, with the exception of the Synopsis of Chrysostom, and those of Cassiodorus and Ebed Jesu.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in receiving this Epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author, and his standing in the Church; the unimportant nature of its contents, and their almost absolute identity with 2 Pet. ii.; and the supposed quotation of apocryphal books; would all tend to create a prejudice against it, which could be only overcome by time, and the gradual recognition by the leading churches of its genuineness and canonicity.

At the Reformation the doubts on the canonical authority of this Epistle were revived, and have been shared in by modern commentators. They were more or less entertained by Grotius, Luther, Calvin, Bergen, Bolten, Dahl, Michaelis, and the Magdeburg Centuriators. It has been ably defended by Jessien, *de Authentia Ep. Judae*, Lips. 1821.

III. *Time and place of writing.*—Here all is conjecture. The author being not absolutely certain, 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 posterior 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" (*ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ*, ver. 18; cf. 1 John ii. 18, *ἐσχάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐσθλῇ*), forbids our placing it in the Apostolic age at all. Lardner places it between A.D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A.D. 70, Credner A.D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and Neander, after the death of all the Apostles but John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem; although considerable weight is to be given to the argument of De Wette (*Einleit. in N. T.* p. 300).

that if the destruction of Jerusalem had already taken place, some warning would have been drawn from so signal an instance of God's vengeance on the "ungodly."

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 "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the Epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," "an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known" (*Eccles. Hist.* 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 body of the Epistle to limit its reference; and though it is not improbable that the author had a particular portion of the church in view, and that the Christians of Palestine were the immediate objects of his warning, the dangers described were such as the whole Christian world was exposed to, and the adversaries the same which had everywhere to be guarded against.

V. *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 exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith that 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 depiction of 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—whom in a torrent of impassioned invective he describes as stained with unnatural 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 Sodom and Gomorrah—are despisers of all legitimate 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 (ver. 14, 15).

The Epistle closes by briefly reminding the readers of the oft-repeated prediction of the Apostles—among whom the writer seems not to rank himself—that the faith would be assailed by such enemies as he has depicted (ver. 17-19), exhorting them to maintain their own steadfastness in the faith (ver. 20, 21), while they earnestly sought to rescue others from the corrupt example of those licentious livers (ver. 22, 23), and commending them to the power of God in language which forcibly recalls the closing benediction of the Epistle to the Romans (ver. 24, 25; cf. Rom. xvi. 25-27).

This Epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from St. Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times—the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (ver. 9, 14, 15).

The former of these passages, containing the reference to the contest of the archangel Michael and the devil "about the body of Moses," was

supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the "Assumption of Moses" (*Ἀνάληψις Μωσέως*), quoted also by Oecumenius (ii. 629). Origen's words are express, "which little work the Apostle Jude has made mention of in his Epistle" (*de Princip.* iii. 2, i. p. 138); and some have sought to identify the book with the פְּטִירַת מֹשֶׁה, "The death of Moses,"

which is, however, proved by Michaelis (iv. 382) to be a modern composition. Attempts have also been made by Lardner, Macknight, Vitringa, and others, to interpret the passage in a mystical sense, by reference to 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 is here making use of a Jewish tradition, based on Deut. xxxiv. 6, just as facts unrecorded in Scripture 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. 24); by St. James (v. 17), and St. Stephen (Acts vii. 22, 23, 30).

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 consequence inclined to receive the Book of Enoch as canonical Scripture), and has been held by many modern critics—or is employing a traditionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which the words used, "Enoch prophesied saying" ἐπροφήτευσεν . . . Ἐνάχ λέγων, seem rather to favour), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named [ENOCH, THE BOOK OF]. This is maintained by Tregelles (*Horn's Introd.* 10th ed., iv. 621), and has been held by Cave, Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 420), Lightfoot (ii. 117), Witsius, and Calvin (cf. *Jerom. Comment.* in *Eph.* c. v. p. 647, 8; in *Tit.* c. 1, p. 708).

The main body of the Epistle is well characterised by Alford (*Gk. Test.* iv. 147) as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer is hurried along, collecting example after example of Divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and as it were labouring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The Epistle is said by De Wette (*Einleit.* in *N. T.* p. 300) to be tolerably good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmid (*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*

Épître de Jude. Strasb. and Par. 1851; Laurmann, *Not. Crit. et Commentar. in Ep. Jud.*, Groningae, 1818; Scharling, *Jacob. et Jud. Ep. Cathol. comment.*, Havniae, 1841; Stier, *On the Epistles of James and Jude*; Herder, *Briefve zweener Brüder Jesu*, Lemgo, 1775; Augusti, Welcker, Benson, and Macknight, on the Catholic Epistles. [E. V.]

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 magnate is represented as going forth "to the gate" amidst the respectful silence of elders, princes, and nobles (comp. xxxii. 9). The actual chiefs of individual tribes are mentioned on various occasions, one as late as the time of David, as preserving importance in the commonwealth (Num. vii. 2, 10, 11, xvii. 6, or 17 in Heb. text; xxiv. 18; Josh. xxii. 14; so perh. Num. xvi. 2, xxi. 18). Whether the princes of the tribes mentioned in 1 Chr. xxvii. 16, xxviii. 1, are patriarchal heads, or merely chief men appointed by the king to govern, is not strictly certain; but it would be foreign to all ancient Eastern analogy to suppose that they forfeited the judicial prerogative, 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 nascent people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead; and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of theft, violence, and other matters of police. Yet the question put to Moses shows that "a prince" and "a judge" were connected even then in the popular idea (Ex. ii. 14; comp. Num. xvi. 13). 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 these 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 offences of public magnitude, criminal cases do not appear to have been distinguished from civil. The duty of teaching the people the knowledge of the law which pertained to the Levites, doubtless included such instruction as would assist the judgment of those who were thus to decide according to it. The Levites were thus the ultimate sources of ordinary jurisprudence, and perhaps the "teaching" aforesaid may merely mean the expounding the law as applicable to difficult cases arising in practice. Beyond this, it is not possible to indicate any division of the provinces of deciding on points of law as distinct from points of fact.

The judges mentioned as standing before Joshua in the great assemblies of the people must be understood as the successors 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, xxii. 14, xxiv. 1).

The judge was reckoned a sacred person, and secured even from verbal injuries. Seeking a decision at law is called "enquiring of God" (Ex. xviii. 15). The term "gods" is actually applied to judges (Ex. xxi. 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 instrumentality was indispensable, the source of justice was upheld as divine, and the purity of its administration only sank with the decline of religious feeling. In this spirit speaks Ps. lxxxii.—a lofty charge addressed to all who judge; comp. the qualities regarded as essential at the institution of the office, Ex. xviii. 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 made popular by being vested in those who led public feeling, and its importance in the public eye appears from such passages as Ps. lix. 12 (comp. cxix. 23), lxxxii., cxlviii. 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 commandment, "judges and officers shalt thou make thee 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; 2ndly, any surplus left of patriarchal seniors when they were taken out (as has been shown from Deut. i. 15, 16) from that class; and 3rdly, the Levites. On what principle the non-Levitical judges were chosen after Divine superintendence was interrupted at Joshua's death is not clear. A simple way would have been for the existing judges in every town, &c., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against facilities of corruption, would determine the choice of a judge, and, taken in connexion with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice. The supposition that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. *pass.*; Lev. xix. 15; Num. xxxv. 24; Deut. i. 16, xvi. 18, xxv. 1). And all that we know of the facts of later history confirms the supposition. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit

* The expression נְשִׂיאֵי בֵית־אָב (Num. xxv. 14) is remarkable, and seems to mean the patriarchal

senior of a subdivision of the tribe (comp. 1 Chr. iv. 38, Judg. v. 3, 13).

of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentment which followed the removal of 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^b of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying nomenclature, and rose from the *capite censi*, or mere citizens, upwards. The more common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (Judg. viii. 14; Ex. ii. 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 soon gained whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield; hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the ruder lay element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allots separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch, there is reason to think, from the general concurrence of phraseology amidst much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and "elders"^c had their analogies, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognised, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Succoth^d (Judg. viii. 14) may be taken as an example. Evidently the *ex officio* judges of Moses' choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Succoth pertained (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 were mostly the headmen by genealogy, they would fall into their natural places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also

^b 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 privation as regards holding land, were an aristocracy very unlike what has usually gone by that name.

^c A number of words—*e. g.* נָשִׂיא, שָׂר, נָנִיר, and (especially in the book of Job) נָרִיב—are sometimes rendered "prince" in the A. V.: the first most nearly uniformly so, which seems designative of the passive eminence of high birth or position; the next, שָׂר, expresses active and official authority. Yet as the נָשִׂיא was most likely, nay, in the earlier annals, certain, to be the שָׂר, we must be careful of excluding from the person called by the one title the qualities denoted by the other. Of the two remaining terms, נָרִיב, expressing princely qualities, approaches most nearly to נָשִׂיא, and נָנִיר, expressing prominence of station, to שָׂר.

^d The princes and elders here were together 77. The subordination in numbers, of which Ten 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

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, &c., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (Ex. xxx. 13; Num. iii. 47; Ezek. xlv. 12). Above all these, the high-priest, in the ante-regal period was the resort in difficult cases (Deut. xvii. 12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and who would in case of need be perhaps oracularly directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli: nor is any judicial act recorded of him; though perhaps his not restraining his sons is meant to be noticed as a failure in his judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judg. xix.^f It is also a fact of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called Judges, was of priestly lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high-priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume that, save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judge in the last resort from Joshua to Samuel. Indeed the current phrase of those deliverers that they "judged" Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might "judge them," rather than that he might "fight their battles" (1 Sam. viii. 5, 20).

These judges were 15 in number:—1. Othniel; 2. Ehud; 3. Shamgar; 4. Deborah and Barak; 5. Gideon; 6. Abimelech; 7. Tola; 8. Jair; 9. Jephthah; 10. Ibzan; 11. Elon; 12. Abdon;

ruling generally than of judging specially, yet we need not separate the two, as is clear from Deut. i. 16. Such division of labour assuredly found little place in primitive times. No doubt these men presided "in the gate." The number of Jacob's family (with which Succoth was traditionally connected, Gen. xxxiii. 17) having been 70 on their coming down into Egypt (Gen. xli. 27), may have been the cause of this number being that of the "elders" of that place, besides the sacred character of the factor 7. See also Ex. xxiv. 9. On the other hand, at Ramah about 30 persons occupied a similar place in popular esteem (1 Sam. ix. 22; see also ver. 13, and vii. 17).

^e The remark in the margin of the A. V. on 1 Sam. iv. 18 seems improper. It is as follows: "He seems to have been a judge to do justice only, and that in South-west Israel." When it was inserted, the function of the high-priest, as mentioned above, would seem to have been overlooked. That function was certainly designed to be general, not partial; though probably, as hinted above, its execution was inadequate.

^f It ought not to be forgotten that in some cases of "blood" the "congregation" themselves were to "judge" (Num. xxxv. 24), and that the appeal of Judg. xx. 4-7 was thus in the regular course of constitutional law.

13. Samson 14. Eli; 15. Samuel. Their history is related under their separate names, and some remarks 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 (p. 323).

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 kingdom of Saul suffered too severely from external foes to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of his only two recorded judicial acts, the one (1 Sam. xi. 13) was the mere remission of a penalty popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (ib. xiv. 44, 45) which, if it was sincerely intended, was over-ruled 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),³ 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 fall to his lot; and the high-priest was of course ready to assist the monarch. This is further presumable from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the subjection of all Israel to David's sway caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (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, xxvi. 29 (comp. v. 32, "rulers" probably including judges) of the 5000 Levites acting as "officers and judges," and amongst them specially "Chenaniah and his sons;" with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon's character, whose reign of peace would surely be fertile in civil questions, the "wisdom to judge" was the fitting first quality (1 K. iii. 9; comp. Ps. lxxii. 1-4). As a judge Solomon shines "in all his glory" (1 K. iii. 16, &c.). 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, 34). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2 Sam. i. 15, iv. 9-12, where sentence is summarily executed,⁴ and the supposed case of 2 Sam. xiv. 1-21. The denunciation of

³ See 2 Sam. xv. 3, where the text gives probably a better rendering than the margin.

⁴ The cases of Amnon and Absalom, in which no notice was taken of either crime, though set down by Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, bk. i. art. x.) as instances of justice forbore through politic consideration of the criminal's power, seem rather to be examples of mere weakness, either of government or of personal character, in David. His own criminality with Bathsheba it is superfluous to argue, since the matter was by Divine interference removed from the cognizance of human law.

2 Sam. xii. 5, 6, is, though not formally judicial, yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the cases of Joab and Shimei (1 K. ii. 34, 46; comp. 2 K. xiv. 5, 6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavourable to the local independence connected with the judicature of the "princes" and "elders" in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralise, 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.⁵ Being to some extent detached, both locally, and by special duties, exemptions, &c., 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. xxii. 17). Hence it is probable that the Levites generally superseded the local elders in the administration of justice. But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingdom of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. Thus they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (1 K. xxi. 8-13). There is in 2 Chr. xix. 5, &c., 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 matters" as a branch of jurisprudence. The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these may have grown probably into a department, somewhat like 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. xxviii. 21; Jer. xxvi. 10, 16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses⁶ in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction; but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant alarm of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy, which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigour was left in the state, and encroached on the sovereign attribute of justice. The employment in offices of trust and emolument would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolise such employment. Hence the constant burden of

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 favour 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.

⁶ That some of the heads of such houses, however, retained their proper sphere, seems clear from Jer. xxvi. 17, where "elders of the land" address an "assembly of the people." Still, the occasion is not judicial.

the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption, of judicial functionaries (Is. i. 17, 21, v. 7, x. 2, xxviii. 7, lvi. 1, lix. 4; Jer. ii. 8, v. 1, vii. 5, xxi. 12; Ez. xxii. 27, xiv. 8, 9; Hos. v. 10, vii. 5, 7; Amos v. 7, 15, 24, vi. 12; Hab. i. 4, &c.). 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 Sanhedrim of later times.^m [See SANHEDRIM.] 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. xxi. 8-14, of a criminal character;ⁿ to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well-known "judgment" of Solomon. Boaz apparently empanels as it were the first ten "elders" whom he meets "in the gate," the well-known site of the Oriental court, and cites the other party by "Ho, such an one;" and the people appear to be invoked as attesting the legality of the proceeding. The whole affair bears an extemporaneous aspect, which may, however, be merely the result of the terseness of the narrative. In Job ix. 19, we have a wish expressed that a "time to plead" might be "set" (comp. the phrase of Roman law, *diem dicere*). In the case of the involuntary homicide seeking the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of its elders (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" (Deut. xix. 12). The expressions between "blood and blood," between "plea and plea" (Deut. xvii. 8), indicate a presumption of legal intricacy arising, the latter expression seeming to imply something like what we call a "cross-suit." We may infer from the scantiness, or rather almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them to be provided for as the necessity for them arose, it being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chicane. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors; Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of 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 to think that until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on *συνηγορος* and *παράκλητος*, any professed class of pleaders existed. Yet passages abound in which the pleading of the cause of those who are unable to plead their own, is spoken of as, what it indeed was, a noble act of charity; and the expression has even (which shows the popularity of the practice) become a basis of figurative allusion

^m The Sanhedrim is, by a school of Judaism once more prevalent than now, attempted to be based on the 70 elders of Num. xi. 16, and to be traced through the O. T. history. Those 70 were chosen when judicature had been already provided for (Ex. xviii. 25), and their office was to assist Moses in the duty of

(Job xvi. 21; Prov. xxii. 23, xxiii. 11, xxxi. 9; Is. i. 17; Jer. xxx. 13, l. 34, l. 36). The blessedness of such acts is forcibly dwelt upon, Job xxix. 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 asses" (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 personally known.

For other matters relating to some of the forms of law, see OATHS, OFFICERS, WITNESSES. [H.H.]

JUDGES, BOOK OF (שׁוֹפְטִים; Κριταί;

liber Judicum). I. *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.-xxi.

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. xii. 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-iii. 6.—This is a second introduction, standing in nearer relation to the following history. It informs us that the people fell into idolatry after the death of Joshua and his generation, and that they were punished for it by being unable to drive out the remnant of the inhabitants of the land, and by falling under the hand of oppressors. A parenthesis occurs (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 a Judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry. (c) 'ii. 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

governing. But no influence of any such body is traceable in later times at any crisis of history. They seem in fact to have left no successors.

ⁿ The example of Susannah and the elders is too suspicious an authority to be cited.

greater or less length. The account of the remaining seven is very short, and merely attached to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows:—

(1) The deliverance of Israel by Othniel, iii. 7-11. (2) The history of Ehud, and (in 31) that of Shamgar, iii. 12-31. (3) The deliverance by Deborah and Barak, iv.-v. (4) The whole passage is vi.-x. 5. 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. 3-5. This is the only case in which the history of a Judge is continued by that of his children. But the exception is one which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of his family by Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who in their turn become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorised anticipation of the kingly government of later times. (5) x. 6-xii. The history of Jephthah, x. 6-xii. 7; to which is added the mention of Ibzan, xii. 8-10; Elon, 11, 12; Abdon, 13-15. (6) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, xiii.-xvi. We may observe in general on this portion of the book, that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance: there are no sacerdotal allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not alluded to after the time of Othniel; and the greater part of the Judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

B. xvii.-xxi.—This part has no formal connexion 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" (ix. 1; cf. xviii. 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 by the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its becoming complete. 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.

III. *Design*.—We have already seen that there is an unity of plan in i.-xvi., 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. Thus Gideon, who in some respects is the most eminent of them, is only the head of his own tribe and has to appease the men of

Ephraim by conciliatory language in the moment of his victory over the Midianites; and he himself is the means of leading away the people from the pure worship of God. In Jephthah we find the chief of the land of Gilead only, affected to some extent by personal reasons (xi. 9); his war against the Ammonites is confined to the east side of Jordan, though its issue probably also freed the western side from their presence, and it is followed by a bloody conflict with Ephraim. Again, Samson's task was simply "to begin to deliver Israel" (xiii. 5); and the occasions which called forth his hostility to the Philistines are of a kind which place him on a different level from Deborah or Gideon. This shows that the passage in question is a general review of the *collective* history of Israel during the time of the Judges, the details of which, in their varying aspects, are given faithfully as the narrative proceeds.

The existence of this design may lead us to expect that we have not a complete history of the times—a fact which is clear from the book itself. We have only accounts of parts of the nation at any one time. We may easily suppose that there were other incidents of a similar nature to those recorded in xvii.-xxi. And in the history itself there are points which are obscure from want of fuller information, e. g. the reason for the silence about the tribe of Judah (see also viii. 18; ix. 26). Some suppose even that the number of the Judges is not complete; but there is no reason for this opinion. *Bedan* (1 Sam. xii. 11) is possibly the same as *Abdon*. Ewald (*Gesch.* ii. 477) rejects the common explanation that the word is a contracted form of *Ben-Dan*, i. e. Samson. And *Jael* (v. 6) need not be the name of an unknown Judge, or a corruption of *Jair*, as Ewald thinks, but is probably the wife of Heber. "The days of Jael" would carry the misery of Israel up to the time of the victory over Sisera, and such an expression could hardly be thought too great an honour at that time (see v. 24).

IV. *Materials*.—The author must have found certain parts of his book in a definite shape: e. g. the words of the prophet (ii. 1-5), the song of Deborah (v.), Jotham's parable (ix. 7-20; see also xiv. 14, 18, xv. 7, 16). How far these and the rest of his materials came to him already written is a matter of doubt. Stähelin (*Krit. Unters.* p. 106) thinks that iii. 7-xvi. present the same manner and diction throughout, and that there is no need to suppose written sources. So Hävernick (*Einleitung*, i. 1, p. 68 sqq. 107) only recognises the use of documents in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (*On Judges*, p. xxviii.-xxxii.) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are narrated 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; in vi.-ix. two distinct authorities are used—a life of Gideon, and a history of Shechem and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samson is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (*Gesch.* i. 184 sqq., ii. 486 sqq.).

V. *Relation to other Books*.—(A) to Joshua.—Josh. xv.-xxi. must be compared with Judg. i. 12

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, xxi. 1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by Josh. xxiv. 28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and ii. 6-9 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.

(B) 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. xv. 6), and that of David (1 Sam. xxx. 29), is explained by i. 16. A reference to the continuance of the Philistine wars is implied in xiii. 5. The allusion to Atimelech (2 Sam. xi. 21) is explained by ch. ix. Chapters xvii.-xxi. 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 connexion either with those that precede or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its view and spirit with those of the other books. But its form would lead to the conclusion 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.-xxi. 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 only deferred on account of their close connexion with the rise of the monarchy. And Judg. xvii.-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.-xvi., 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 connexion of these books, however, is denied by De Wette (*Einleit.* §186) and Thénius (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. Sam.* p. xv., *König*, p. i.). Bertheau, on the other hand, thinks that one editor may be traced from Genesis to 2 Kings, whom he believes to be Ezra, in agreement with Jewish tradition.

VI. *Date*.—The only guide to the date of this book which we find in ii. 6-xvi. is the expression "unto this day," the last occurrence of which (xv. 19) implies some distance from the time of Samson. But i. 21, according to the most natural explanation, would indicate a date, for this chapter at least, previous to the taking of Jebus by David (2 Sam. v. 6-9). Again, we should at first sight suppose i. 28, 30, 33, 35, to belong to the time of the Judges; but these passages are taken by most modern critics as pointing to the time of Solomon (cf. 1 K. ix. 21). i.-xvi. may therefore have been

originally, as Ewald thinks (*Gesch.* i. 202, 3), the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, *Introduction*, 649, 50). 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 (xvii. 6, xviii. 1). There is some doubt as to xviii. 30. 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 B.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, there remains the one important fact 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 to those days, as well as in these, to refuse to recognise 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 Joshua's death and the invasion of Cushan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shamgar was Judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 410 years when reckoned consecutively; and Acts xiii. 20 would show that this was the computation commonly adopted, as the 450 years seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by xi. 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 480 years (440, LXX.). One solution questions the genuineness of the date in 1 Kings. Kennicott pronounces against it (*Diss. Gen.* 80, §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 Thénius (*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 Jair, but makes Jephthah 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, and the Philistine wars

to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations—differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the Exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the Judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning. 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 (x. 7). Round numbers seem 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, p. 323.

VIII. *Commentaries*.—The following list is taken from Bertheau (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. z. A. T., Das Buch der Richter u. Rut.*), to whom this article is principally indebted. (1) Rabbinical: In addition to the well-known commentaries, see R. Tanchumi Hierosol. *ad libros Vet. Test. commentarii Arabici specimen una cum annotationibus ad aliquot loca libri Judd.*, ed. Ch. Fr. Schnurrer, Tubing. 1791, 4to.; R. Tanchumi Hierosol. *Comment. in prophetas Arab. specimen* (on Judg. xiii.-xxi.), ed. Th. Haarbrücker, Halis, 1842, 8vo. (2) Christian: Victor Strigel, *Scholia in libr. Judd.*, Lips. 1586; Serrarius, *Comment. in libros Jos. Judd., etc.*, 1609; *Critici Sacri*, tom. ii. Lond. 1660; Sebast. Schmidt, *In libr. Judd.*, Argentor. 1706, 4to.; Clerici *V. T. libri historici*, Amstelod. 1708, fol.; J. D. Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebers. des A. T.* Göttingen, 1772; Dathe, *Libri hist. Lat. vers.* 1784; *Exeg. Handb. d. A. T.*; Maurer, *Comment. gramm. crit.* pp. 126-153; Rosenmüller *Scholia*, vol. ii. Lipsiæ, 1835; Gottl. Ludw. Studer, *das Buch der Richter grammat. und histor. erklärt.* 1835. There are many separate treatises on ch. v., a list of which is found in Bertheau, p. 80. [E. R. O.]

JUDGMENT-HALL. The word *Praetorium* (Πραιτώριον) is so translated five times in the A. V. of the N. T.; and in those five passages it denotes two different places.

1. In John xviii. 28, 33, xxix. 9, it is the residence which Pilate occupied when he visited Jerusalem; to which the Jews brought Jesus from the house of Caiaphas, and within which He was examined by Pilate, and scourged and mocked by the soldiers, while the Jews were waiting without in the neighbourhood of the judgment-seat (erected on the Pavement in front of the Praetorium), on which Pilate sat when he pronounced the final sentence. The Latin word *praetorium* originally signified (see Smith's *Dict. of Ant.*) the general's tent in a Roman camp (Liv. xxviii. 27, &c.); and afterwards it had, among other significations, that of the palace in which a governor of a province lived and administered justice (Cic. *Verr.* ii. 4, §28, &c.). The site of Pilate's praetorium in Jerusalem has given rise to much dispute, some supposing it to be the palace of king Herod, others the tower of Antonia; but it has been shown elsewhere that the latter was probably the Praetorium, which was then and long afterwards the citadel of Jerusalem. [JERUSALEM, p. 1032a.] This is supported by the fact that at the time of the trial of Christ, Herod was in Jerusalem, doubtless inhabiting the palace of his father (Luke xxiii. 7). It appears, however, from a passage of Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 14, §8), that

the Roman governor sometimes resided in the palace, and set up his judgment-seat in front of it. Pilate certainly lived there at one time (Philo, *Ley. in Caium*, 38, 39). Winer conjectures that the procurator, when in Jerusalem, resided with a body-guard in the palace of Herod (Jos. *B. J.* ii. 15, §5), while the Roman garrison occupied Antonia. Just in like manner, a former palace of Hiero became the praetorium, in which Verres lived in Syracuse (Cic. *Verr.* ii. 5, §12).

2. In Acts xxiii. 35 Herod's judgment-hall or praetorium in Caesarea was doubtless a part of that magnificent range of buildings, the erection of which by king Herod is described in Josephus (*Ant.* xv. 9, §6; see also *B. J.* i. 21, §5-8).

3. The word "palace," or "Caesar's court," in the A. V. of Phil. i. 13, is a translation of the same word praetorium. The statement in a later part of the same Epistle (iv. 22) would seem to connect this praetorium with the imperial palace at Rome; but no classical authority is found for so designating the palace itself. The praetorian camp, outside the northern wall of Rome, was far from the palace, and therefore unlikely to be the praetorium here mentioned. An opinion well deserving consideration has been advocated by Wieseler, and by Conybeare and Howson (*Life of St. Paul*, ch. 26), to the effect that the praetorium here mentioned was the quarter of that detachment of the Praetorian Guards which was in immediate attendance upon the emperor, and had barracks in Mount Palatine. It will be remembered that St. Paul, on his arrival at Rome (Acts xxviii. 16), was delivered by the centurion into the custody of the praetorian prefect.

4. The word *praetorium* occurs also in Matt. xxvii. 27, where it is translated "common hall," and in Mark xv. 16. In both places it denotes Pilate's residence in Jerusalem. [W. T. B.]

JU'DITH, 1. יהודית; 'Ioudith, 'Ioudēth, 'Ioudēth, "the daughter of Beeri the Hittite," and wife of Esau (Gen. xxvi. 34). [AHOLIBAMAH.]

2. 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 ff.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (ix. 2), and the manner in which she refers to his cruel deed (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 zealous ritualism (xii. 1 ff.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (viii. 31 ff.). Clement of Rome (*Ep.* i. 55) assigns to Judith the epithet given to Jael ('Ioudēth ē makaria); 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 Ecclesiae diabolum capite truncavit; cf. *Ep.* xxii. 21, p. 105).

The name is properly the feminine form of יהודי, *Judaeus* (cf. Jer. xxxvi. 14, 21). In the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of *Judah*, i. e. "praised." [B. F. W.]

JU'DITH, 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 Holofernes, and the deliverance of Bethulia, through the stratagem and courage of the Jewish heroine, contains too many and too serious diff-

culties, 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 connexion with the course of Jewish history. The latter fact is seen most clearly in the extreme varieties of opinion among those critics who have endeavoured to maintain the veracity of the story. Nebuchadnezzar has been identified with Cambyses, Xerxes, Esarhaddon, Kiniladan, Merodach Baladan, &c., 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 (xv. 8, ἡ γερονσία τῶν νῆδων Ἰσραήλ; cf. iv. 4, Samaria; viii. 6, προσάββατον, προμηθίων); 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 facts, which underlies the whole narrative, renders it superfluous to examine in detail the other objections which may be urged against it (e.g. iv. 6, Joacim; cf. 1 Chr. vi.; Joseph. *Ant.* x. 8, §6, JOACIM).

2. The value of the book is not, however, lessened by its fictitious character. On the contrary it becomes even more valuable as exhibiting an ideal type of heroism, which was outwardly embodied in the wars of independence. The self-sacrificing faith and unscrupulous bravery of Judith were the qualities by which the champions of Jewish freedom were then enabled to overcome the power of Syria, which seemed at the time scarcely less formidable than the imaginary hosts of Holofernes. The peculiar character of the book, which is exhibited in these traits, affords the best indication of its date; for it cannot be wrong to refer its origin to the Maccabæan 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 Bertholdt, *Eiul.* 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 B.C. (175-100 B.C.), the attempts which have been made to fix its date within narrower limits, either to the time of the war of Alexander Jannæus (105-4 B.C., Movers) or of Demetrius II. (129 B.C., Ewald), rest on very inaccurate data. It might seem more natural (as a mere conjecture) to refer it to an earlier time, c. 170 B.C., when Antiochus Epiphanes made his first assault upon the Temple.^a

3. In accordance with the view which has been given of 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 deriva-

tion (e.g. Achior = *Brother of Light*; Judith = *Jewess*; Bethulia = בתוליה, the virgin of *Sehovah*), and the historical difficulties of the person of Nebuchadnezzar disappear when he is regarded as the Scriptural type of worldly power. But it is, perhaps, a mere play of fancy to allegorise the whole narrative, as Grotius has done (*Prolog. in Jud.*), who interprets Judith of the Jewish nation widowed of outward help, Bethulia (בית-אליה) of the Temple, Nebuchadnezzar of the devil, and Holofernes (הלפר נחש, *lictor serpentis*) of Antiochus, his emissary; while Joacim, the high-priest, conveys, as he thinks, by his name the assurance that "God will rise up" to deliver this people.

4. Two conflicting statements have been preserved as to the original language of the book. Origen speaks of it together with Tobit as "not existing in Hebrew even among the Apocrypha" in the Hebrew collection (*Ep. ad Afric.* §13, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ [οἱ Ἑβραῖοι] καὶ ἐν Ἀποκρίφοις Ἑβραῖστί, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγγνώσκμεν), by which statement he seems to imply that the book was originally written in Greek. Jerome, on the other hand, says that "among the Hebrews the book of Judith is read among the Hagiographa [Apocrypha] . . . and being written in the Chaldee language is reckoned among the histories" (*Praef. ad Jud.*). The words of Origen are, however, somewhat ambiguous, and there can be little doubt that the book was written in Palestine in the national dialect (Syro-Chaldaic), though Jahn (*Eiul.* ii. §3) and Eichhorn (*Eiul. in d. Apohr.* 327) maintain the originality of the present Greek text, on the authority of some phrases which may be assigned very naturally to the translator or reviser.^b

5. The text exists at present in two distinct recensions, the Greek (followed by the Syriac) and the Latin. The former evidently is the truer representative of the original, and it seems certain that the Latin was derived, in the main, from the Greek by a series of successive alterations. Jerome confesses that his own translation was free (*magis sensum e sensu quam verbum e verbo transferens*); and peculiarities of the language (Fritzsche, p. 122) prove that he took the old Latin as the basis of his work, though he compared it with the Chaldee text, which was in his possession (*sola ea quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui Latinis expressi*). The Latin text contains many curious errors, which seem to have arisen in the first instance from false hearing (Bertholdt, *Eiul.* 2574 f; e.g. x. 5, καὶ ἄρτων καθαρῶν. Vulg. et panes et caseum, i.e. καὶ τυροῦ, xvi. 2, ὅτι εἰς παρεμβολὰς αὐτοῦ. Vulg. qui posuit castra sua, i.e. ὁ θεὸς; xvi. 17, καὶ κλαύσονται ἐν αἰσθήσει. Vulg. ut wantur et sentiant); and Jerome remarks that it had been variously corrupted and interpolated before his time. At present it is impossible to determine the authentic text. In many instances the Latin is more full than the Greek (iv. 8-15, v. 11-20, v. 22-24, vi. 15 ff., ix. 6 ff.), which however contains peculiar passages (i. 13-16, vi. 1, &c.). Even where the two texts do not differ in

^a The theory of Volkmar (*Das vierte Buch Ezra*, p. 6; *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856-7) that the book of Judith refers to the period of the Parthian war of Trajan, need only be noticed in passing, as it assumes the spuriousness of the first epistle of Clement (§6).

^b The present Greek text offers instances of mis-translation which clearly point to an Aramaic original: e.g. iii. 9, xvi. 3, i. 8; cf. v. 15, 18 (Vaihinger; in Herzog's *Encykl.* s. v.; Fritzsche, *Eiul.* §2; De Wette, *Eiul.* §208, c.).

the details of the narrative, as is often the case (e.g. 1, 3 ff., iii. 9, v. 9, vi. 13, vii. 2 ff., x. 12 ff., xv. 11, xvi. 25), they yet differ in language (e.g. c. xv., &c.), and in names (e.g. viii. 1) and numbers (e.g. i. 2); and these variations can only be explained by going back to some still more remote source (cf. Bertholdt, *Eintl.* 2568 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 (*Sel. in Jerem.* 23; cf. *Hom. ix. in Jud. i.*), Hilary (*in Psal.* cxxv. 6), and Lucifer (*De non paroc.* p. 955). 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 Bibl. Text.* 646 a), but it obtained a place in the Latin Canon at an early time (cf. Hilar. *Prolog. in Ps.* 15), which it commonly maintained afterwards. [CANON.]

7. The Commentary of Fritzsche (*Kurzgefasstes Exeg. Handbuch*, Leipzig, 1853) is by far the best which has appeared: within a narrow compass it contains a good critical apparatus and scholarlike notes. [B. F. W.]

JUEL (Ἰουήλ: *Johel, Jessei*). 1. 1 Esd. ix. 34. [UEL.] 2. 1 Esd. ix. 35. [JOEL, 13.]

JULIA (Ἰουλιὰ), a Christian woman at Rome, probably the wife, or perhaps the sister, of Philologus, in connexion 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), the courteous centurion of "Augustus' band," to whose charge St. Paul was delivered when he was sent prisoner from Caesarea to Rome (*Acts* xxvii. 1, 3).

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 *Sebasteni* by Josephus (*Ant.* xix. 9, §2, &c.). Conybeare and Howson (*Life of St. Paul*, ch. 21) adopt in the main Wieseler's opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the *Praetorian Guards* attached to the person of the Roman governor at Caesarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Priscus (*Tacit. Hist.* ii. 92, iv. 11), sometime centurion, afterwards prefect of the *Praetorians*. [W. T. B.]

JU'NIA (Ἰουνίας, i.e. JUNIA), 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 seventy disciples. Hammond also takes

the name to be that of a man, Junias, which would be a contraction (as Winer observes) of Junilius or Junianus. 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.]

JUNIPER (Ἰουνίη, from Ἰουνή, "bind," Gesen. p. 1317; βαθμῆν, φυτόν, 1 K. xix. 4, 5; *juniperus*). It has been already stated [CEDAR] that the oxycedrus or Phoenician juniper was the tree whose wood, called "cedar-wood," was ordered by the law to be used in ceremonial purification (*Lev.* xiv. 4; *Num.* xix. 6). The word, however, which is rendered in A. V. juniper, is beyond doubt a sort of broom, *Genista monosperma*, G. rætam of Forskål, answering to the Arabic *Rethem*, which is also found in the desert of Sinai in the neighbourhood of the true juniper (Robinson, ii. 124). It is mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (1 K. xix. 4, 5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for human food (*Ps.* cxx. 4; *Job* xxx. 4). It is very abundant in the desert of Sinai, and affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm, to travellers (*Virg. 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

יְבִשֵׁי (Job xxx. 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 have sometimes served for human food (*Gesen.* p. 1484). The roots are much valued by the Arabs for charcoal for the Cairo market. Thus the tree which afforded shade to Elijah may have furnished also the "coals" or ashes for baking the cake which satisfied his hunger (1 K. xix. 6; see also *Ps.* cxx. 4, "coals 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, Rithmah (*Num.* xxxiii. 18, 19; Burckhardt, *Syria*, pp. 483, 537; Robinson, i. 203, 205, Lord Lindsay, *Letters*, p. 183; Pliny, *H. N.* xxiv. 9, 65; Balfour, *Plants of the Bible*, p. 50; Stanley, *S. & P.* 20, 79, 521). [H. W. P.]

JUPITER (Ζεὺς, LXX.). 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 Olympius (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 hospitality" (cf. Grimm, on 2 *Macc.* i. c.), is more obscure. In 2 *Macc.* vi. 2 it is explained by the clause, "as was the character of those who dwelt in the place," which may, however, be an ironical comment of the writer (cf. *Q. Curt.* iv. 5, 8), and not a sincere eulogy of the

* Of modern versions the English follows the Greek, and that of Luther the Latin text.

hospitality of the Samaritans (as Ewald, *Gesch.* iv. 339 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 "Jupiter, which was before their city," means that his temple was outside the city. [B. F. W.]

JUSHAB-HESED (יֵשׁוּב הַסֵּד): Ἀσοβέδ, Ἀσοβαίσεδ, Cod. Alex.: *Jzabhesed*, son of Zerubabel (1 Chr. iii. 20). 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 Judaea after the return, whereas the three others were born at Babylon. The name of Jushab-hesed, 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 (Ἰουστος). Schoettgen (*Hor. Hebr. in Act. Ap.*) shows by quotations from Rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews. 1. A surname of Joseph called Barsabas (Acts i. 23). [JOSEPH BARSABAS, p. 1142.]

* This—with one t—is the form given in Hahn's text of xv. 55; Michaelis and Walton insert a dagesh, but it was apparently unknown to any of the old

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.

3. A surname of Jesus, a friend of St. Paul (Col. iv. 11). [JESUS, p. 1039.]

JUTTAH (יֻטָּה), i. e. Jutta; * also יֻטָּי, and in xxi. 16, יֻטָּי: Ἰτάν, Alex. Ἰετρά; Ταύ, Alex. omits: *Iota, Ieta*, a city in the mountain region of Judah, in the neighbourhood of Maon and Carmel (Josh. xv. 55). It was allotted to the priests (xxi. 16), but in the catalogue of 1 Chr. vi. 57-59, the name has escaped. In the time of Eusebius it was a large village (κώμη μεγίστη), 18 miles southward of Eleutheropolis (*Onomasticon*, "Jettan"). A village called *Jutta* was visited by Robinson, close to *Main* and *Kurnul* (*B. R.* 1 ed. ii. 195, 628), which doubtless represents the ancient town.

Reland (*Pal.* 870) conjectures that Jutta is the πόλις Ἰουδα (A. V. "a city of Juda") 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. [G.]

translators, in whose versions (with the exception of the Alex. LXX.), whatever shape the word assumes, it retains a single t.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.



